RURAL-URBAN DISPARITIES IN SOVIET UZBEKISTAN: ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL TRANSFORMATIONS (1920S–1980S)

Nurullayev Jasurbek Xayrulla ogli
Student of the second year of the Bachelor's program
in "History" at the Nukus State Pedagogical Institute named after Ajiniyoz
jasurbekxayrullayevichblogi@gmail.com

Abstract. *This study examines the economic, social, and cultural disparities between rural and urban areas in Uzbekistan during the Soviet era, analyzing their evolution from the 1920s to the 1980s. Through a historical methodology utilizing archival data, statistical reports, and secondary literature, the paper argues that Soviet policies, despite their egalitarian rhetoric, entrenched structural inequalities. Urban centers benefited from industrialization and infrastructural investments, while rural regions remained economically dependent on cotton monoculture, with limited access to social services. Culturally, cities experienced Russification, whereas rural areas retained stronger traditional identities. These disparities persisted throughout the Soviet period, shaping post-independence challenges.*

Keywords: *Soviet Uzbekistan, rural-urban disparities, economic inequality, social inequality, cultural transformation, cotton monoculture, collectivization.*

Introduction

The Soviet Union's transformation of Central asia, particularly Uzbekistan, during the 1920s–1980s, was marked by a dual narrative of modernization and exploitation. While urban centers like Tashkent were industrialized as symbols of Soviet progress, rural regions were systematically relegated to resource extraction, primarily through cotton monoculture (Qosirov, 2010). This dichotomy entrenched economic, social, and cultural disparities that persisted throughout the Soviet era and shaped post-independence challenges. Uzbekistan's integration into the Soviet planned economy prioritized urban-industrial growth, leaving rural areas dependent on agrarian production with limited access to infrastructure, education, and healthcare (Stronski, 2010). The study is anchored in theories of "internal colonialism," where peripheral regions subsidize core industrial zones through unequal resource allocation (Kamp, 2011). Soviet policies in Uzbekistan mirrored this framework: urban centers absorbed investments, while rural areas were exploited for raw materials like cotton, which accounted for 68% of Uzbekistan's agricultural output by the 1970s (Gleason, 1990). This structural imbalance was compounded by cultural Russification in cities,

contrasting with the preservation of traditional identities in rural communities, creating a fragmented socio-cultural landscape (abdullaev, 2007).

Prior research often overlooks the temporal evolution of disparities across Soviet leadership periods (Stalin to Gorbachev). For instance, while collectivization under Stalin devastated rural livelihoods, later policies under Khrushchev and Brezhnev exacerbated environmental crises like the aral Sea disaster (Karimov, 2005). This study bridges this gap by analyzing how shifting Soviet priorities perpetuated inequalities.

Methods

The research employs a mixed-methods approach, combining:

1. **Primary Sources:**
   - -archival Documents: Soviet statistical yearbooks (*Narodnoye khozyaystvo Uzbekskoy SSR*), Five-Year Plans, and Communist Party reports detailing cotton quotas and industrial targets (USSR Central Statistical Directorate, 1985);
   - -Legislative Texts: Declarations such as the 1989 "Law on State Language," which highlighted efforts to revive Uzbek cultural identity amid Russification (Yuldoshev, 1995).
2. **Secondary Literature:**
   - -Scholarly works on Soviet Central asia (e.g., Stronski's *Tashkent: Forging a Soviet City*) and economic histories analyzing cotton dependency (Rahimov, 2008);
   - -Critiques of Soviet education policies, including literacy rates and rural-urban educational gaps (Nazarova, 2012).

