

**MANIFESTATION OF THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE POLITICAL SYSTEM OF
SOCIETY IN WORLD EXPERIENCE**

Toshboyev Jamshid

Teacher of Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

E-mail: yanajamshid@mail.ru

Tel: +99897 642 60 66

Annotatsiya: Mazkur maqolada jamiyat siyosiy tizimining vujudga kelishi, rivojlanishi va transformatsiyalashuvi masalalari tahlil qilingan. Siyosiy tizimning ijtimoiy-iqtisodiy asoslarga bog‘liqligi, unda siyosiy hokimiyatning markaziy o‘rni hamda davlat orqali amalga oshirilishi yoritib berilgan. Shuningdek, XX asrda dunyo miqyosida avtoritar va totalitar rejimlardan demokratiyaga o‘tish jarayonlari, ularning asosiy shakllari va modellari ilmiy qarashlar asosida ko‘rib chiqilgan. Maqolada post-kommunistik davlatlarning o‘tish davridagi o‘ziga xos jihatlari va O‘zbekistonda mustaqillikdan so‘ng amalga oshirilgan siyosiy islohotlar hamda “Kuchli davlatdan – kuchli fuqarolik jamiyati sari” g‘oyasining ahamiyati ochib berilgan.

Kalit so‘zlar: Jamiyat siyosiy tizimi, siyosiy hokimiyat, transformatsiyalashuv, avtoritarizm, totalitarizm, demokratiya, demokratiyaga o‘tish, siyosiy rejim, fuqarolik jamiyati, post-kommunistik o‘tish, siyosiy islohotlar, O‘zbekiston tajribasi, modernizatsiya, demokratlashtirish.

Abstract: This article analyzes the issues of the emergence, development, and transformation of the political system of society. The dependence of the political system on socio-economic foundations, the central role of political power within it, and its implementation through the state are highlighted. In addition, the processes of transition from authoritarian and totalitarian regimes to democracy in the twentieth century, as well as their main forms and models, are examined based on scholarly approaches. The article also reveals the specific features of the transition period in post-communist states and the significance of political reforms carried out in Uzbekistan after independence, along with the concept of “From a strong state to a strong civil society.”

Key words: Political system of society, political power, transformation, authoritarianism, totalitarianism, democracy, democratic transition, political regime, civil society, post-communist transition, political reforms, Uzbekistan’s experience, modernization, democratization.

Аннотация: В данной статье анализируются вопросы формирования, развития и трансформации политической системы общества. Освещается зависимость политической системы от социально-экономических основ, центральная роль политической власти и её реализация через государство. Также рассматриваются процессы перехода от авторитарных и тоталитарных режимов к демократии в XX веке, их основные формы и модели на основе научных подходов. В статье раскрываются особенности переходного периода в посткоммунистических государствах, а также значение политических реформ, осуществлённых в Узбекистане после обретения независимости, и концепции «От сильного государства – к сильному гражданскому обществу».

Ключевые слова: политическая система общества, политическая власть, трансформация, авторитаризм, тоталитаризм, демократия, переход к демократии, политический режим, гражданское общество, посткоммунистический переход, политические реформы, опыт Узбекистана, модернизация, демократизация.

Introduction. Since the beginning of communal life on Earth, social life has been functioning, but the need to moderate and regulate the political life of society arises as a result of the emergence of socio-economic inequality. Gradually, this necessity intensifies and transforms into a political system that harmonizes the life of this sphere of society.

By the political system of a particular society, we mean the system of political life and institutions of political power operating within its framework. The nature of a society's political system inevitably stems from its socio-economic basis, the mode of production, and is built upon it; the economic basis constitutes the political superstructure.

The political system of society, in accordance with its mechanism and essence, has certain structural elements, which are inextricably linked and interconnected with each other.

"Political system," as a category, performs political activity in the political life of society and has the character of a system.

The central element and core of the political system is political power, exercised through the state, possessing political power, political status, and political essence.

In the second half of the 20th century, especially in the last decades of global political development, political power was exercised through the state, and the leading direction in it manifested itself in the form of a transition from totalitarianism and authoritarianism to democracy. Examples include the collapse of fascist regimes in Spain and Portugal, military dictatorships in Argentina, Brazil, Greece, and North Korea, the transition of socialist countries of Central and Eastern Europe from past communist totalitarianism to democracy, and the experience of many independent states that emerged in the territory of the former USSR in building democratic states.

