

Model Of Social Stratification of The Uzbek Society (The End of The Xix Century - The End of the 30s Of the Xx Century)

By

Nadira Makhkamova

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Leading Researcher

Head of the Department of Humanitarian Sciences

Tashkent University of Information Technologies named after Muhammad al- Khwarizmi

Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article is an attempt from modern conceptual and methodological positions, on a significantly updated source base, analyze in a historical retrospective the transformation of the social stratification of society on the territory of Uzbekistan in conjunction with socio-political and socio-economic events since the end of the XIX century, until the end of the 1930s of XX century. The article defines the main stages of changes in the social structure of society on the territory of Uzbekistan under the colonial and Soviet regimes, studied the specific features, dynamics and trends of changes in all its social strata in each of them, rethought their role in society. The author in the course of the study identified the directions of transformation of the social composition of the society of the indigenous population of the territories that became part of the Turkestan Governor-Generalship after their conquest by the Russian Empire, and also traced the process of strengthening the layer of middle owners in Turkestan at the beginning of the XX century. Of particular importance is the rethinking from the standpoint of a new methodological approach of the essence of the policy of the Soviet government in relation to various social strata of the population, as well as the disclosure of the repressive nature of its measures for the social stratification of society on the territory of Uzbekistan in the course of political and social transformations in the 20-30s of the XX century, as a result of which the historically established strata of its indigenous population in traditional types of professional activity were practically destroyed in Uzbekistan, which had tragic consequences. The article also discusses the positive and negative aspects of the formation of new social strata of the Soviet society - industrial workers and “worker-dekhkan” intelligentsia.

Keywords: model, stratification, strata, social structure, layers, dictatorship of the proletariat.

Introduction

Modern times require historians to apply new modern conceptual and methodological approaches in their work, based on a renewed study of the sources and achievements of world historical science. This was especially necessary to identify an objective picture of the social development of society, since in historical science until the end of the 80s of the twentieth century, two methodological conceptual approaches prevailed in the study of its social structure - “class” and “stratification”.

The class approach reigned supreme in Soviet historiography. It was based on the Marxist-Leninist theory, according to which society was divided into classes, and their main feature was the attitude towards the means of production. At the same time, many other social groups of the population were not taken into account, which did not have class-forming

Published/ publié in *Res Militaris* (resmilitaris.net), vol.12, n°3, November Issue 2022

features, but were components of the social structure of society - the intelligentsia, employees, clergy, artisans, handicraftsmen, merchants, housewives, disabled people, students, pensioners, etc. There was also a class stratification, which in no way corresponded to the signs of class. With a class approach in a class society, the exploiting class included self-sufficient artisans and wealthy peasants using hired labor, while the exploited class included the bulk of artisans and peasants. But all of them, by their origin, belonged to one lower third class without rights. As a result of the class approach in science, there was no clear terminology that would give a clear idea of the composition of the population. So, in Soviet historiography, the exploiting class included the “class of the bourgeoisie” and the “class of prosperous peasants”, at the same time there was also the “class of working peasants”, and simply the “class of peasants”, etc. The concept of the class structure of society did not make it possible to correctly determine the place of each social group in it, to identify the factors influencing the dynamics of its development, and created a one-sided and often biased approach to historical processes and phenomena.

It is quite obvious that in modern conditions the theory of social stratification of society, which has been widely used in world practice since the 1940s, is more in line with the new tasks of historical science. The concept of “stratum” is more flexible than the concept of “class”, it includes a wide range of social phenomena and provides ample opportunities for analyzing the composition of society. The stratification approach shows that the social structure of society is a dynamically changing social category and the vector of its changes is determined by the general progress of society, which is determined by the multiplying and more complex forms of the division of labor, the increasing number of professions, the changing relations between members of society, their way of life, etc. The purpose of this study is to analyze, on a significantly updated source base, in a historical retrospective, the transformation of the social stratification of society on the territory of Uzbekistan in relation to socio-political and socio-economic events in the period from the end of the XIX century to the end of the 30s of the XX century.

Literature Review

The chronological framework of the study - the end of the XIX century in the 30s of the XX century, determined the need to study a large layer of literature that was created for more than 100 years under various political regimes and from the standpoint of various conceptual and methodological approaches. Therefore, all literature, in one way or another affecting the problem we have chosen, can be divided into groups - the works of scientists and local historians of the colonial period; publications of the Soviet period; scientific works of the period of independence.

The literature of the colonial period is represented by works written in the late XIX - early XX centuries by Russian and Central Asian authors. Special works devoted to the analysis of the social structure of colonial Turkestan were not created at that time. But there was a significant number of studies, to one degree or another, concerning certain aspects of the problem. In this review, we will name only the largest of them, which were of particular interest to us. These are the studies of V.V. Grigorieva, A.P. Khoroshkhina, M.I. Venyukov, A. Midendorf, G.A. Arandarenko, I.I. Geyer, V.I. Massalsky [1.532;297;489;667;346;861], containing extensive summarizing information about the region (including the composition of the population). Interesting data characterizing the economic and social situation of various social strata of the Turkestan society are contained in A.P. Demidova, S.I. Gulishambarova, V.N. Ogloblin, V.V. Zaorskaya and A. Alexander [2.256; 559]. Written at the beginning of

the XX century, they well reflected the economic and social situation in the region, when the colonial orientation of the development of the region's economy, as a raw material appendage of the metropolis, had already been formed. The agrarian nature of the region's economy with a pronounced colonial bias led to the existence of extensive literature on the development of agriculture in general, the social status and social structure of the village in particular. In this regard, of particular interest are the works of officials of the tax service of the Turkestan Territory A.I. Shakhnazarova, A.P. Demidov, agronomist of the Office for Migration Affairs of the Syrdarya region V.I. Yuferev, agronomist of the land tax department of the same region S.V. Poniatowski [3.512;280;60;76;357]. The analysis carried out in these works shows that at the beginning of the XX century in the Turkestan village, a significant part of these small dekhkan farms, which specialized in growing cotton, were farms of average income. This gives grounds to refute the opinion prevailing in Soviet historiography about the extremely distressed situation of small-scale farms, which already at that time were not able to conduct effective economic management on their own.

