

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716  
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

### International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 10 Volume: 78

Published: 30.10.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Farruh Abdusamadov

Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute  
Teacher

## THE POLICY OF SOVIET POWER TO LIMIT PRIVATE PROPERTY AND ITS NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES

**Abstract:** This article highlights the restriction of Soviet power policy to private property in Uzbekistan and its negative consequence. The article covers the policy of the Soviet state in connection with the restriction of private property in Uzbekistan and transfer of any property to state ownership.

**Key words:** private property, Soviet state, Bolsheviks, classification, repression, nationalization, tyranny.

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Abdusamadov, F. (2019). The policy of soviet power to limit private property and its negative consequences. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 10 (78), 490-492.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-10-78-90> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.10.78.90>

**Scopus ASCC:**

### Introduction

Today, the level of public policy has increased in Uzbekistan to support private property, ensure the rights of the layer of property owners and protect their legitimate interests in increasing the welfare of the people and moving to market relations. Because increasing the incomes of the population through the development of private property in our country, in a word, creating decent living conditions for a person, is the main goal of the reforms.

Unfortunately, in the first quarter of the last century, more precisely in 1917 ear, when the Bolshevik power in our country found a decision, the monopolistic attitude of the ruling party in all spheres of the life of the state and society began to be felt, the private relations that had developed in agriculture, gardening, production, crafts and other areas for centuries began to Even the lands and places of mosques and madrasas, which were community-owned, began to be transferred to the state. This situation, of course, negatively affected the socio-economic lifestyle of the population.

As a result of the implementation of the policy of “military communism” conducted by the Bolsheviks, a militarized society arose, the main signs of which were the absolute centralization and gross periodization of management, the abolition of private property, the confiscation of economic activities, the imposition of labor with punitive measures, the

destruction of the existing system of market economy, the violent exchange of national and As a result, the number of peasant farms and the population for work has significantly decreased. In particular, by the beginning of 1921, the number of peasant farms decreased by 15% compared to 1915, and the number of men employed in them by 36% [2, 243]. A new economic policy, developed to address such conflicts, turned out to be a temporary measure. The state nevertheless went on the way of limiting private property.

The policy of Soviet power on the restriction of private property in Uzbekistan and the transfer of any property to the state power can be seen as follows:

First, even at the beginning of the twentieth century, a large part of the population lived in the conditions of traditional society. The main income of the people came from farming, cattle-breeding and crafting, as well as partly from trade. In 1924-1925, 84% of the labor-intensive part of the population was occupied by agriculture. Started in 1917 year, the drought continued to creep. The peasant practically got into a difficult situation. Meeting the needs of people for bread became the biggest of the problems. In such conditions, the state began to gradually introduce all property under its jurisdiction, instead of supporting private land. This caused the separation of the population from their farms, which served the primary needs. Instead, the dominant ideology began

## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA (India)</b>	<b>= 4.971</b>	<b>SIS (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland)</b>	<b>= 6.630</b>
<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE)</b>	<b>= 0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI (Russia)</b>	<b>= 0.126</b>	<b>PIF (India)</b>	<b>= 1.940</b>
<b>GIF (Australia)</b>	<b>= 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ)</b>	<b>= 8.716</b>	<b>IBI (India)</b>	<b>= 4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b>	<b>= 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco)</b>	<b>= 5.667</b>	<b>OAJI (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.350</b>

to propagate the false nonsense of the tribe “for one person, for all, for one person”.

Secondly, it is true that in the hands of a large part of the population there was not so much wealth. But a small number of farmland farms gave the opportunity to grow agricultural and melons products. Most of the lands were concentrated in the local rich hands, and they recruited ordinary peasants and carried out farming. On December 2, 1925, at the extraordinary session of the Uzssr MiG, the decree “on the nasionalization of land and water” was adopted. According to him, more than 50 desyatina lands were seized in the Samarkand region, more than 40 desyatina in Fergana region. 7-10 desyatina reduced farms where there is a husband[3]. In 1926, 575 farms were completed in the same Fergana Region[4]. And this, too, did not do, the Bolshevik authorities moved to the nasionalization of their property by “ear” the local rich. Local rich people, separated from their land, were exiled to a completely different territory. Their families remained in a difficult situation.