The study of these processes allows political scientists to draw general conclusions about the processes of transformation of the political system of society. Polish sociologist and political scientist Yeji Vyatr, summarizing the experience of authoritarian regimes moving towards democracy using the example of Turkey, Greece, Spain, Portugal, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, South Korea, the Philippines, and Eastern European countries, concluded that the transition to democracy occurs under conditions of peaceful change. He emphasizes that the transformation of the political system of society occurs in three forms: reform from above; rapid disintegration; reform agreed upon between the government and the opposition.[1]

Analysis of literature on the topic (Literature review). The problem of the transformation of the political system of society is one of the widely studied topics in modern political science and sociology. Research conducted on this issue is mainly aimed at the theoretical and practical interpretation of the processes of transition from authoritarian and totalitarian political regimes to democracy.

In the works of the Polish political scientist Yeji Vyatr, various forms of transition from authoritarian regimes to democracy are deeply analyzed. He scientifically substantiated that reforms from above, the rapid disintegration of power, and reforms agreed upon between the

government and the opposition are the main mechanisms for the transition to democracy. His conclusions are supported by the experience of Turkey, Spain, Portugal, Latin America, and Eastern European countries.

American political scientist Samuel Huntington, who analyzed the processes of political transformation on a global scale, put forward the theory of the "three waves" of democratization. According to his views, in the 20th century, democracy gradually spread throughout the world, and each wave was formed under the influence of certain historical, social, and political factors. Huntington's concept serves as an important methodological basis for the periodic and comparative analysis of the transformation of the political system of society.

The processes of political transition in post-communist states were interpreted differently in the works of A. Leipzig, F. Schmitter, A. Stepan, and S. Terry. Some scholars assess the experience of these states within the framework of the third wave of democratization, while others emphasize that the post-communist transition has its own unique, complex, and contradictory characteristics. In particular, the necessity of simultaneously forming a market economy and a democratic system is indicated as the main problem.

Also, the phased model of transformation of post-communist societies proposed by L. Shin allows for an institutional analysis of these processes. It distinguishes the stages of the collapse of the totalitarian system, the transition to a democratic system, its affirmation, and deep improvement.

The issue of the transformation of the political system in Uzbekistan is mainly reflected in the works and speeches of the First President of the country, Islam Karimov. The concept of "Uzbekistan's Own Path of Independence and Development," as a national model, put forward the idea of gradual reform of society, building a strong state, and transitioning from it to a strong civil society. In recent years, reforms in this direction have been consistently continued under the leadership of President Sh.M. Mirziyoyev.

Research Methodology. Reform from above is carried out when autocratic rulers, by their own will and as a result of opposition pressure, decide to change the political system. Thus, a group of generals who seized power in Brazil in 1964 eventually began to form a civil-democratic government. A similar thing happened in Chile after the military coup of General A. Pinochet in 1973.

However, such reforms are rarely successful. They are too distant, hesitant, and inconsistent. Because reformers try to democratize the system during the reign of power. Moreover, they are often caught between two fires. On the one hand, they are influenced by the ruling conservative-thinking elite, which controls a significant part of the old state machine, and on the other hand, they are resisted from below, from the side where they moved. As a result, reformers face an alternative: either a decline in reforms or a withdrawal from the political arena.

However, this path of democratic change has undeniable advantages over others, as it is gradually implemented from above and has the least radical character. Therefore, reforming from above in the transformation of the political system of society is considered the most effective way for society. There are several countries that have successfully implemented such changes. For example, such a situation can be observed in Brazil, Turkey, and Chile.

The rapid disintegration of power (the relinquishment of power by the head of state, the renunciation of office or authority) signifies the collapse of the authoritarian regime in a

historically short period of time. This mainly occurs under the influence of external factors. The reason for this could be events in neighboring countries, participation in a military conflict, and defeat. Examples of such a breakdown of authoritarian regimes can be the collapse of the rule of the "black colonels" established in Greece in 1974, the clash of this country with Turkey in Cyprus, or the collapse of the military junta in Argentina as a result of its defeat in Malvina (Folkland) in the last war with England.

