

Problems of Regulating Population's Income Level

Aziza Tokhirovna Akhmedova ¹

Abstract

The presented article examines the development of the state, which affects the social level of the population through legislation regulating economic activity, tax, budgetary, credit policy by regulating money circulation, the level of prices, wages, housing and other living conditions of citizens.

Keywords: *budget, credit policy, innovative, system, income, population, budget, social needs, finance, financial analysis.*

¹ Acting, Assistant Professor Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service

An economic system is defined as a system aimed at meeting the needs of the population, creating conditions for individuals and teams to demonstrate their innovative abilities and opportunities to work in accordance with the conscious and unconscious demands of society. At the same time, self-government is understood as the determination by enterprises themselves of their inputs and outputs (horizontal connections are established only on their own initiative on the basis of business contracts) while optimizing the criterion for making management decisions (maximizing profits) in the conditions of establishing, under the influence of supply and demand, prices and volumes of consumption of material, labor and financial resources and product output. In relation to the economy, the role of an external mechanism is the superstructure that implements the economic policy of the state in the form of public administration.

From our point of view, the term “state management of the economy” is more correct, since economic policy state is expedient. Indeed, the state influences the social level of the population through legislation regulating economic activity, tax, budget, and credit policies by regulating money circulation, price levels, wages, housing and other living conditions of citizens

This process is facilitated by the variety of forms of ownership and to a lesser extent, if not to a greater extent, is the centralization of an ever-increasing part of national income in the state budget in the implementation of the state’s social policy. State support of the population can also be considered as a form of implementation by the state - the subject of property of the right of ownership, use, disposal in a more specific definition in relation to large-scale production based on labor cooperation.

The concept of “state support of the population” is based on the generally accepted understanding of social support as the purposeful impact of the subject of management on the object - the living standard of the population, therefore, state support for the population is the authoritative, ordering influence of the subject - the state - on objects - society, various social formations and individual members.

In the social sciences, there is a strong tendency to use the term “regulation” in a broader sense than the term “management.” It is believed that social regulation includes social management (conscious regulation) and spontaneous regulation. Therefore, in relation to the market, the term “regulation” is used (as a spontaneous regulator), and not management.

In light of the above, it can be argued that the term “social regulation” cannot be an analogue for defining the interaction between the state and the economy, since, ultimately, this interaction is manifested in the conscious influence of the state on the social level population, that is, in management, which is accompanied by national, local, industrial self-government, self-government of the activities of the active part of the population.

And although this impact may vary in strength and form from simple taxation of business entities (individual citizens and their associations in various forms of management) until the complete nationalization of economic life, in all cases it is established based on the goals of state social and economic policy.

It is obvious that, being a political superstructure over the economic basis, the state of all times and peoples managed the economy, “Strictly speaking, in history there is not and has not been such a national economy, the development of which would take place without any influence from the bodies of economic policy.”

And although this impact may vary in strength and form from simple taxation of business entities

(individual citizens and their associations in various forms of management) until the complete nationalization of economic life, in all cases it is established based on the goals of state social and economic policy.

It is obvious that, being a political superstructure over the economic basis, the state of all times and peoples managed the economy, "Strictly speaking, in history there is not and has not been such a national economy, the development of which would take place without any influence from the bodies of economic policy."

At the same time, at all times and among all peoples, the state was by no means necessarily the owner of the means and objects of production. It actually became such under the conditions of the formation and development of a state-monopoly economy.

In our opinion, we consider it possible to consider state social management as a form of implementation by the state-owner of the right of ownership, use, and disposal.

In favor of this conclusion, one can express the idea that the transformation of politics into the commanding force of the economy is favored by the state form of ownership of the means and products of production, and to a lesser, if not more, degree by the centralization of an ever-increasing part of national income in the state budget.

Thus, the objects of state social development there are both state-owned (state-owned) and non-state (cooperative, joint-stock, joint ventures formed by attracting foreign capital and individuals engaged in self-employment) enterprises and organizations, which in their activities must equally act within the framework of laws adopted by the state. In the light of the above understanding of state social regulation of the life of the population, let us move on to consider the problem of denationalization and privatization. The term "denationalization" was obtained by translating into the Russian language the French term *desetatization* (*desetatization*), which comes from *etat-state*. The opposite in meaning is the term "nationalization".