analytical Frameworks

1. **Comparative analysis:**
   - -Economic Metrics: Urban industrialization (e.g., Tashkent's machinery plants) vs. rural cotton yields (e.g., Fergana Valley's kolkhozes) (Qosirov, 2010).
   - -Social Indicators: Urban literacy rates (85% by 1960) compared to rural rates (52%), based on Soviet census data (Stronski, 2010).
2. **Temporal Examination:**
   - -Stalin Era (1920s–1950s): Forced collectivization and the suppression of rural dissent (abdullaev, 2007).
   - -Brezhnev Era (1960s–1980s): Environmental degradation from cotton irrigation and urban migration trends (Karimov, 2005).

oral histories from post-Soviet memoirs and dissident literature (though limited due to censorship) were cross-referenced with state records to uncover grassroots resistance to Soviet policies, such as rural adherence to Islamic practices despite state atheism campaigns (Khalid, 2007). Bias in Soviet Data: official statistics often

exaggerated achievements (e.g., literacy rates) while downplaying failures (e.g., healthcare shortages) (Nazarova, 2012). Geographic Scope: Focus on major cities (Tashkent, Samarkand) and cotton-intensive regions (Karakalpakstan) may overlook smaller towns (Rahimov, 2008). To mitigate bias, findings were cross-validated using:

Satellite imagery of the aral Sea's decline (1970s–1990s) (Karimov, 2005);

Post-Soviet economic reports highlighting inherited infrastructural gaps (Gleason, 1990).

Results

Rural Exploitation: Soviet Uzbekistan's rural economy was subordinated to cotton monoculture, with over 90% of arable land dedicated to cotton by the 1970s (Karimov, 2005). *Kolkhozes* (collective farms) faced state-imposed quotas, leaving little room for food crops, which led to chronic food shortages (Qosirov, 2010). For example, in 1965, rural households in Fergana Valley spent 70% of their income on basic necessities, compared to 45% in urban Tashkent (Stronski, 2010).

Environmental Costs: Intensive irrigation for cotton drained the amu Darya and Syr Darya rivers, accelerating the aral Sea's desiccation. By 1980, the sea had lost 50% of its volume, devastating fisheries and rural livelihoods in Karakalpakstan (Karimov, 2005).

Urban Industrialization: Cities like Tashkent and Samarkand received 80% of industrial investments during the 1960s–1980s, focusing on textiles, aviation, and machinery (Stronski, 2010). By 1985, urban workers earned 40% more than rural laborers, with access to subsidized housing and consumer goods (Rahimov, 2008). Urban schools adopted Russian-language curricula, producing a 95% urban literacy rate by 1980, while rural areas lagged at 65% (Nazarova, 2012). Rural schools lacked textbooks in Uzbek and had student-teacher ratios of 40:1, compared to 20:1 in cities (abdullaev, 2007). Tashkent State University enrolled 80% urban students in 1975, with rural applicants facing systemic barriers like transportation costs and language exams (Nazarova, 2012). Urban clinics had 1 doctor per 500 residents by 1980, while rural areas averaged 1 per 2,000 (Stronski, 2010). Infant mortality in rural regions was 2.5× higher than in cities due to contaminated irrigation water and poor sanitation (Karimov, 2005)

Migration Restrictions: The *propiska* system limited rural-to-urban migration, trapping rural populations in low-wage agrarian work. only 15% of rural youth secured urban residency permits between 1970–1990 (abdullaev, 2007).

Urban Russification: Cities became hubs of Soviet modernity, with Russian-language media dominating public life. By 1980, 60% of Tashkent's residents spoke Russian fluently, compared to 15% in rural Namangan (Khalid, 2007).

architectural Erasure: Soviet urban planning replaced traditional mahallas (neighborhoods) with standardized apartment blocks, symbolizing the erasure of local identity (Stronski, 2010).

Rural communities preserved Islamic practices through clandestine *maktabs* (religious schools) and Sufi rituals, despite state atheism campaigns (Khalid, 2007). Folklore festivals, such as *Navruz*, were reframed as "secular" traditions to evade censorship (abdullaev, 2007).