The third form of democratic transformation of the authoritarian system is the phased reforms agreed upon between the government and the opposition. This is based on an agreement between the ruling and opposition political forces in the interests of the country and the people. Such a compromise means that, despite the pressure of the social forces behind them, the authorities and the opposition can come to an agreement. They try to avoid mutual accusations and rumors about the past and abandon radical positions and methods of struggle in connection with the sharp deterioration of the socio-economic situation in the country. This form allows achieving significant progress on the path of democratic transformations in a historically short period of time and with minimal social losses. Spain is an example of coordinated implementation of democratic transformations. Through the joint efforts of the government and King Juan Carlos, the reforms carried out after the death of dictator Franco in 1975 made it possible to rise to the status of a modern democratic state in less than 10 years. Poland can serve as an example of a compromise model of democratic transformation of society.

The leading forms of transition from authoritarianism to democracy are evolution, revolution, and occupation. Evolution implies gradual democratic reforms without drastic changes in the ruling elite. Revolution is a rapid change in the political regime. Aggression is characterized by the "location" of democracy by the occupied side as a result of the military defeat of a totalitarian or authoritarian regime in war. After the Second World War, the same happened in Japan and Germany.

The transition from totalitarianism to democracy has its own peculiarities. If the transition from authoritarianism to democracy is mainly a change in the political regime, then the transition from totalitarianism to democracy requires changes in all spheres of public life, in the socio-economic system. The transition to democracy greatly contributes to the development of the economy and can overcome its crisis state. The transition to a democratic political regime requires a state-limited, decentralized economy. If the economy is managed by the state, then it can negatively affect the processes of democratic transition.

Analysis and results (Analysis and results). S. Huntington identified several models of the processes of transformation of the political system of society. The main thing for the traditional model is the irreversibility of democratization, leading to a certain sequence of tasks. This will ensure a gradual transition from classical to modernized political power, allowing for the expansion of the rights and freedoms of the population, as well as their role in the political sphere.

The so-called iterative model was based primarily on the generalization of the experience of Latin American countries. In many Latin American countries, the first attempts to transition to democracy began in the 19th century, after the liberation from Spanish colonialism. Democratic rule was often interrupted by military coups and the rise of military dictatorships, but there were also many instances of the authoritarian collapse of civil regimes.

After the 1960s, the Latin American mistake was repeated in almost all the new countries of Asia and Africa, where democratic and authoritarian regimes alternated.

The third model is the dialectical model, which took place in Germany and Italy, as well as in Spain, Portugal, and Greece.[2] The totalitarian and authoritarian regimes established in these states delayed the formation of democratic institutions. Democracy can be viewed as a denial of the rejection of further return, as a result of which a similar path of democratic formation is called dialectical.

Generalizing the experience of the transformation of the political system of society in many countries of the world allows us to conclude that there are three main stages of such a process:

- 1) the collapse of the authoritarian system and its liberalization;
- 2) establishment of democracy;
- 3) strengthening democracy.

The collapse of an authoritarian or totalitarian system occurs as a result of a sharp decline in its legitimacy. The causes of de-legitimacy can be the death of a charismatic leader or public dissatisfaction with the dominant ideology. With the collapse of the regime, a confrontation arises between supporters of "hard" and "soft" measures. The victory of supporters of "soft" measures often opens up new opportunities for liberalism. As a result of liberalization, the role of civil society increases (if it has already been formed), liberalization prepares society for the next step - the creation of democracy.

The formation of a system of competitive parties and the democratic institutionalization of the structure of state power are the leading elements of the formation of democracy. At the stage of building democracy, the constitutional foundations of the new political system are laid. But for irreversible changes, the next, third stage is needed - the stage of strengthening democracy. At this stage, there is an irreversible legalization of democratic institutions, the adaptation of society to new mechanisms of political power.

From the mid-1970s, the process of the collapse of the anti-democratic regime began to be widely observed in all regions of the world. S. Huntington called this process the third wave of democratization. The first wave of democratization, in his opinion, spanned more than 100 years - from 1820 to 1926 - and affected many states in Europe and South America. Since 1926, Mussolini's fascist dictatorship has finally taken root in Italy, with a reverse or reverse wave emerging, characterized by a decline in the number of democracies and an increase in totalitarian and authoritarian political regimes. From 1942, that is, from the turning point of the Second World War, the second wave of democratization begins, which, according to Huntington, continued until 1962. Following this, numerous military coups were observed in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Europe (Greece, 1967). The third wave of democratization begins with democratic transformations in the countries of Southern Europe (Spain, Portugal, Greece), and then in the countries of Latin America and East Asia.

