



The Increasing Of The Socio-Political Crisis In The Ussr And Impact On The Social Life Of The Population Of The Republic

Tuxtayeva Rano Nortuxtayevna – Docent of Turan University

Mavlonova Bashorat Abduvaliyevna – Master’s Student of Turon University

Abstract

This study examines the socio-economic development of Uzbekistan during the 1960s–1980s within the framework of the Soviet administrative-command system. The research analyzes the economic reforms introduced after 1965, their limited positive outcomes, and the subsequent strengthening of centralized control that deepened the economic crisis in the republic. Particular attention is paid to the decline in industrial productivity, inefficiency in the use of production capacities, stagnation in agriculture, and the overdependence of Uzbekistan on cotton production under Soviet economic policy.

Keywords: administrative-command system, economic crisis, socialism, cotton policy, industrial development, agriculture, corruption, socio-economic development, centralized planning, developed socialism, economic stagnation.

INTRODUCTION

The Soviet leadership interpreted the processes of social development in terms of class, according to which Uzbekistan entered a "new historical stage" in 1961 as a result of the "creation of the material and technical base of communism."¹ During this period, Soviet theorists quickly developed an unscientific theory of the construction of communism, a classless society, and achieving this goal formed the basis of the Center's socio-economic policy in Uzbekistan.

As is known, later the Soviet leadership recognized that "a developed socialist society had been built in the USSR" and introduced the term "developed socialism" into public life. However, the Soviet political and economic system,

¹ Коммунистическая партия Узбекистана в резолюциях и решениях съездов и пленумов ЦК. Том III. 1960-1975 гг. -Ташкент: «Узбекистан», 1988. -С. 117-119.



that is, the political governance of the state, remained the same, no democratic institutions were formed, and no fundamental changes occurred in production and property relations in the economy.

Despite some positive developments in the socio-economic development of the USSR, in general, in the mid-1960s, the economy was under the negative influence of the Soviet administrative-command management model. This was manifested in the following facts, that is, the Soviet political leadership was forced to recognize the following negative situations in the economy:

- the existing form of management organization, methods of planning and economic stimulation of industry, and the development of productive forces did not meet the level of modern requirements,

- due to strict regulation, the initiative of teams in enterprises was limited, and the responsibility of business leaders for improving the organization of production was reduced,

- due to the insufficient rights of enterprises and the strengthening of control over them by planning and economic management bodies, the method of economic accounting, which is much more effective for achieving high production indicators and improving product quality, was used extremely little,

- due to insufficient attention being paid to the material incentives of employees in industrial enterprises, they were not interested in economic indicators, improving product quality, and the overall results of the enterprise's work.

It is worth noting that, despite their limited nature, the implemented economic reforms yielded some positive results in 1965-1980. However, in the highest circles of power in the Center, old-fashioned leaders constituted the majority.

Some positive steps, namely reforms, that were experimentally applied in some sectors of the economy were abandoned, and administrative-managerial principles of management were restored in them, and the command system in the economy was strengthened. As a result, from year to year in Uzbekistan, as in the entire USSR, the indicators of socio-economic development decreased. As



a result, in the early 80s, the republic's economy experienced extremely serious problems, and a deep crisis was evident in some sectors of the Uzbek economy. This testified to the crisis of the Soviet administrative-command model of management of the economy as a whole. For example, in Uzbekistan, the gross social product grew by 6.7 percent in 1966-1970, while in 1981-1985 this figure was 3.6 percent. During this period, the national income generated fell from 6.8 percent to 3.3 percent, and the real income of the population decreased from 6.6 percent to 1.3 percent². Also, the huge scientific and production potential, rich raw materials and labor resources, and favorable natural and climatic conditions available for the rapid development of productive forces in the industry of Uzbekistan were not fully and effectively used.

The inefficiency of the Soviet economic system and its crisis tendency were also manifested in the following facts. During the three years of the Eleventh Five-Year Plan (1981-1985), the value of the main productive assets in industry increased by 28 percent, while production volume increased by only 15.4 percent.³

In many industries, especially in the production of steel, lead, mineral fertilizers, and cement, production capacities were used inefficiently. In mechanical engineering, the equipment turnover coefficient (equipment utilization coefficient) did not exceed 1.35 percent.

The light industry sector of the economy was also in a state of crisis. Although fixed assets increased by 1.8 times at the beginning of the eleventh five-year plan, in particular, in this sector, the fund productivity fell by 12 percent during the first three years of the five-year plan. The enterprises and production facilities commissioned during this period were developed quite late and at half capacity. It is also worth noting that a large part of the equipment in many enterprises of this sector was morally and physically obsolete, and many

² Народное хозяйство Узбекской ССР за 70 лет Советской власти. Юбилейный статистический ежегодник. - Ташкент: "Узбекистан", 1987. - С. 152.

³ "Правда Востока", 24 июня 1984 г.



issues of material and technical support were not resolved, dozens of machine tools remained unused due to the lack of minor details⁴.