Considering the literature of the colonial period, it should be noted the works of prominent Russian local historians and ethnographers V.P. Nalivkina, N.P. Ostroumova, A.I. Dobrosmyslova, N.S. Lykoshin [4.244;144;272;215;;520;412], who made a significant contribution to the study of such important issues as social relations, social psychology, mentality and life of the indigenous population of Turkestan, the role of religion in their lives.

The literature of the Soviet period includes the works of historians and social scientists published in the 20–80s of the XX century. Their methodological basis was the Marxist-Leninist class theory, and their distinguishing feature was a pronounced apology for the Soviet system. In accordance with the ideological conjuncture, historical works studied “the experience of the struggle of the communist party to build a socialist society” in the republic, considered the formation and creative activity of only the working class, collective farmers and the “worker-dekhkan” intelligentsia. All these processes were described only in positive dynamics. At the same time, it was proved that in the 20-30s all other groups of the population were explicit (clergy, national intelligentsia) or potential (artisans, handicraftsmen, merchants) enemies of the Soviet system [5.382; 250;768].

The information and scientific significance of the literature of the Soviet period is unequal. For our work, the works of historians, well-known party and public figures on socio-economic issues, published in the 20s, were of great interest [6. 147;218;77;42;119;235;160]

Their authors were still working in relatively favorable conditions, when the methodological class approach had not been established in science, non-standard conclusions were allowed, pluralism of opinions, attention was paid to the reliability of facts, and not to their political assessment. All this, of course, had a positive effect on the scientific level of these works and the quality of the rich and objective information they provide. However, the social structure of society in the period under review was not the object of special study.

The first attempt to consider the problem of social stratification of society as a whole was made in the monograph by S. Tursunmukhamedov “The Great October and Changes in the Social Structure of Soviet Uzbekistan” [7.184], which was the undoubted advantage of this work, although it mainly studied the structure of society in Soviet Uzbekistan during the period of “developed socialism”. And only at the beginning, the author gave a brief description of the social composition of the population of Turkestan in the colonial period. Conceptually, the work fully complied with the ideological requirements of its time. Collective monograph “Change in the class structure of society in Uzbekistan during the

years of Soviet power (1917-1980)” [8.303], published in the early 1980s examined the standard three-member structure of society, consisting of two classes (workers and peasants) and a stratum (intelligentsia). All other population groups for the authors, as it were, did not exist and remained outside the study.

A monograph by R.G. Rabich “Formation and development of the social structure of Uzbekistan (1917-1941)” [9.124] was the next attempt to take a new step in the development of perestroika processes in Russian historical science. The advantage of the work is that R.G. Rabich made an attempt to move away from the prevailing stereotypes and give a new for Soviet historiography of the late 80s - early 90s of the XX century in a negative assessment of the migration of the European population to Uzbekistan during the years of the first five-year plans, the collectivization of agriculture, and the methods of forming the Soviet intelligentsia. In addition, in the introduction, he rightly condemned “the principle of class determinism in social processes that reigned supreme in science, which did not take into account the diverse criteria of social development” and set the goal of giving an “objective, taking into account new methodological and theoretical approaches, presentation of the most important issues of the formation of classes in Soviet Uzbekistan”.

In general, the work of R.G. Rabich did not achieve the breakthrough he claimed in studying the problem of the formation of the social structure of Uzbekistan in 1917-1941, since he approached its disclosure from the old methodological positions.

The next group of historical literature, in which various aspects of the problem we have chosen, are the works published in the Republic of Uzbekistan after gaining independence, when domestic social scientists had a real opportunity to objectively and independently, without predetermined ideological framework, cover the history of their people, create works in a qualitatively new conceptual key with an installation on generally accepted scientific principles and the ideology of independence. During this period, several works were published, as well as dissertations were defended, which touched on certain aspects of the social stratification of society on the territory of Uzbekistan [10].

All the above works testify to the significant advancement of the historical science of the republic over the years of independence.

At the same time, their analysis shows that with all the variety of problems raised by scientists of the republic, the problem of transformations of the social structure of society on the territory of Uzbekistan from the end of the XIX century to the end of the 30s of the XX century in historical retrospect remains little studied.

In addition to the historical literature on the chosen problem described above, it is necessary to note another significant historiographical layer, to which domestic scientists received free access only in conditions of independence. These are the studies of Western scientists, who in Soviet times were called “bourgeois falsifiers” for their objective assessment of the transformation processes taking place in the socialist state, and therefore were strictly prohibited.

Of these, according to the problem of interest to us, 2 groups can be distinguished:

- first: works on the theory of stratification by Pitirim Sorokin, Talcott Parsons, Max Weber, Milton M. Gordon, Leonard Bigley, Daniel Rossides and others, in which the social

structure of society was considered regardless of the level of development of the productive forces and production relations;

- second: studies of well-known Western scientists, for example, such as M. Chokaev, J. Bergkhorn, V. Monteil, A. Park, B. Hayit, M. Rivkin, J. Wheeler, B. Walsh, Helen Carrer d'Ancos, E. Allworth, W. Linn, Shoshana Keller [11. 403-420;150;428;61;191;272;126;220;190;50;227] and others, who criticized the purely class, politicized approach of Soviet historians to the coverage of the processes of socialist construction in Uzbekistan and especially such aspects of it as the social and agrarian policy of the Communist Party and Soviet power, repressive measures against the national intelligentsia and the Muslim clergy, the formation of a cadre of industrial workers at the expense of Europeans who came from the center, ways and methods of resolving the issue of emancipation of women, the imperial position of the center in matters of cultural construction, etc. These works were widely used in writing this article.

Methods

The theoretical and methodological basis of this article was the orientation towards the concept of new historical thinking with its priority of universal humanitarian values. To solve the tasks set, the main methodological principles of dialectical thinking were used in the work: historicism, objectivity, comprehensiveness, determinism, consistency, requiring consideration of phenomena genetically, through identifying the main stages of development, studying phenomena in their connections and relationships with other phenomena, revealing the cause-and-effect relationships of all ongoing processes, studying phenomena in motion and development, considering them as an integral system in which each element occupies its strictly defined place, due to the laws of the emergence and existence of this system, and is interconnected with its other elements. At the same time, the study used a pragmatic method of cognition, which involves considering the social experience of the past and present in terms of their practical significance.