The turning point of the third wave of democratization was the crisis of communist regimes in the 1980s and 1990s, which had long been considered stable. Starting from this stage, post-communist development processes became the main object of study of transitology, which has become a relatively independent scientific discipline.

Opinions among Western political scientists about the post-communist transition. Some (A. Leiphart, A. Stepan, and F. Schmitter) believe that the processes occurring in Eastern Europe and the post-Soviet space are similar to those in other regions affected by the third wave of

democratization. However, S. Terry had a different point of view. In his opinion, the difficulties facing post-communist states differ from those of states that previously transitioned from totalitarianism and authoritarianism to democracy.

The first difference is related to the desire of post-communist states to simultaneously create a market economy and pluralistic democracy. The desire to build a market economy and a democratic system simultaneously led to internal contradictions in the communist post-communist transition period.

The second difference relates to the socio-economic sphere. During the transition to democracy, the task was set to create new sectors of the economy - the national economy - in countries with low financial and industrial development. Former communist countries faced the need for constructive restructuring and transformation of previously created industries.

The third difference is related to the ethnic diversity of post-communist states. This leads to the spread of nationalist movements, and nationalism in all its manifestations contradicts democracy, since it focuses on the superiority of one nation over others and prevents the emergence of a true civil society.

Political scientist L. Shin lists four stages of transformation of post-communist society:

- 1) the collapse of the totalitarian system;
- 2) transition to a democratic system;
- 3) confirmation of the democratic system;
- 4) radical improvement of democratic institutions.[3]

Comparative analysis of the experience of different countries of Europe, Latin America, and Asia does not give a clear answer to the question of the effectiveness of the authoritarian method of modernization. Under an authoritarian regime, the possibility of successful market reforms, and then the liberalization and democratization of this regime, cannot be denied.

At this point, it is worth noting the profound social transformations on the path from totalitarianism to democracy and the processes of political transformation in the experience of independent states that emerged after the collapse of the Soviet Union. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, it was very important for the newly independent states to create a common trajectory of development corresponding to place and time.

Because, on the one hand, opportunities for joining the world's political processes opened up for increasing the political culture of the population, and on the other hand, for the democratization of the country. It is known that the dominant paradigm in political trends is essentially "Westernization" or liberal-democratic modernization, which ensures the transition of the economy to market rails, ideological pluralism and free political competition, and the formation of a legal state accountable to an active civil society. This path, as a result of the collapse of the bilateral system of international relations, was perceived by all peoples as a kind of "pillar road" of world development. However, many countries of the former Soviet Union, although they declared their support for building a democratic state of the Western model, in practice limited themselves only to beautiful declarations, adapting political systems to the interests of the ruling elites. On the other hand, the possibilities of the emerging independent states were not taken into account.

From the first days of Uzbekistan's independence, it can be said that the process of transformation of the political system began. For this purpose, without rejecting all the positive practices drawn from the world and our own past experience, they began to choose their own

path of socio-economic and political-legal development. Of course, at a time when the country is at a critical juncture, fulfilling the tasks related to its transition to a new society requires the head of state to develop a management system suitable for the new conditions and create the economic foundation of society. It was also necessary to create a system of ideas uniting all segments of the population around a single goal. In such a difficult situation, the First President of the Republic of Uzbekistan, I.A. Karimov, came to power.

In the process of political transformation in Uzbekistan, attention was paid to the following factors:

Firstly, the effective use of the legacy and experience of the former Soviet Union;

Secondly, to act based on the specific spiritual and moral situation of the Republic;

Thirdly, taking into account the favorable geopolitical opportunities of the Republic when developing Uzbekistan's development path;

Fourthly, paying attention to the social, psychological, and psychological aspects of Uzbekistan's transition to market relations;

Fifthly, changing the attitude towards Islam in determining the policy of Uzbekistan;

Sixthly, developing plans for the effective use of Uzbekistan's rich material, spiritual, and production potential and personnel.