Thirdly, at the time when the Bolsheviks came to power, they opposed all forms of private property. For them, the more dangerous the intelligentsia, which is the front part of the people, the financially higher part of the population also became the target of the current authorities. Such a policy did not bypass not only large landowners, but also artisans who own their own craft workshops. Workshops of artisans, who saw the day through carpet weaving, stone carving, leather weaving, copper weaving, fabric weaving and dozens of other types of crafts, began to be closed. The Bolsheviks brought industry, factories to the country and showed themselves as if the fur had made the population miserable. The fact is that at the time of such a reform, the aim of the population to strive for production, the loss of abilities and entrepreneurial skills and dependence on the state lay.

Fourth, the Bolsheviks also began to take cultural institutions into their own hands. There was a readiness to create an organizational-institutional structure of the integration of communist ideology into the minds and hearts of the people. Until now, Russian-tuzem schools, new-style schools established by jadidists, amateur artistic communities were closed, they were also introduced into the state. Now the established schools were necessary not only to teach knowledge, but also to turn the Bolshevik ideology into a means of propaganda. The policy of repression against the jadids was a “decisive” blow given to the initiators of the new method schools.

Educational institutions and cultural institutions passed to the dominant ideology izmiye.

Fifth, during the Khanate system, there were separate estates of mosques and madrasas. The state has exempted such properties from any taxes. These properties are aimed at the repair of mosques and madrasahs, social protection of students and strangers. Since 1920-1922 ears, the properties of the foundation began to be limited. Their property was also transferred to the state. The state began to support atheistic politics, proceeding from the ideas of the Communist Party. He intended to integrate his religion into the account of the weakening of the people. But such a policy later brought out its negative consequences.

Today, it is important to study the policy of Soviet power to limit private property as a holistic scientific study. In our opinion, it is worthwhile to pay attention to the following aspects:

- Analysis of the state of private property in Uzbekistan in 1917-1930 and the consequences of its acquisition into state power in the Soviet period and in the ears of independence;

- Comprehensive coverage of the objectives and directions of the establishment of the Bolshevik power in the territory of Uzbekistan, its policy on monopolization of public and public life, its reforms related to the restriction of private property;

- analysis of the consequences of the process of nasionalization of land properties by indicating the total amount of private owners in the envisaged period, their place in the socio-economic life of the country;

- To reveal through archival sources and literature that the social situation of the population in the cities and villages in 1917-1930 ears has deteriorated due to the policy of nasionalization, which led to their dominant ideology;

- to examine the tendencies of the gradual destruction of the rich traditions of the population in agriculture, craftsmanship and trade by the state, etc.

In general, in 1917-1930, the limitation of private property on the territory of Uzbekistan and its socio-economic consequences were extremely valuable to our people. At the time when the Bolsheviks came to power, the state of private property and its complete devolution tendencies, the efforts to eliminate the folk traditions associated with farming, crafting and trade, the deterioration of the socio-economic situation of the population from ear to ear, the process of limiting the ownership of religious institutions were the product of the economic policy.

<b>Impact Factor:</b>	<b>ISRA (India) = 4.971</b>	<b>SIS (USA) = 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland) = 6.630</b>
	<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126</b>	<b>PIF (India) = 1.940</b>
	<b>GIF (Australia) = 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ) = 8.716</b>	<b>IBI (India) = 4.260</b>
	<b>JIF = 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667</b>	<b>OAJI (USA) = 0.350</b>

## References:

1. (n.d.). *O'zbekistonning yangi tarixi*. 2 kitob. (p.178). Tashkent: Sharq.
2. Aminova, R. (1963). *Agrarnaya politika sovetsoy vlasti v Uzbekistane (1917-1920 gg.)* (p.243). Tashkent.
3. (1925). "Pravda vostoka", 1925, 10 dekabr.
4. (1926). "Qizil O'zbekiston", 1926, 28 yanvar.
5. (1986). *Narodnoe xozyaystvo Uzbekskoy SSR v 1985 g.* (p.42). Tashkent.
6. Tuxtaev, E.S. (1980). *Sotsialno-ekonomicheskie problemi povisheniya urovnya jizni selskogo naseleniya Uzbekskoy SSR.* (p.139). Tashkent: Fan.
7. (2000). *O'zbekiston sovet mustamlakachiligi davrida. O'zbekistonning yangi tarixi*. 2-jild, - Tashkent: Akademiya.
8. Shubin, A.V. (n.d.). Ot «zastoya» k reformam. SSSR v 1917-1985 gg... p.259.