

The Concept, Significance and Role of Governance as the Main Aspect of the Formation of the Theory of Political Institutions

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 discusses the role and place of statehood in the dynamics of its development among the research circles of various scientific theorists. A new concept of statehood is also revealed, which is characterized more widely than the classical concept of statehood within one country, limited by its sovereignty. In addition, the author compares the statehood of various countries and identifies the features of institutional management. The author comes to the conclusion that modern statehood in the context of the formation of political institutions has undergone significant changes from its classical understanding. and statehood should be interpreted much broader to include various international organizations.

Key words: statehood, political institutions, actors, politics, law.

In this regard, K. V. Starostenko singles out political pluralism, consisting of philosophical, spiritual and political. Political pluralism, according to the researcher, means recognition of the diversity of political institutions, including parties, public organizations, etc. Pluralism is an important feature of modern states and political institutions. In our case, pluralism characterizes statehood as a field of study for various specialists, and the exact attribution of statehood to any political system is very difficult.

In most modern states, the dominance of the realistic tradition in the theory of international relations is reflected, according to which the state is the main actor in foreign and domestic policy. And in the liberal theory of international relations, part of the power is transferred to various non-governmental organizations and corporations.

So we can say that statehood is for the most part a mechanism close to the theory of realism in terms of the concept of the structure of the state and its foreign policy (where the state is a separate actor in international relations). As we know, a sovereign state is a political entity that is recognized by other sovereign states. At the same time, sovereignty itself is an institution founded

on the norms developed by the community of states. A state may consist solely of a realistic approach in the sense that sovereign states are considered to be constituent components of the international system. In other words, one way states are similar is that formal, legal sovereignty has been conferred upon them by a community of states.

Very interesting is the study by S.V. Malyugin, who identifies the typology of statehood and its varieties.

1. "Formation theory" - statehood based on the slave-owning type and the feudal type of relations.
2. "Civilization approach" - Western, Islamic, Jewish, etc. Third theory. In addition, the author identifies four levels of statehood from "low" - agrarian-handicraft type of economic production, to "high" - market relations with a democratic society. Also among modern researchers it should be noted

N. P. Lagerlof, through a systematic approach, he identifies three types of statehood, significantly distinguishing them in the econometric sphere.

1. Non-state (not statehood) in which investments and public goods are carried out by each group voluntarily, and the output is distributed randomly;
2. Authoritarian statehood where the benefits are mostly concentrated in the ruling establishment;
3. Democratic statehood, where democracy is a more coherent technology for building state capacity and equal opportunities.

S. V. Malyugin and N. P. Lagerlof consider statehood not only as a set of political institutions, but systematically divide them into civilizational differences in the first case and economic ones in the second. It is difficult to disagree with their conclusions, and each of their assumptions is reflected in modern states.

Based on the foregoing, one must agree with A.I. Orazbayeva, who comes to the conclusion that “someone sees only the legal side in “statehood”, identifying it with civil society or the rule of law, state power, someone is only interested in its attributes and external manifestations, when another focuses attention on the spiritual component: traditions, values, problems of continuity, while the other observes only the process of evolution of the state as such, that is, each specialist sees his subject of study in this category and defines it as the field of his scientific study.

Modern approaches to the theory of statehood on the example of countries. Statehood in various countries is primarily associated with their independence and sovereignty over a certain territory.

As Z. S. Askarov notes, “after gaining independence in Uzbekistan, it was possible to realize and consolidate national interests in accordance with the new reality. Of great importance was the appeal to the historical experience and traditions of the people.

In the preamble to The Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan reflects an important aspect, where it is written “based on the historical experience of the development of the Uzbek statehood”, i.e. from a legal point of view, there is a consolidation of statehood, as something that has been formed historically and showing the uniqueness of the country. In addition, Art. 12 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan says that “public life develops based on the diversity of political institutions, ideologies and opinions. Here it can also be said that political institutions are part of the modern state, and may mean the institutions that allow the state to function properly.

Conducted in Uzbekistan socio-economic, political and legal transformations led to a significant change in its statehood, the formation of new institutions of statehood. Thus, the events that have taken place since the independence of Uzbekistan contributed to the strengthening of statehood in the country and made Uzbekistan an active participant in international relations.

That is, for Uzbekistan, statehood was essentially the preservation of historical and the formation of new directions for the sustainable development of the country. And according to the typology of S.V. Malyugin Uzbekistan can be attributed to states with a market economy and a democratic political system.

Also consider the understanding of statehood in China. Researchers Yi Li and F. Wu, when studying the statehood of China, come to the conclusion that the changing trajectory of regional governance indicates on state restructuring. From the Chinese dynamics of governance change, it can be seen that state selectivity is focused on decentralization and the revival of the regional scale, which is characterized by individualization and concentration.

These researchers raise the important issue of changing statehood, if the initial understanding of statehood means unified control from above, then Yi Li and F. Wu single out the strengthening of the autonomy of the regions (regions) of China, due to their high cross-border activities and economic independence. In this regard, F. Chang in his study reveals the importance of the island of Taiwan, and concludes that, from the point of view of the unity of China, Taiwan to some extent violates the integrity of statehood in the country. The same feature is and Hong Kong, where the laws are somewhat different from mainland China.

Also interesting is the US experience in defining statehood. In the case of the United States, the country's constitution gives Congress the power to grant statehood, but does not establish a process for doing so. Congress has the right to determine the conditions of statehood in each specific case.