These instructions and conclusions were regularly supplemented by I. Karimov and enriched with new rules and guidelines. In particular, in August 1992, on the eve of the celebrations of the first anniversary of independence, President Islam Karimov's work "Uzbekistan's Own Path of Independence and Development" was published, which outlined the guidelines for transforming the political system of society. In particular, in the political sphere, this is: the need for the full participation of the people in the exercise of state power, both directly and indirectly, that is, through their representatives; deepening democracy and building national statehood based on the introduction of the internationally recognized principle of separation of powers into legislative, executive, and judicial branches; radical renewal of the political system of society, the structures of state bodies; ensuring the legal equality of all citizens before the law and the rule of law; renunciation of the monopoly of one ideology, one worldview, recognition of the diversity of political organizations, ideologies, and opinions; formation of a multi-party system as a legal component of democracy; It means that every person born in Uzbekistan, living and working on its soil, regardless of their beliefs and nationality, will achieve equal citizenship of the Republic. The world has accumulated vast experience in this regard, which is being studied by developing countries. Although studied, it cannot be said that these experiments are always being used. Many conclusions of world experience clearly correspond to the realities of Uzbekistan. Apparently, it is necessary to consider and perceive these experiences in the unique historical environment that gave rise to them, so that the mistakes of others are not repeated, and no one has yet managed to avoid their own mistakes. Or are those who say that others' mistakes teach nothing right?

In practically all countries of the world, the transition period is inextricably linked with the following key social problems:

- the constructive role of the state in carrying out reforms;
- by mobilizing the social capabilities of society;
- with the formation and expansion of the middle class;
- further improvement of interaction with the international environment.[4]

The gradual nature of these factors, their significance, as well as the effectiveness of each of them individually and as a whole, depends on various reasons. The most important of these is the situation on the eve of the transition period, the ability to determine the state of the country before its beginning.

The most important factor of the transition period is the creation of a strong state. Without such a state (which has been repeatedly confirmed by the experience of many countries in the world), it is impossible to mobilize existing social opportunities, to form a middle class, and to achieve success in international relations. This process was reflected in the idea put forward by the First President of the Republic of Uzbekistan I.A. Karimov "From a Strong State to a Strong Civil Society." Based on this idea, the process of transformation of the political system in Uzbekistan was carried out. These reforms are being continued by the current President of the country, Sh.M. Mirziyoyev.

Conclusion/Recommendations. Analysis shows that the transformation of the political system occurs in each society in accordance with historical, socio-economic, and cultural characteristics. The success of the transition to democracy depends, first of all, on the stability of state institutions, the consistency of economic reforms, and the development of civil society. It was also revealed that in post-communist countries, these processes are complex and contradictory, and the simultaneous creation of a market economy and democratic institutions is a great challenge.

It was concluded that, using the example of Uzbekistan, the transformation of the political system was carried out gradually, evolutionarily, a national development model was formed, and the principle "From a strong state to a strong civil society" was adopted as the main direction.

When improving the political system of society, it is advisable to gradually implement democratization processes and take into account national characteristics.

Along with ensuring the institutional stability of state power, special attention should be paid to the development of civil society institutions.

It is necessary to carry out political reforms in conjunction with economic reforms, to ensure the effective functioning of market economy mechanisms.

It is advisable to strengthen the social support of democratic institutions by raising political culture, increasing the political consciousness and activity of the population.

Comparative analysis of the processes of political transformation in Uzbekistan with international experience and the expansion of scientific research will serve to increase the effectiveness of future reforms.

References:

1. Вятр Е. К новому мировому порядку XXI века. https://www.lihachev.ru/pic/site/files/lihcht/2017/dokladi/WiatrJ_plen_rus_izd.pdf
2. Сигачёв М., Слепцов Э. Национальные государства Европы и европейский союз: дисфункции и противоречия (на примере Италии и Германии). <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/natsionalnye-gosudarstva-evropy-i-evropeyskiy-soyuz-disfunktsii-i-protivorechiya-na-primere-italii-i-germanii>
3. Общая и прикладная политология: Учебное пособие. / Под общей редакцией В.И. Жукова, Б.И. Краснова. –Москва. МГСУ: Союз, 1997. –С. 254-256.
4. Левитин Леонид, Дональд С. Карлайл. Ислом Каримов – Янги Ўзбекистон Президенти. –Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1996. 56-б.