This article is based on the theory of social stratification. As mentioned above, Soviet historiography used a class approach, which was based on the Marxist-Leninist theory, according to which society was divided into classes, and their main feature was considered to be the attitude towards the means of production. Depending on whose hands they were, the classes were also determined - the exploiters (owners of the means of production) and the exploited (who did not have them). Such a structure scheme was artificially created to solve purely ideological problems. It is quite obvious that in modern conditions the theory of social stratification of society, which has been widely used in world practice since the 40s of the twentieth century, is more in line with the new tasks of historical science. It divides human society into strata. The term "stratum" itself is borrowed from geology and means "layer". In sociology, "stratum" means "layer of society", and "stratification" - its division into layers. According to the theory of stratification, various strata can be distinguished in a society according to a variety of criteria - according to professional occupations, education, ethnic, demographic, gender characteristics, territorial location (urban and rural population), etc. The concept of "stratum" is more flexible than the concept of "class", it includes a wide range of social phenomena and provides ample opportunities for analyzing the composition of society. The American sociologist I. Kraus believes that "stratification and class division are, in fact, different structural relations. Stratification is a descriptive concept that implies a certain ordering of members of society based on some criterion: income, education, profession, ethnic origin. Classes in Marxist theory are conflict groups that challenge the existing division of power. The recognition of a class means the recognition of antagonism, the

opposition of the interests of large social groups. The recognition of strata means the recognition of certain differences between people, which lead to the stratification of individuals in society” [12.15-16].

The great possibilities of the stratification approach make it possible to recreate a more complete picture of the social life of human society at every stage of its historical development. It is on this approach that the conceptual and methodological basis of the present is based, and the analysis of the social composition of society on the territory of Uzbekistan is based on its stratification by professional occupations. This criterion is most often used in modern scientific practice. “Profession, according to the definition of Russian sociologists V.V. Radaeva and O.I. Shkaratana is a special kind of activity of an individual, which has a market value, in which this individual is constantly engaged in order to obtain a stable income and which predetermines his social position [13.217]. It is an objectively stable material criterion of social stratification, since in various historical situations, members of professional groups who have a common sphere of work occupy coinciding social positions and show similar behavior.

The old class approach to the studied problem of the social stratification of society on the territory of Uzbekistan gave rise to its tendentious and one-sided coverage in Soviet historiography and led to the writing of a falsified history, when only the working class was presented as the main driving force in the social life of society, and such socially active strata as artisans, handicraftsmen, people employed in the sphere of trade, national intelligentsia, progressive clergy were evaluated according to the residual principle. Rethinking and highlighting from new conceptual and methodological positions their place and role in society meet the needs of the present day and determine the relevance of this study.

Results And Discussions

The period from the end of the XIX century to the end of the 30s of the XX century for the Uzbek society, as well as for the entire Central Asian region, was full of complex and tragic social processes. In a relatively short historical period, its social structure has been changed twice. Moreover, these changes were achieved in radically opposite ways - evolutionary, when from the end of the XIX century new productive forces developing in a feudal society formed a corresponding social structure, and revolutionary, when after October 1917 the state of the victorious proletariat purposefully created a new structure of socialist society by violent methods.

Until the middle of the XIX century, the basis of the social structure of the feudal society of the Central Asian khanates was the class division, which determined the entire internal life of society and the position of the individual in it. The rapid pace of historical progress in the XIX century, intensively involved more and more regions into the orbit of world economic relations. The objective process of development could not but affect the Central Asian region. The changing world situation manifested itself in the Central Asian khanates primarily in a significant expansion by the middle of the XIX century in their foreign trade relations with neighboring states - Russia, China, Iran, Afghanistan, and through them with European states. So, if in 1830 goods worth 2.3 million rubles were annually exported from Central Asia to Russia, and 2 million rubles were imported, then in 1851 the export increased to 3.5 million rubles, and the import up to 2.7 million rubles, in 1861 - up to 8.3 million rubles, respectively and 5.8 million rubles. Moreover, it is characteristic that 45% of the cost of products exported from Central Asia were finished products (textiles, silk

products, carpets) and 30% - raw materials (yarn, raw cotton) [14.34;65;140]. During the same period, changes were also taking place in the internal trade turnover of the khanates: the exchange of goods between agricultural and nomadic regions was revived, the process of forming a single internal market began.

The active development of trade marked the beginning of the loss of the defining significance of class division in the position of the individual in society. The social status of merchants belonging to the lower class begins to gradually change. As a result of large-scale trading operations, many of them accumulate significant capital, the possession of which significantly increases their social position.

The aggressive actions of Russia in the Central Asian region in the second half of the XIX century ended with the seizure of its significant territory and the creation of the Turkestan Governor-General. The inclusion of Turkestan in the orbit of the economic life of Russia caused the rapid development of commodity-money relations in the region and led to serious changes not only in the economic and socio-political life of Uzbek society, but also in its social structure.

In connection with the increased demand of industrial enterprises of the metropolis for Turkestan raw materials, in the region at the end of the XIX - beginning of the XX centuries, commodity sectors of agriculture were developing rapidly, industrial enterprises for processing agricultural products, railways were being built, cities were growing, the economic isolation of individual regions was being destroyed, merging local markets into a single domestic national market. A diverse economy and a corresponding social structure are taking shape in the region. The composition and position of the social strata and groups of the old feudal society are undergoing significant changes, new social priorities are emerging, new social strata are being formed - the national bourgeoisie represented by entrepreneurs, industrialists, merchants, wealthy artisans, the industrial proletariat, the new national intelligentsia, etc. During this period, in Uzbek society, the meaning of class division was finally lost, which, as a feudal category, turns into a formal sign of a person's belonging to any class in the past. Instead of class rights and privileges, the main and decisive factor determining the position of the individual in the social hierarchy is now such a criterion as capital, property, a new social force is being formed and affirmed - the layer of owners. He occupies a leading place in the economic and socio-political life of society at the beginning of the XX century.

