

Political Institution As A Scientific Concept, In The Context Of The Historical Substantiation Of The Concept In The Theory Of Political Science

Rasulov Sardor Makhmudjonovich

Masters of the Practical Politology
the University of World Economy and Diplomacy
54 Mustakillik Ave., Tashkent 100007, Uzbekistan.
tel.: 90-788-21-59, e-mail: rasulovs540@gmail.ru

Annotation: The article deals with the concept of a political institution in its historical origin and development. A political institution is a kind of composite value in the state, forming its main authorities. In the historical context, most political scientists and sociologists have not directly singled out a political institution as something separate from the state. Only by the beginning of the 20th century did a clearer definition of a political institution appear and develop. And already modern researchers are considering a political institution, which is a set of political and economic organizations, of which not all are state-owned. The author argues that the development of political institutions within the state affects the strengthening of the system of "checks and balances", which makes the functioning of the state more successful. In addition, the author believes that the concept of a political institution is becoming "blurred" in modern research circles and requires a larger study to determine the essence of a political institution.

Key words: state, democracy, political institution, neo-institutionalism, conservatism.

Historically, political institutions are determined in science deductively, and in modern science the following institutions are distinguished: parliamentarism, executive power, civil service, the institution of the head of state, and judiciary. At the same time, these institutions are divided into internal features. The term "institution" from the Latin language "īnstitūtī" is revealed as a custom, principle, decree, intention and institution, that is, it can be assumed that this is the "creation of a government institution" in compilation with the power term.

At the same time, the origins of the development of political institutions can be attributed by the time of the Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle. By that time, Aristotle had already singled out democracy, tyranny and oligarchy.

For example, the basic institutions of democracy stem from "parliamentarism" and "presidency." In modern political theory, "democracy" is defined as an institutional arrangement for political decision-making, in which the people are given the right to make decisions through voting to determine the most suitable candidate for political office at various levels.

At the same time, N.A. Bogdanova in her article highlights the period of "Zhanguo" or the fighting kingdoms in ancient China, where the understanding of political institutions was noticeably different. "Confucians" and "legalists" were distinguished,

in modern political theory, they can be classified as "idealists"

and realists. That is, the very concept of a political institution since ancient times has not had an identical meaning with similar terms,

but its correlation with the political structure of the state is undeniable.

The next important stage in the development of the political institution should be attributed to the Middle Ages. It was then that the Florentine writer and diplomat N. Machiavelli carried out his activities in the study of politics

and states directly referring to the philosophers of ancient Greece and Rome as the founders of the theory of legal institutions. N. Machiavelli puts forward the theory of "the art of political administration", guided by the

knowledge of his predecessors, he creates a treatise on the recommendations of state administration. From the works of N. Machiavelli, several political institutions can be distinguished: the institution of the head of state and the executive branch. Although N. Machiavelli himself did not single them out, these institutions are clearly present in his writings.

At the same time, N. Machiavelli did not study the political institution in detail, as the main object of his study, most of his activities were devoted to issues of state administration. It should be noted that at that time the understanding of the political institution was at the stages of formation. As noted by B. Tolen N. Machiavelli was focused on creating a work that includes the ideas of Aristotle and Plato on government. Creating your work, "Sovereign",

N. Machiavelli laid the foundation for the formation of more effective political institutions in the future.

The next person to be singled out is the English philosopher T. Hobbes, who carried out his activities after Machiavelli. T. Hobbes already singled out political institutions separately. In political institutions, he saw only institutions that are subject to the powers of state power, that is, legal organizations and structures permitted by the state, and in fact became one of the founders of the normative-legal approach.

Starting with the classical works of E. Durkheim and M. Weber in political science and sociology, as opposed to the state-legal or administrative-legal understanding of political institutions, a sociological approach to institutions has been outlined, which brought the problem of the relationship between content and form in political contacts to a new theoretical level.

Here there is an obvious expansion of the understanding of the political institution, from the point of view of the fact that this is not an exclusively political component within the framework of one state, but the complexity of socio-economic aspects including.

There is an obvious similarity between the ideas of N. Machiavelli and the German political scientist M. Weber, who continued the development of the theory of the political institution in a more direct sense. M. Weber believed that a "political union" is achieved through war or the physical destruction of the enemy. And here

M. Weber singles out a "power institution" that has the exclusive right to use legitimate political violence. The latter presupposes the existence of relations in society according to the type of power vertical from top to bottom.

By the early 1980s, political scientists J. March and P. Olsen developed a new form of institutionalism. March and Olsen made an important theoretical distinction between the logic of conservatism and the logic of relevance in their research. Rational choice and new institutionalism have dominated political science for decades

and developed largely in parallel, which is also true of rational choice institutionalism, although its name signals otherwise. From this followed historical institutionalism is the most structural version of the new institutionalism, with dependence

from the path as a fundamental concept that emphasizes the legacy of the past as a powerful force behind present and future actions.

In this case, J. March and P. Olsen combined: normative, political, sociological, historical and discursive institutionalism into a single whole. That is, they believed that all these institutions are inherent in the modern state to a greater and lesser extent.

At the same time, theorists did, focus on the economy and politics of the state equally, explaining this by the fact that politics without economics is impossible.

You should also pay attention to how some researchers reveal the concept of a political institution. HA. Hajiyev reveals the political institution as a rather complex phenomenon, which is an indispensable element of the main social spheres. A. V. Abramov considers the political institution to be historically established, normatively fixed, organizationally formalized and regularly reproduced model associated with the conquest of political power, the implementation of public administration, as well as the participation of citizens in these processes.

B. Tolen considers the political institution to be a set of state authorities, while assigning a role to the economic one. S. Gilad identifies a political institution in a scientific form as a set of formal rules (codes of laws, codifications, etc.) and informal norms of common understanding that limit and prescribe the interaction of political actors with each other.