The average level of production growth in the republic fell by 3.8 percent compared to the tenth five-year plan (1971-1975) and by 1.1 percent in the first three years of the eleventh five-year plan⁵.

These circumstances were also characteristic of the social life of the republic. In particular, in the late 70s and the first half of the 80s of the 20th century, as in the entire USSR, a negative social situation arose in Uzbekistan, which was expressed in abuse of power, embezzlement, and violation of laws and moral standards. In numerous letters addressed to the leadership of Uzbekistan, people wrote about these negative facts, reporting on the social injustice that had become characteristic of the life of Soviet society. Faced with irrefutable evidence, the political leadership of the republic was forced to admit the correctness and validity of many of the arguments about the violations of the law presented in these letters.

One of the negative factors of social life during this period was embezzlement and embezzlement. They not only created a false sense of well-being, but also prepared the ground for the theft of state property. Among the perpetrators of such crimes were not a few Soviet leaders of various categories. For example, a group of robbers consisting of 59 people operated for many years in the "Gozal" sewing association in the Tashkent region. They were engaged in the manufacture and sale of goods hidden from accounting, causing material damage to the state in the amount of several million rubles. Despite the very low selling prices of cotton and the fact that they were causing losses, the political leadership of the republic, under pressure from the Center, continued to demand from the population that "cotton growing was and remains the main type of agricultural crop in Uzbekistan, and that it is the international duty of the

⁴ "Правда Востока". 24 июня 1984 г.

⁵ Ўзбекистон тарихи (1917-1991 йиллар) Иккинчи 1939-1991 йиллар. – Тошкент, O`zbekiston, 2019. – 121 б.



republic for all workers to fulfill their plans and obligations to cultivate “white gold” in a timely manner⁶.

In the 1970s and 1980s, the growth of the USSR's export revenues was the result of a sharp (several times) increase in world oil and gas prices. However, the fall in prices for raw materials on the world market in 1986 was one of the reasons that later led the Soviet economy to a financial and economic crisis.

In the 1970s, a new international division of labor was formed in the practice of the world economy: the share of raw materials and materials in world trade gradually decreased, technological progress eliminated the comparative advantage associated with natural conditions and geographical location⁷.

In accordance with the socio-economic policy of the Soviet planned economy, the economy of Uzbekistan was developing according to five-year plans developed by the state and financial bodies of the Center. Five-year socio-economic tasks were approved by the plenums and congresses of the CPSU and the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, which were considered mandatory for the implementation of these tasks by the ministries, departments and economic bodies of the republic, while local authorities were obliged to rely on party directives in their socio-economic activities and ensure the implementation of the tasks set by the congresses and plenums of the CPSU and the Communist Party of Uzbekistan.

The deterioration of the socio-economic situation in Uzbekistan was largely due to the following conditional factors:

- if in the pre-war and first five-year periods after the war the Soviet planned economy contributed to the creation of new industrial sectors and the formation of a productive agricultural sector, then from the mid-60s of the 20th century it began to experience certain difficulties associated with the need to change the methods of managing the national economy,

⁶ “Правда Востока”, 24 июня 1984 г.

⁷ Шмелев К., Попов Г. На переломе: экономическая перестройка в СССР. - Москва: АПН, 1989. - С. 301.



- although in the mid-60s of the 20th century attempts were made to introduce new forms and methods of organizing economic management, this need was ignored by the central political leadership of the USSR.

There were two trends in the socio-economic development of Uzbekistan in the 80s of the 20th century. In particular, on the one hand, in the first half of the 80s of the 20th century, as the political leadership of Uzbekistan noted, "...The rapid development of the economy was ensured. Gross social products and national income increased. The volume of industrial products increased by 26 percent, and the material and technical base of the agrarian sector of the economy was strengthened. Food production increased several times. In the field of capital construction, more than 30 billion rubles of fixed assets were mobilized. Later, the transport and communication sectors also developed..."

But, on the other hand (the Communist Party of Uzbekistan was forced to admit that as a result of its own mistakes, the following negative factors existed in the socio-economic life of the republic): "... As a result of certain shortcomings in the activities of the party, soviet and economic bodies, serious mistakes and shortcomings in the selection and placement of personnel in the national economy of the republic, and in the party's leadership over the economy, the national economy of the republic has been developing for many years at the expense of extensive factors. The existing production and scientific and technical potential, favorable natural and climatic conditions, rich raw materials and labor resources were not used effectively, and this did not give the desired result.

Fraud, theft, bribery spread widely, leading to the demoralization and corruption of a certain part of the personnel, deliberate silence about the slow pace of socio-economic development that occurred in the 1970s - 1980s, fraud and distorted in every way by means of ostentatiousness..."

This period had a negative trend for the agriculture of Uzbekistan. It developed slowly, and the tasks of growing raw cotton, grain and other agricultural products were not fulfilled. The situation in livestock breeding was also unsatisfactory.