By 1917, the owners of various sizes and forms of ownership in the region accounted for 76% of men of working (that is, over 18 years old) age. They developed the productive forces of society, provided for their families, gave work to that part of the population that had practically no property [15.42-44]. It should be noted that the process of losing the defining importance of class division and the formation of a layer of owners took place in Uzbek society at the turn of the XX century without conflicts and upheavals.

The leading core of the layer of owners were large landowners, industrialists, merchants, who accounted for 19.5% of the male working population [15.42]. They occupied a leading position in the life of Uzbek society, in accordance with their contribution to the development of such spheres as the economy, culture, and education. The greater part of the stratum of proprietors was made up of medium and small proprietors, who predominated in agricultural, industrial, handicraft production, and trade. These were the owners of small plots of land (that is, the main part of dehkans), mills, rice makers, handicraft and semi-handicraft enterprises, craft workshops, shops, shops, caravanserais, teahouses, etc. Possessing various

forms of ownership, they were an economically independent subject of a middle class society. As a rule, they combined labor force and organizing capital in one person, since in the vast majority they were not only owners of property, but also direct participants in the production process, together with members of their families. They were characterized by a particularly careful and respectful attitude to property, an interest in its preservation and enhancement, amazing diligence, respectful and friendly relationships, decency, honesty, good manners, and charity. They were the guarantors of the stability of the society, of which they were an integral part, and in the prosperity of which they were vitally interested. In 1917, out of 184,000 men of working age living in large cities of the region, only 61,000 men employed in industrial production and trade, and 36,000 employed in handicraft production were average owners [15]. The layer of owners was the basis of the emerging new social layer of the national bourgeoisie. If we talk about the social situation in the Uzbek village, the American scientist A. Park characterized it as follows: “The lifestyle, cultural level, religious beliefs of the rich bais were little different from those who rented land from them. They lived on the land nearby and maintained close contact with their tenants. Islam created spiritual and social ties between landowners and dekhkans closer than those that existed among the rural Orthodox population. The local villages did not have open sores that the Soviet regime could call a class struggle virus” [16.293].

The development of industrial production led to the emergence of a new social stratum in Uzbek society - industrial, construction and railway workers. By 1917 there were over 76 thousand [17.145]. More than 70% of them were workers of indigenous nationalities, as well as people from neighboring countries (Persians, Kashgarians, etc.). But they were not yet the industrial proletariat in the form in which it was already at that time in Russia. These were the semi-proletarians of the city and village, as well as dekhkans, who supplemented their agricultural income with side earnings in the city and still had strong ties with the land. The bulk of them performed menial, unskilled work, were dispersed among small enterprises [18.304]. The process of formation of the national proletariat in Turkestan was still in its infancy.

In the new economic and political situation in the region at the beginning of the XX century, a new business and creative national intelligentsia is being formed. It manifests itself in new areas of activity: politics, enlightenment, the creation of a national press, the reform of school education, the publication of school textbooks, scientific and popular literature. Among its ranks were politicians, lawyers, journalists, publishers, teachers, historians, poets, and writers. They advocated democratic freedoms, the economic liberation of their people, their involvement in intellectual progress, and the search for ways of their political liberation. The leading representatives of the new commercial and industrial bourgeoisie, in addition to developing the productive forces of the region, also contributed to the education of its broad sections of the population. They published oriental fiction, school textbooks and sold them at low prices, opened public bookstores, reading libraries [19.57]. That is why, as M. Holdsworth writes, “even Western scholars, who were reluctant to recognize the erudition of Eastern society, were forced to admit the fact that books and brochures were more in demand in Turkestan in the XIX and early XX centuries than was usually believed” [20.37]. Many of the merchants-entrepreneurs were owners of rich collections, were engaged in extensive charity work, beautification of cities.

Officials underwent significant changes in their social status. If earlier in feudal society it was a class category (bek, kazi, amlyakdar were both officials and large feudal lords in one person), now after the creation of the colonial administration, an official appears

in society who lives only on a salary, but has enormous power. In terms of numbers, it was a very small social group. According to the first general census of the population of the Russian Empire in 1897, in the Syrdarya, Fergana and Samarkand regions of Turkestan, officials of the colonial administration, courts, police officers, public and class services accounted for 0.4% of the total employed population [21.114], but the power they wielded was not even commensurate with their numbers. Among them, embezzlement and tyranny reigned. A typical image of a Turkestan official was created by M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin in his satirical work “Lords of Tashkent”

The colonial status of Turkestan and the military-bureaucratic system of government determined the emergence of a social group of military personnel of the colonial army. Fearing the outlying position of the region and the dissatisfaction of the Muslim population with the colonial policy of the metropolis, the tsarist government maintained significant armed forces in Turkestan. At the end of the XIX century, the military accounted for 0.6% of the total population of the three regions, or 9% of its employed part, while the Muslim clergy, which was very influential and, it was believed, numerous force of the Muslim society, amounted to only 0.2% of the entire Muslim population of these regions or 0.7% of its employed part [21].

In general, the structure of Uzbek society by October 1917 was very diverse. It retained elements of obsolete patriarchal feudal structures (large feudal landowners, chairiker sharecroppers), and new social structures, caused by developing capitalism, matured and strengthened (the national bourgeoisie, the industrial proletariat).

A distinctive feature of Uzbek society by October 1917 was that, despite the unconditional presence of social inequality, there were no pronounced antagonistic relations between those who owned property and those to whom they provided work and livelihood. This was due to the fact that in the centuries-old relationships between members of society, sharp contradictions were not laid due to their different property status. The traditional community association of the population at their place of residence in the mahalla gave rise to a harmonious ethical system of mutual responsibility based on democratic principles, created the laws of collectivism and cooperation, despite the unequal property status of its members. All transformational processes in society took place in an evolutionary way, there was no desire for revolutionary transformations among various segments of the population of the region. Therefore, the October events of 1917 in Turkestan, according to contemporaries, took place only by the forces of the European proletariat, “only a few of the local population took part in the October revolution ... For the bulk of the indigenous population, the new system was only a change of power” [15.13]. Soviet historiography created a myth about the active participation of indigenous workers in Turkestan in the revolutionary transformations of the first years of Soviet power. In fact, these statements were far from the truth. As Baymirza Hayit wrote, “the Russian people were practically the only representative of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Turkestan” [22.21]. Western scientists J. Wheeler, E. Allworth, E. Bacon, V. Montale, A. Park, J. Bergkhorn were on the same point of view [23], which, back in the 1950s, gave a different assessment of the historical turning point in the fate of the peoples of Central Asia after the October Revolution of 1917 and, above all, its laws, legitimacy, the degree of participation of the indigenous population in it, as well as in subsequent revolutionary transformations. In particular, J. Wheeler wrote that “nothing could be further from the truth than the assertions of Soviet historians that the local Muslim population took an active part in the revolution” [24.50]. According to V. Montale, “Muslims

of Central Asia were disappointed, deceived and humiliated by the results of the revolutionary events of 1917” [25.32].