At the same time, each state in the United States has an extensive legislative system, which may differ from the laws in a neighboring state. In turn, economic relations between the US states are very active and, in fact, each jurisdiction has its own laws. Conflicts of laws applied by other countries in the event of a dispute of applicable law in the United States occur at the state level. That is, in fact, each state acts as a separate state with its own legal system. It can be assumed that the US federal system is a more advanced model of interconnections in China.

One recent significant study of statehood is the identification of network statehood, i.e., networks of individual states, international organizations, and transnational regimes.

In this regard, researchers single out the term "network state", which fluctuates between two meanings of this "denationalized state". On the one hand, it denotes a separate nation-state in its various roles at three levels; on the other hand, it refers to the newly emerging collectivity of the network itself.

From a positive point of view, network global statehood can be seen as a compensatory institution for solving two problems of transnationalization. On the one hand, it compensates for the weakening of the monopoly of the nation-state on the public performance of security tasks and the regulation of social spheres, such as economic production, finance, and cybersecurity in society.

On the other hand, it compensates for the absence of a single world state that could take on these tasks. The result of both compensations is that the political system reacts

on the functional differentiation of the world society by building reticular forms of organization, the distinguishing feature of which is the reconstruction of the internal differentiation of the political system in the changed political, social and economic landscape that has emerged from globalization.

Thus, the concept of network statehood should be understood as a complex analytical tool, a conceptual genus useful for both descriptive and normative purposes, including a wide range of phenomena and actors as its varieties.

That is, state collectives like G7 or G20 by many. According to researchers, they are actors of network statehood. Wherein

the EU can be added to this list, where each state transferred part of its power to a supranational body. Economic relations within the EU are among the highest in the world and show an example of a kind of new federalism.

Based on the foregoing, it can be said that statehood is more than a platform for the creation of political institutions. Of course, if we take a state from Central Asia, then for the most part statehood means the sovereignty of the country, which is controlled by the branches of power. They are a kind of political institutions and contribute to the formation of new institutions. But if we consider modern statehood, then it is much more than one state, and moving away from the theory of political realism, where states are the main actors in global politics, here we can talk about various organizations.

Thus, statehood in the modern understanding of researchers means a different understanding of the political essence of states. Where autonomous local government is developed to varying degrees, there are regions striving for autonomy, and so on. And in the end you can't

to confidently assign statehood to the country, it is necessary to interpret the term more broadly, taking into account the specifics of the development of global politics as a whole.

Bibliography

1. Askarov Z.S. National statehood of Uzbekistan: theoretical approaches to the essence and content. *Sociology and law*. 2017;(3):101-105.
2. Gevorgyan V. To the concept of statehood. URL: http://ysu.am/files/02V_Gevorgyan.pdf (date of access: 05/06/2022)
3. Drobot G. A. Realism in the theory of international relations: history, foreign and domestic schools // *Social and humanitarian knowledge*. 2014. No. 4. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/realizm-v-teorii-mezhdunarodnyh-otnosheniy-istoriya-zarubezhnaya-i-otechestvennaya-shkoly> (date of access: 05/15/2022).
4. Zelenko B. I. On the ontology of network statehood in modern Russia (political context) // *Power*. 2021. №3. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/ob-ontologii-setevoy-gosudarstvennosti-v-sovremennoy-rossii-politicheskiy-kontekst> (date of access: 05/15/2022).
5. The Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan // *Milliy hukuqiy akhborot markazi davlat muassasasi* URL: <https://lex.uz/docs/35869> (date of access: 10.05.2022)
6. Malyugin S.V. Theoretical and historical aspects of the definition of statehood: the concept, types, main features of modern and Russian statehood // *Genesis: historical research*. - 2015. - No. 4. - P. 275 - 298. DOI: 10.7256/2409-868X.2015.4.15281 URL: https://nbpublish.com/library_read_article.php?id=15281 (Accessed: 05/11/2022)
7. Orazbayeva A.I. The category of "statehood" as a theoretical and methodological problem. // No. 1(05), 2016 URL: <https://edu.e-history.kz/ru/publications/view/366> (Accessed 11.05.2022)

8. Starostenko KV Political pluralism and political diversity: some problems of political theory // *Socium and power*. 2010. №1. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/politicheskiy-plyuralizm-i-politicheskoe-mnogoobrazie-nekotorye-problemy-politicheskoy-teorii> (date of access: 05/14/2022).
9. Borneman J. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. // Reference Work, Second Edition, 2015. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/statehood> (accessed 05/06/2022)
10. Chiang F. *The One-China Policy: State, Sovereignty, and Taiwan's International Legal Status*. // Elsevier Asian Studies Series URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/statehood> (accessed 05/07/2022)
11. Golia A. *Networked Statehood: An Institutionalized Self-Contradiction*. URL: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3725646 (accessed 15.05.2022)
12. *How the US Statehood Process Works*. // ThoughtCo URL: <https://www.thoughtco.com/us-statehood-process-3322311> (accessed 05/12/2022)
13. Lagerlof N.P. *Statehood, democracy and preindustrial development* // *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* Volume 67, June 2016. –P. 58-72.
14. *Political Institutions and Governance*. // World Bank// URL: https://elibrary.worldbank.org/doi/10.1596/0195216067_Chapter5 (Accessed 05/05/2022)
15. Sørensen G. *An analysis of contemporary statehood: Consequences for conflict and cooperation*. *Review of International Studies*, 23(3), (1997), -P. 253-269. doi:10.1017/S0260210597002532
16. Yi Li., Fulong W. *The transformation of regional governance in China: The rescaling of statehood*. // *Progress in Planning* Volume 78, Issue 2, August 2012. -P.55-99.