Many factories and plants located in Uzbekistan had the status of Union and were directly subordinate to the Center. Since these enterprises denied the interests of the republic, their activities brought very little benefit to the economy and budget of Uzbekistan. Although they used the natural and economic resources of Uzbekistan, the tax revenues from their activities went directly to the Union budget. In addition, Union enterprises did not want to help solve the social problems of Uzbekistan. For example, they solved the issue of personnel by attracting specialists and labor from Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and other places. This led to a steady decrease in the number of indigenous peoples at the enterprises of the republic, such as the capital city of Tashkent, Tashkent and Navoi regions. This situation ultimately led to social unrest and high unemployment among the indigenous population.

The resolution also sharply criticized the inefficiency of the Institute of Economics: "... The fundamental problems of improving the economic system of a developed socialist society are not being analyzed in sufficient depth in the scientific research being conducted. The development of the methodology of the political economy of socialism remains the same, its disconnection from practice has not been completely eliminated. The study of problems of production efficiency in the conditions of its intensive development, such as accelerating the progress of scientific and technical progress, and improving the planned management of the national economic complex, does not meet the requirements of the present day..."⁸.

From the tasks set before the Institute of Economics, namely, the main theoretical issues of the socialist economic system, such as the "economic theory of socialism", "socialist production relations", "socialist property", etc., as well as other contradictions of socio-economic development inherent in the economy of the USSR at that time, it is possible to conclude not only that the fundamental problems did not find their solution, but also about the deep crisis of the Soviet model of economic development.

CONCLUSION

⁸ КПСС в резолюциях и решениях съездов, конференций и пленумов ЦК. Том XIV. - С. 495.



In general, all this reflected the systemic crisis that the Soviet economic model was experiencing in the early 80s. However, despite the deepening of the crisis, the political leadership of the Center continued to emphasize the ideological factor, rather than the economic laws of social development, in its socio-economic policy. This, in turn, not only exacerbated the crisis of the Soviet political system, but also became one of the factors that accelerated the collapse of the USSR.

REFERENCES

1. Allworth, Edward. *The Modern Uzbeks: From the Fourteenth Century to the Present*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1990.
2. Carrère d'Encausse, Hélène. *Islam and the Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
3. Critchlow, James. *Nationalism in Uzbekistan: A Soviet Republic's Road to Sovereignty*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1991.
4. Gregory, Paul R., and Robert C. Stuart. *Soviet Economic Structure and Performance*. 7th ed. New York: HarperCollins, 1994.
5. Keller, Shoshana. *To Moscow, Not Mecca: The Soviet Campaign Against Islam in Central Asia, 1917–1941*. Westport: Praeger, 2001.
6. Khanin, Grigorii. "The 1950s–1980s and the Soviet Economic Crisis." *Europe-Asia Studies* 55, no. 8 (2003): 1185–1206.
7. Lubin, Nancy. *Labour and Nationality in Soviet Central Asia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
8. Nove, Alec. *An Economic History of the USSR, 1917–1991*. London: Penguin Books, 1992.
9. Rashid, Ahmed. *The Resurgence of Central Asia: Islam or Nationalism?* Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1994.
10. Smith, Graham, ed. *The Nationalities Question in the Soviet Union*. London: Longman, 1990.



11. Suny, Ronald Grigor. The Soviet Experiment: Russia, the USSR, and the Successor States. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
12. White, Stephen, Alex Pravda, and Zvi Gitelman, eds. Developments in Soviet Politics. Durham: Duke University Press, 1990.
13. Ўзбекистон Республикаси Энциклопедияси. Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси. Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси давлат илмий нашриёти, 2002.
14. Karimov, I. A. Uzbekistan on the Threshold of the Twenty-First Century. Tashkent: Uzbekistan Publishing House, 1997.
15. Абдуллаев, Р. М. Ўзбекистон иқтисодиёти тарихи. Тошкент: Фан, 2005.
16. Коммунистическая партия Узбекистана в резолюциях и решениях съездов и пленумов ЦК. Том III. 1960-1975 гг. -Ташкент: «Узбекистан», 1988. -С. 117-119.
17. Народное хозяйство Узбекской ССР за 70 лет Советской власти. Юбилейный статистический сборник. - Ташкент: "Узбекистан", 1987. - С. 152.
18. "Правда Востока", 24 июня 1984 г.
19. "Правда Востока". 24 июня 1984 г.
20. Ўзбекистон тарихи (1917-1991 йиллар) Иккинчи 1939-1991 йиллар. – Тошкент, O`zbekiston, 2019. – 121 б.
21. "Правда Востока", 24 июня 1984 г.
22. Шмелев К., Попов Г. На переломе: экономическая перестройка в СССР. - Москва: АПН, 1989. - С. 301.
23. КПСС в резолюциях и решениях съездов, конференций и пленумов ЦК. Том XIV. - С. 495.