Having won in October 1917, the Russian proletariat established its dictatorship in the country and set about creating a socialist classless society. The leading role of the proletariat and its party in relation to the rest of the non-proletarian strata of the population was secured by the relevant legislative acts and the one-party system that was established in the country, which ensured the hegemony of the proletariat in society. The socialist order was not formed as a result of the objective development of the social process, it began to be created after October 1917 from above, by violent methods. Therefore, the social policy of the Soviet state was aimed at restructuring the old social space and eradicating the established way of life of the indigenous population of the region. In Turkestan, all the activities of the Soviet government contradicted the psychology, the life of the bulk of its population.

The process of destruction of the national mentality of the peoples of Turkestan went in parallel with the process of breaking down its old social structure, and the ban on private ownership of the means of production and the use of hired labor in the private sector should have prevented its restoration. The formation and approval of a new social structure took place in the process of socio-economic transformations of the transition period, when a multi-structural economy and the corresponding social strata and groups were still preserved.

The social structure of the Uzbek society in the transition period, as in the beginning of the 20th century, was characterized by the predominance of medium and small owners both in the city and in the village. “Among the indigenous settled population, the middle commercial and industrial stratum is very developed,” the decisions of the V Conference of the Communist Party of Turkestan (January 1920) noted [26.76]. This was also confirmed by the results of the city census of the population of the Turkestan Republic in 1923: “In Turkestan cities, among the amateur population, there is a predominance of petty-bourgeois elements” [27.12] — so called medium and small owners under Soviet rule. Being hostile to them, the party nevertheless recognized the “progressive” and “organizing” possibilities of middle capital and considered it necessary to use it, especially in the village [28.76].

Medium and small proprietors, having survived the cataclysms of the first revolutionary years, were able to maintain and even stabilize their position with the transition to a new economic policy. Possessing property in the form of a land plot, commercial working capital, a craft workshop, city real estate, good production and qualification skills and corresponding social prestige, which provided them with a certain economic independence, they were an economically active, enterprising part of the population during this period. In the conditions of devastation, raw material, food and fuel starvation, medium and small commodity producers and merchants, having shown enviable efficiency, actively joined in the restoration of the destroyed economy of the Turkestan Republic. They produced the most scarce goods and products for the domestic market and ensured their sale. In the mid-20s, almost 100% of agricultural products, 100% of silk weaving, silk-winding, leather production, 90% of metalworking, woodworking and clothing production, 68% of agricultural equipment production came from them. They occupied a dominant position in retail (98.5%) and wholesale and retail (72.1%) trade, and in the total trade turnover of the republic, the private sector occupied 60.7% [29.32-33].

The reason for the stability of medium and small proprietors in this period was that they were “precautionary, resourceful, diligent, amateur,” able to “quickly catch up and organize” [28.235], to mobilize their labor resources, knew well the needs of the population,

relied on the local raw materials market, their high professionalism and historically established skills in the production of goods for the population and the organization of the service sector. But the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat saw in these sections of the population not a support for the well-being and prosperity of society, but only potential enemies of its system and pursued a targeted policy to limit their activities, and then to completely eradicate them. Since medium and small proprietors could not be expelled and destroyed, as was done with large landowners, industrialists and bankers in the very first year after the victory of the revolution, they had to be deprived of their basis - property, their activity and existence itself should be made impossible. This policy was implemented in the process of cooperating handicraftsmen; ousting the private trader from trade; municipalization of urban real estate; in every possible way tightened the tax press, which had a pronounced class character and was directed against the wealthy segments of the population; permanent restriction, and then complete deprivation of their political rights and civil liberties. The Soviet government, cultivating the thesis that the vast majority of the rural population is impoverished, pauperized dehkans, that the possibilities of individual farming are limited, made great efforts to transform the sole privately-owned dehkans into a new social structure - the collective farm peasantry. This task was accomplished in the course of the implementation of the collectivization of agriculture and the policy of "eliminating the kulaks as a class with the transition to complete collectivization", which, in terms of their socio-economic content, being the negation of individual farming, destroyed the former social structure of the Uzbek village and the traditional way of life of its population. The former "antagonistic", according to the Bolsheviks, dual nature of the farmer was eliminated - remaining a worker, he ceased to be an owner. Thus, the backbone of agriculture, the farmer-owner on his own land, was eliminated.

All these factors finally broke the old social structure of the Uzbek society, forcibly destroyed its active and stabilizing part represented by medium and small owners. During this process, the Muslim clergy and the old national intelligentsia were also liquidated, the traditional way of life of the people was lost.

By the mid-1930s, according to the assertion of its political leadership, the socialist system had triumphed in the country, all the exploiting classes had been finally eliminated, the causes that gave rise to the exploitation of man by man and the division of society into exploiters and exploited had been completely destroyed. The party declared that the country had entered "a period of completion of the construction of a classless socialist society and a gradual transition from socialism to communism" [30.339] and thus the social homogeneity of society had already been achieved. Soviet society now consisted of the working class, the class of the collective farm peasantry and a layer of intelligentsia.

In Uzbekistan in the late 30s of the XX century, according to the 1939 census, 19.3% of the population were workers, 12.9% - employees, 62.6% - collective farmers, 2.3% - cooperative handicraftsmen, 2.9% - individual peasants and non-cooperative handicraftsmen [31.11; 43]. Indeed, in Uzbek society, the private sector and the possibility of using hired labor were almost completely eliminated. The remaining 76 thousand individual peasants and 107,700 non-cooperative handicraftsmen [32.78] represented the most unprotected part of the population, which was doomed to a very difficult existence. These were real and potential unemployed, whom the state did not protect. However, there was no social homogeneity in society, and the Soviet state did not achieve the desired results from the victory of the socialist way of life.