Thus, the disclosure and understanding of the term is heterogeneous, each author understands it differently, but there are similarities that should be highlighted, for example, a political institution is inextricably linked with the state, it has a relationship with other institutions, and a political institution includes a set of social and economic component.

The development of a political institution in modern conditions

In the modern sense, political institutions are already organizations in the government that create, enforce and apply laws. They are often mediators in conflicts, determine (state) policy regarding the economy and social systems and otherwise ensure the representation of the population. In this regard, the political institution already acts as an organ of state power and a mediator, in terms of activities between the population and the state.

Consider democratic political regimes, which are the most common, divided into two types: presidential (led by with the president) and parliamentary (led by parliament). Legislatures built to support regimes are either unicameral (only one chamber) or bicameral (two chambers—for example, the Senate). and the House of Representatives or the House of Commons and the House of Lords). The branching of the system of power in countries is due to an attempt to create a system of checks and counterweights. For example, the EU has various institutions to control and the interaction of various processes within the union, the member states gave part of their power to the “supranational body” (institution), which allowed countries to develop more efficiently.

In addition, modern political institutions include political party organizations, trade unions and (legal) courts. The term "political institutions" may also refer to the recognized framework of rules and principles within which the aforementioned organizations operate, including such concepts as voting rights, responsible government, and accountability.

Depending on the country where the level of political literacy of the population is higher or lower, these political institutions have a significant impact on the interaction between the state and the population. At the same time, legal courts are emphasized and here we mean the European Court of Human Rights, where citizens of the participating countries can sue the country in case of infringement of their rights.

Political institutions and systems have a direct impact on the business environment and activities of a country. Corporations stand out here, which are also one of the significant participants in the political process of both national and global scale, and the degree of their influence is increasing more and more. The perception of corporations as political institutions is relevant in those countries where their significance is great in the sense that if a corporation ceases to operate in a particular country, the city of the place of operation or even the country may suffer from an economic point of view. That is, large corporations cause the country to depend on it and its departure means more losses for the country, and in such conditions corporations receive various legal benefits for their activities and act as a separate institution in the country.

Thus, the concept of a political institution through an empirical study of scientific articles by various authors and their conclusions, we can say that the classification they created, which was developed on the basis of well-known, logical and conceptual differences, is the main scientific concept of the term.

One of the problems with a conceptual rather than an empirical approach is that one can never be sure that these artificial classifications of institutions - or other conceptually defined phenomena - correspond to real-life conditions. A serious consequence of this approach is that institutions that have not been conceptually defined cannot be discovered. If the natural sciences followed the exploratory principles of political science, it would be impossible to make any discoveries that go beyond a priori conceptualization.

It follows from this that the political institution in research circles, studied through the empirical method and the deductive one, is still

does not represent a doctrinal nature in the legal documents that determine the foreign or domestic policy of the country. At the same time, various organizations in developed countries use branched political institutions, including not only classical government bodies, but also socio-economic organizations. Thus, in the theory of political science, a political institution is a system of views of various authors who are trying to somehow characterize this or that political system of the state through a systematic approach to the vertical of power.

Bibliography

1. Abramov A. V. Political institution and political institutionalization: definition of concepts // Power. 2010. No. 5. -FROM. 53-55.
2. Andryushina E. Corporations as political subjects: state and global levels // Power. 2007. No. 8. - FROM. 12-15.
3. Bogdanova N. A. To the question of the role of stratagems in Chinese diplomacy // Vestnik RUDN University. Series: International relations. 2015. No. 1. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/k-voprosu-o-rol-i-stratagem-v-diplomatii-kitaya> (Date of access: 04/27/2022).
4. Gadzhiev Kh. A. Political institutions: institutional and neo-institutional approach // Power. 2015. No. 7. -FROM. 134-140.
5. Sovereign / Niccolo Machiavelli; comp., foreword, comment. E. Vashkevich, trans. with it. G. Muravyova. - Moscow: AST Publishing House, 2021. - 256 p. — (Popular Philosophy).
6. Huseynov A. A. MORAL AND POLITICS: LESSONS OF ARISTOTLE // Bulletin of Applied Ethics. 2004. No. 24. -FROM. 97-31.
7. History and theory of political institutions in definitions, logic diagrams and tables: teaching aid / G.Ya. Kozlov; Ryaz. state un-t im. S.A. Yesenin. - Ryazan, 2006. - 96 p.
8. Menshikov V.V. M. Weber on power // South Russian Journal of Social Sciences. 2012. No. 1.- S. 41-48.
9. Polishchuk I. A. The party as a socio-political institution // Bulletin of the National University "Law Academy of Ukraine named after Yaroslav the Wise". Series: Philosophy, philosophy of law, political science, sociology. 2019. No. 4 (43). -FROM. 101-117.
10. Rybakov A. V., Studnikov P. E. The category "Political institution" in modern political science // Topical issues of social sciences: sociology, political science, philosophy, history. 2015. No. 2 (43). - FROM. 18-27.
11. Gilad Sh. "institution". Encyclopedia Britannica, 28 Dec. 2015. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/institution>. (date of access: 30.04.2022)
12. Hysing, E., Olsson, J. New Political Institutionalism. In: Green Inside Activism for Sustainable Development. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. (2018). URL: https://doi-org.proxylibrary.hse.ru/10.1007/978-3-319-56723-5_2 (date of access: 04/29/2022)
13. Musso P. Technicity and the Power of Institution. Law Critique 33, 2022.–P.131–139
14. Tholen B. Machiavelli's Lessons for Public Administration, Administrative Theory & Praxis, 38:2, 2016. –P. 101-114.