Nationalization is a process of active, constantly expanding state intervention in economic life, not only the development of a network of state-owned enterprises, that is, the nationalization of production, but also the nationalization of market relations (increasing state consumption, control, regulation, etc.).

The term "privatization" is similarly derived from the English

words private-private personal. We emphasize that such a translation is contained in

Anlo-Russian economic dictionary." Consequently, in translation, privatization means the development of both private and personal property Let us also note that these terms denote not just the development of this or that type of property, but the development through transfer, transformation of part from one form of property to another, but also the life activity of the population.

With labor private ownership by the employee and the owner is one and the same person who himself works on his means of production. Personal property differs from both types of private in that it is ownership not of the means of production, but of consumer goods.

Let us note that only in the case of non-labor and labor private property, the owner himself cannot work and receive income from capital in any form, therefore it makes sense for persons who own significant funds to advocate for privatization in the form of development of private property.

The practice of market developed countries clearly indicates that these the terms are not identical: given that, along with private property cooperative society is developing here, denationalization can be carried out transformation of state property into cooperative property, and not only state property, but also cooperative property can be privatized. But still, given the relative importance of state and private types of property, the processes of transformation (sale) of state property into private property are of particular importance.

In favor of the conclusion about the strengthening role of government influence on vital activity of the population, according to the data given in table 1 and the established relationship between the size of the average per capita national product and the share of centralized government spending in gross national product.

Table 1. Share of government expenditures in gross national product of developed capitalist countries*%

Years	France	Germany	Japan	Sweden	England	USA
2015	15	10	11	6	10	8
2017	19	31	19	8	24	10
2019	35	32	18	31	32	28
2022	52	47	33	65	48	37

The main argument in favor of denationalization is that effective management requires combining in one person both the owner, the owner, and manager. In its limiting case, this idea leads to the conclusion about the need to create a social system in which everyone the employee must be both an owner and a manager certainly receive income to maintain their standard of living.

It is obvious that, based on the identification of management as a special type of socially useful activity and the education of professionally prepared individuals for it, in modern society there is a separation of the owner from the manager.

This does not mean that the owner cannot be a manager. But for To achieve this, he must have certain abilities and undergo a certain Course of Study. The same fact that in firms in market-developed countries workers can have their shares does not in itself indicate their participation in management. Of course, in this case it can be argued that a worker who has shares and receives dividends on them depending on the size of the company's profit is interested in working intensively and efficiently, contributing to increasing profits.

Speaking of shares, it should also be borne in mind that the United States passed a federal law on the so-called "Equity Ownership Programs" (EAS). As a result, PAC programs cover about 10 million blue-collar workers, but 82% of the total US wealth held in bonds, securities, stocks and trusts is owned by just 0.25% of the US population.

In conclusion of our consideration of the problem of denationalization and privatization, I would like to note that it has not been resolved for market-developed countries either. Indeed, in the case of the sale of state-owned enterprises to private corporations, the state, in fact, moves from the category of owners of industrial capital to the category of owners of financial capital, and if the rate of profit (profitability) of the sold enterprise is equal to the interest rate for the loan, then the state can, without any losses, lend your financial capital. It is obvious that in this situation the financial (economic) power of the state in no way decreases.

Bibliography

1. Kondratiev N.D. Problems of economic dynamics Redkol. L.I.Abalkin (ed.) et al. - M., 2019, p.93.
2. English-Russian Economic Dictionary: about 6000 terms (Ed. A.V. Anikin). - M., 2012, p. 475.
3. Olsevich Yu.Ya. Social reorientation of the economy. M., 2018, p.44-45
4. Supyan V.B. Wage labor in the USA at the new stage of scientific and technological revolution: qualitative evolution and problems of use.-M., 2017.p. 60. Problems of education and employment of youth.