Although formally the bearer of political power and the leading force in society, the Uzbek working class, however, did not correspond to this either in quantity or quality, especially in relation to its national composition. The total number of the working class in the republic, although not at a very rapid rate, nevertheless grew systematically. But this growth was mainly at the expense of Russian workers coming from the central regions of the country. The number of workers from local nationalities increased much more slowly, and from the mid-1930s there was a tendency to decrease. This was the result of the development of scientific and technological progress in industry, when manual labor began to be supplanted in industrial production, while workers of local nationalities were mainly engaged in manual labor. So, if in 1926 in Uzbekistan the proportion of workers in the total number of employed population was 6.41%, then in 1939 it was 19.3%. But its national composition looked completely different - in 1926, Uzbeks made up 50.4% of the total number of workers, Russians - 17.5%, and in 1939 the number of Uzbek workers decreased to 36.5%, and Russians increased to 34.3% [33.112-115]. This disproportion was the result of the implementation of the party's policy of internationalizing the ranks of the working class, which it regarded as the main pillar of Soviet power, especially in the national republics. The majority of workers from local nationalities still had low qualifications, since the main source of their formation was semi-literate or illiterate dekhkans. In general, the composition of the workers was not socially homogeneous. The division into qualified and unskilled sharply affected their material, social status. In addition, in the 30s of the XX century, a privileged structure of shock workers, Stakhanovists, innovators began to form in its qualified part.

Fundamental changes have taken place in the structure of the Uzbek village. First of all, the collective-farm dehkans appeared in it, forcibly created by the Soviet state in the process of collectivization. Despite the fact that all collective farmers were placed in the same starting positions, there was no social homogeneity in the village. Very soon, the collective farms had their own elite in the form of collective farm chairmen, secretaries of party organizations, foremen, site managers, accountants, etc., whose social and material situation quickly began to differ from that of ordinary collective farmers. In addition, such social groups as workers of state farms and rural machine operators appeared in the village, occupying, as it were, an intermediate position between dehkans and workers, since they lived in the village and remained villagers in their way of life, but in terms of working conditions and wages they were already workers.

Instead of the rejected and gradually destroyed old Uzbek intelligentsia, the Soviet worker-peasant intelligentsia appeared, which for some reason was considered in the Soviet state not as an independent class, but only as a class stratum. It was formed on a new ideological, russified, rigidly class social basis, in a completely new system of higher and secondary special education. The Soviet national intelligentsia of Uzbekistan was still very small in the 30s of the XX century, it included few technical and scientific personnel.

In addition to the officially designated social structure of Soviet society, consisting of the working class, the class of the collective farm peasantry and the stratum of the intelligentsia, other social strata and groups are formed in it, already generated by the socialist way of life. First of all, it was a new social group, the so-called "promoted leaders". Experiencing an acute need for new cadres dedicated to the cause of the revolution, leaders of enterprises, the state, Soviet and party apparatus, the Soviet government began to solve this problem using a typically revolutionary leftist method - to nominate the most active workers and peasants to these positions and thereby to manage the complex state mechanism were poorly educated, incompetent people are called. In Soviet historical literature, there was an

opinion that nomination was one of the ways in which the Soviet intelligentsia was formed at the first stage of the existence of the Soviet state. Such an opinion is certainly erroneous, since the intelligentsia is primarily an educated part of society, consisting of people professionally engaged in mental work. The nominees were not only uneducated, but in most cases simply illiterate people. They can hardly be attributed to the category of non-specialist employees, but certainly not to the intelligentsia. A positive assessment of promotion as one of the successful ways to solve the personnel problem in the same period is also erroneous, since it did not benefit the state, but enormous harm. The nomination was based not on professionalism and education, but on the purity of the social origin of the nominated worker and his revolutionary enthusiasm. The poorly educated and uncultured people involved in the leadership of the country contributed to the establishment among the workers of the party, Soviet and state apparatus of such qualities as bureaucracy, incompetence, “party generals”, dullness. Moreover, these qualities began to manifest themselves from the first years of the application of this method. Thus, in the resolution of the Third Congress of the CPT (June 1919), it was noted that the promoted active workers “easily became bureaucrats, easily broke away from the party, and their activity began to take on the ugly forms of party generalship” [28.45]. In general, nomination did not solve the personnel problem of the 1920s either quantitatively or qualitatively, but it did significant harm to the development of society.

From this social group of worker-peasant leaders in the early 1930s, in the social structure of Soviet society, its political elite began to form on a new class basis - a new social stratum of the “party nomenclature”, endowed with enormous powers and privileges, access to which was regulated strict selection mechanism. The workers and peasants, having fallen into this structure, quickly lost contact with their class and became part of a complex bureaucratic apparatus. Already in the second half of the 1930s, the “party nomenclature”, which, by the nature of their occupation, began to refer to “employees”, began to occupy a dominant position in the party ranks. If in 1926 in the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, workers employed directly in production accounted for 31.6%, employees - 25.9%, then in 1938 there were already only 12.5% of workers, employees - 54.2%, and in terms of social origin, the composition was completely different - in 1926 there were 41.8% of workers, 35.2% of peasants, 18.4% of employees, in 1938 - 45.5% of workers, 35% of peasants, employees - 19.3% [34.23;25;61]. These were party, Soviet and economic workers from the “party nomenclature”, for the most part formally descended from workers and peasants.

Conclusion

The stratification conceptual and methodological approach to the study of the social structure of society made it possible to consider it in this article as a dynamically changing category, a diverse set of various interconnected social strata, to determine the place and role of each of them in society, to identify factors that affect the dynamics of their development.