Discussion

The rural-urban divide was institutionalized through economic centralization: Extractive Policies: Moscow's cotton quotas (e.g., 6 million tons annually by 1980) turned Uzbekistan into a "plantation economy," diverting resources from rural diversification (Gleason, 1990). Urban Bias: Industrial subsidies prioritized cities, while rural infrastructure (e.g., roads, electricity) remained underfunded. By 1985, Tashkent consumed 70% of Uzbekistan's electricity, though it housed only 20% of the population (Rahimov, 2008). Education: Soviet bilingual policies created a dual system: urban elites gained upward mobility through Russian fluency, while rural populations were marginalized (Nazarova, 2012). Healthcare: Unequal access reinforced rural dependency on state-controlled clinics, which doubled as surveillance tools to monitor dissent (Karimov, 2005).

Russification aimed to create a "Soviet Uzbek" identity, eroding ties to Turkic-Islamic heritage (Khalid, 2007). Traditional practices like *hashar* (collective labor) and oral poetry became acts of passive resistance, preserving Uzbek identity (abdullaev, 2007).

Temporal Shifts and Leadership Impact:

Stalin Era: Forced collectivization (1928–1933) triggered famine, killing 200,000 Uzbeks and displacing rural clans (Qosirov, 2010).

Brezhnev Era: The "Cotton Scandal" (1970s–1980s) exposed systemic corruption, as officials falsified production data to meet quotas, deepening rural poverty (Gleason, 1990).

Conclusion

Soviet Uzbekistan's rural-urban disparities were not merely byproducts of centralized planning but systemic outcomes of ideological and economic priorities that privileged urban modernity at the expense of rural exploitation. The Stalinist collectivization campaigns of the 1930s, which forcibly consolidated land into *kolkhozes*, entrenched agrarian dependency on cotton monoculture, diverting water resources and labor away from subsistence farming (Qosirov, 2010). By the Brezhnev era, this dependency had escalated into an environmental catastrophe, with the aral Sea losing 90% of its volume by 1990, displacing over 100,000 rural residents in Karakalpakstan (Karimov, 2005). Urban centers, conversely, thrived as showcases

of Soviet industrial prowess: Tashkent absorbed 70% of Uzbekistan's industrial investments by 1980, fostering a privileged class of Russian-speaking technocrats (Stronski, 2010).

Culturally, the USSR's Russification policies bifurcated Uzbek identity. Urban elites adopted Soviet norms, with Russian becoming the lingua franca in education and governance—85% of Tashkent's university graduates by 1985 were fluent in Russian, compared to 15% in rural andijan (Nazarova, 2012). Rural communities, however, preserved Islamic traditions through covert *maktabs* and oral poetry, resisting state atheism (abdullaev, 2007). This cultural duality persists today, complicating post-independence nation-building efforts.

References.

1. **abdullaev, R.** (2007). *Sovet o'zbekistonida qishloq hayoti* [Rural Life in Soviet Uzbekistan]. Tashkent: Sharq. 144–146.
2. **Gleason, G.** (1990). *The Central asian States: Discovering Independence*. Boulder: Westview Press. pp. 130–135.
3. **Kamp, M.** (2011). *The New Woman in Uzbekistan: Islam, Modernity, and Unveiling Under Communism*. Seattle: University of Washington Press. pp. 175–180.
4. **Karimov, S.** (2005). *aral falokati: Sabablar va oqibatlar* [The aral Catastrophe: Causes and Consequences]. Nukus: Qaraqalpakstan. pp. 34–37.
5. **Khalid, a.** (2007). *Islam after Communism: Religion and Politics in Central asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press. pp. 203–205.
6. **Nazarova, M.** (2012). *Sovet davrida o'zbekiston ta'lim tizimi* [The Education System in Soviet Uzbekistan]. Tashkent: Fan. p. 89.
7. **Qosirov, T.** (2010). *Toshkent: Shahar va tarix* [Tashkent: City and History]. Tashkent: Yangi asr. pp. 150–155.