An analysis of the development of social stratification of society on the territory of Uzbekistan in the period from the end of the XIX century to the end of the 30s of the XX century from new positions showed that in this relatively short historical period it underwent serious transformations twice, which were not the result of the natural development of society, but were carried out from above after the military actions of the tsarist government in Central Asia in the second half of the XIX century and the Bolshevik coup in October 1917. The study conducted allows us to conclude that by the end of the 30s. XX. In the Uzbek society, the model of the social structure that developed at the beginning of the XX century was completely broken, the basis of which was the layer of owners, who served as a support

for economic development and stability of society. The natural-historical process of development of the most traditionally able-bodied stratum was interrupted, which is being restored with enormous difficulty in our republic now, already in the conditions of its independence. In the society of victorious socialism, a new model of socialist society was forcibly created, which, contrary to the assertion of its political leadership, was not completely equal and unified in terms of its social composition and the position of its individual strata. The leading role in this society belonged not to the working class, but to the bureaucratic “party nomenclature”. The study also allows us to formulate the following provisions:

1. Transformations of the social structure of society should be the result of its natural development, the use of administrative measures in this process turns out to be huge social, economic and even demographic losses for society.
2. A change in social relations and the social composition of society always involves a transitional period associated not only with political and economic difficulties, but also with complex problems of social adaptation of people, when a painful process of changing their psychology, thinking, getting used to new life realities takes place.
3. In the conditions of market relations, a strong economic basis and social force in society are middle owners - the most enterprising in individual production activities, economically active, enterprising part of the population, which ensures prosperity and stability for society, affirming the principle that the state in which every family is rich is rich.
4. As part of the average owners, the social stratum of people engaged in private family business (in the 1920s they were called “owners working with helping family members”) has a special economic stability and productivity. Its significance for society is invaluable in that, in addition to economic, it helps to solve important social and moral and ethical tasks - employment of the population, continuity of family professional skills, education of the young generation industriousness, patience and tolerance, respect for elders and mutual respect.

References

- Grigoriev V.V. Russia and Asia. Collection of studies and articles on history, ethnography and geography, written at different times. - St. Petersburg, 1876. - 575 p.; Horoshhin A.P. Collection of articles concerning the Turkestan region. - St. Petersburg, 1876. - 532 p.; Venyukov M.I. Russia and the East. Collection of geophysical and political articles. - St. Petersburg, 1877. - 297 p.; Midendorf A. Essays on the Ferghana Valley. - St. Petersburg, 1878. - 489 p.; Arandarenko G.A. Leisure in Turkestan. 1874-1889. - St. Petersburg, 1889. - 667 p.; Geyer I.I. Turkestan. - Tashkent, 1909. - 346 p.; Russia. Full geographical description. T. XIX. Turkestan region / Compiled by Prince V.I. Massalsky. - St. Petersburg, 1913. - 861 p.
- Demidov A.P. Economic essay on cotton growing, cotton trade and industry in Turkestan. - Tashkent, 1912. - 256 p.; Gulishambarov S.I. Economic overview of the Turkestan region served by the Central Asian Railway (Trans-Caspian, Samarkand, Syrdarya and Semirechensk regions, as well as the Bukhara and Khiva khanates). Parts 1-3. - Askhabad, 1913; Ogloblin V.N. Industry and trade of Turkestan. - M., 1914; Zaorskaya V.V. and Alexander A. Industrial institutions of the Turkestan region. Development of the data of the questionnaire, produced in the summer of 1914 by the economic organization of surveys on the construction of reservoirs in the upper reaches of the Syrdarya River. - Petrograd, 1915. - 559 p.

- Shakhnazarov A.I. Agriculture in the Turkestan region. - St. Petersburg, 1908. - 512 p.; Demidov A.P. Economic essay on cotton growing, cotton trade and cotton industry in Turkestan. - Tashkent, 1912. - 280 p.; Yuferev.V.I. Labor in the cotton farms of Turkestan (experience in characterizing the labor issue in the cotton regions of the Turkestan region). - St. Petersburg, 1914. - 60 p.; His own. The economy of the Sarts in the Fergana region. - Tashkent, 1911. - 76 p.; Poniatovsky S.V. Experience in studying cotton growing in Turkestan and the Transcaspian region. - St. Petersburg, 1913. - 357 p.
- Nalivkin V., Nalivkina M. Essay on the life of a woman of the settled indigenous population of Fergana. - Kazan, 1886. - 244 p.; Nalivkin V.P. Natives then and now. - Tashkent, 1913. - 144 p.; Ostroumov N.P. Sarts. Ethnographic materials. - Tashkent, 1896. Issue. 1. - 272 p.; His own. Introduction to the course of Islamic studies. - Tashkent, 1914. - 215 p.; Dobrosmyslov A.I. Tashkent in the past and present. Historical essay. - Tashkent, 1912. - 520 p.; Lykoshin N.S. Half a life in Turkestan. Essay on the life of the native population. - Petrograd, 1916. - 412 p.
- See: Nepominin V.Ya. Historical experience of building socialism in Uzbekistan (1917-1937). - Tashkent, 1960. - 382 p.; History of the national economy of Uzbekistan. - Tashkent, 1962. V. 1. - 250 p.; History of the Uzbek SSR. - Tashkent, 1967. T. II. - 707 p.; Essays on the history of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan. - Tashkent, 1974. - 768 p.
- Safarov G. Colonial Revolution (Experience of Turkestan). - Moscow: 1921. - 147 p.; Ryskulov T. Revolution and the indigenous population of Turkestan (Collection of the most important articles, reports, speeches and theses). Part 1. 1917-1919. - Tashkent, 1925. - 218 p.; Silonov A.K. To the question of the role of usurious capital in the agriculture of Central Asia. - Tashkent, 1926. - 77 p.; Khodzhaev F. Ten years of struggle and construction (On the tenth anniversary of October). - Samarkand-Tashkent, 1927. - 42 p.; Reztsov L. October in Turkestan. - Tashkent, 1927. - 119 p.; Galuzo P.G. Turkestan - a colony (Essay on the history of Turkestan from the conquest by the Russians to the revolution of 1917). - M., 1929. - 235 p.; Lavrentiev V. Capitalism in Turkestan (Bourgeois colonization of Central Asia). - Leningrad, 1930. - 160 p.
- Tursunmukhamedov S. Great October and the change in the social structure of Soviet Uzbekistan. - Tashkent, 1977. - 184 p.
- Changes in the class structure of society in Uzbekistan during the years of Soviet power (1917-1980). - Tashkent, 1984. - 303 p.
- Rabich R.G. Formation and development of the social structure of Uzbekistan (1917-1941). - Tashkent, 1991. - 124 p.
- Makhkamova N.R. The social structure of society on the territory of Uzbekistan: traditions and transformations (the end of the XIX century - the end of the 30s of the XX century). - Tashkent: "Aloqachi" - 2009; "Stratification processes of the society of Uzbekistan in the context of historical processes". Collective monograph. Tashkent - 2014; Normurodova G. XIX asr oxiri va XX asr boshlarida Samarkand viloyati aholisining izhtimoijy stratifikatsiyasi. - Tashkent: "Yangi nashr". - 2013; Normurodova G. Bukhoro amirligi stratifikatsiyasi va aholi katlamlarining zhamiyat hayotidagi urni (1868-1920 yillar). - Tashkent: "Navruz". - 2019.
- Chokaev (Chokai-ogly) Mustapha. Turkestan and the Soviet Regime // Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society, XVIII (1931) - 403-420 pp. Turkestan under the rule of the Soviets (on the characterization of the dictatorship of the proletariat). - Paris, 1935; Barghoorn G. Soviet Russian Nationalism. - New York. 1956; Monteil V. Les musulmans soviétiques. - Paris, 1957 - 150 p.; Park A. Bolshevism in Turkestan.

- 1917-1927. – New York, 1957 – 428 p.; Hayit Baymirza. Some Problems of Modern Turkistan History. – Dusseldorf, 1963 – 61 p.; Rywkin M. Russia in Central Asia. – London. 1963 – 191 p.; Wheeler G. The modern History of Soviet Central Asia. – Washington, 1964 – 272 p.; Wheeler G. The peoples of Soviet Central Asia. – London, 1966 – 126 p.; Jukeles A. Social Change in Soviet Russia. – Cambridge, 1968 – 220 p.; Walsh W. Russia the Soviet Union. A modern history. Michigan University Press. 1968 – 682 p.; Hellen Carrere D'Encausse. Islam and Russian Empire. University of California Press. 1988 – 190 p.; Ollworth E. The modern Uzbeks From the Fourteenth Century to the Present. – California, 1990 – 410 p.; Lynne V. The Role of the OGPU in Dekulakization, Mass Deportation, and Special Resettlement in 1930 // The Carl Beck Papers. January. 2000 – 50 p.; Keller Shoshana. To Moscow, Not Mecca. The Soviet Campaign against Islam in Central Asia. 1917-1941. Westport, Connecticut, London. 2001 – 277 p.
- Kraus I. Stratification, Class, and Conflict. – New York, 1976. – P. 15-16.
- Radaev V.V., Shkaratan O.I. social stratification. – Moscow: 1999. - P.217.
- Aminov A.M. Economic development of Central Asia (colonial period). — Tashkent, 1959. — P.34,65,140.
- Statistical Yearbook 1917-1923 T.I, part 3. - Tashkent, 1924. – P. 42-44;13
- Park A. Bolshevism in Turkestan. 1917-1927. – Columbia University Press. New York. 1957. – P. 293.
- Zaorskaya V.V., Alexander K.A. Industrial institutions of the Turkestan region. - Pg., 1915. - Tab. U; NA Uz, f.R-105, op.1, d.3, l.145.
- Alkin Ilias. Central Asia: an economic and geographical essay. Part I. – Moscow:, 1931. - P.304.
- See: Chabrov G.N. From the history of printing and publishing literature in local languages in pre-revolutionary Turkestan (1868-1917) // Proceedings of SAGU. - Tashkent, 1954. Issue . 57.
- Holdsworth M. Turkestan in the Nineteenth Century (A Brief History of the Khanates of Bukhara, Kokand and Khiva). – Oxford. Soviet Affairs Study Group. 1959. – P. 37.
- Calculated on the basis of publications: The first general census of the population of the Russian Empire in 1897, V.83. Samarkand region - St. Petersburg, 1905. - P. 94; T.86. Syrdarya region - St. Petersburg, 1905. - P. 116; T.89. Fergana region - St. Petersburg, 1904. - P. 114.
- Hayit Baymirza. Some Problems of Modern Turkistan history. An analysis of Soviet attacks on the alleged falsifiers of the history of Turkistan. – Dusseldorf. 1963. – P. 21.
- Wheeler G. The peoples of Soviet Central Asia. – London, 1966; Ollworth E. The modern Uzbeks From the Fourteenth Century to the Present. Hoover Institution Press Stanford University. – California, 1990; Bacon E. Russian Influence on Central Asia Languages. Cornell University Press. – London, 1980; Monteil V. Les musulmans soviétiques. – Paris, 1957; Park A. Bolshevism in Turkestan. 1917-1927. Columbia University Press. – New York, 1957; Barghoorn G. Soviet Russian Nationalism. – New York, 1956.
- Wheeler G. Op. cit. – P. 50.
- Monteil V. Op. cit. – P. 32.
- The Communist Party of Turkestan in the resolutions of congresses and conferences. - Tashkent, 1988. - P.76.
- The class and professional composition of the urban population of the TSSR in 1923 according to the results of the city census of 1923 - Tashkent, 1924. - P.12.
- The Communist Party of Turkestan in resolutions— P. 76;45;235
- Itkin A. Soviet trade in Central Asia. - Tashkent, 1936. - P.32-33.

- CPSU in resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums of the Central Committee. V. 5. – Moscow:, 1971. - P. 339.
- Results of the All-Union Population Census of 1959. Uzbek SSR. – Moscow: 1962. - P. 11, 43.
- Uzbekistan. Economic and geographical characteristics. - Tashkent, 1950. - P. 78.
- All-Union population census of 1926. Vol. XXXII. Uzbek SSR. - M., 1930. - S. 2; Results of the All-Union Population Census of 1959. Uzbek SSR. - Moscow, 1962. – P. 43, 112-115.
- The Communist Party of Uzbekistan in Figures (Collection of Statistical Materials, 1924-1964). - Tashkent, 1964. - P. 23, 25, 61.