РАЗДЕЛ VIII. ПОЛИТОЛОГИЯ

Dekhkanov N.B.

Formation of public authority – strategic base of providing the stable development of the society

*Namangan state university
(Uzbekistan, Namangan)*

doi: 10.18411/gdsn-25-12-2019-32

idsp: scienceconf-25-12-2019-32

Abstract

In this article the issue of developing stable society by forming public authority is described and the thoughts of great politicians are analyzed.

Key words: state, government, decree, society, polis, consultation, social class, political system, democracy, citizen, political culture

Public authority is citizens' consciously, active, equal and free participation in accepting the political decisions [1, p. 224].

In our view point, public authority – the leading political institution of the society is also the formation of state and local state authority and the existence of citizens' opportunity to participate actively in their activities on the basis of equal right and freedom.

From the conceptual and methodological point of view, since 2017 a serious turn happened in the relationship between the state and person, government and citizen which had never existed before, literally, an opportunity of forming mutual communication, dialogue between political government and public was created. The bright fact of this is the establishment of completely new political institutions called public receptions and the virtual reception of the President, literally, public authority, the appearance of conditions for democracy, from 2017 the state, the governors and the head staff of the governments went into the position of receiving decisions by going out the places and seeing the real condition and different social problems with their own eyes instead of governing the people from the above by sitting in the cabinet. As the President Sh.M.Mirziyoev says "People shouldn't work for the state bodies, but the state bodies should work for people" began to find its foundation on the basis of the principles of democracy not in words, but in practice. It can be literally evaluated as the political modernization [2]. For the first time the President's address to the high palate – the Senate of the Oliy Majlis was carried out.

The communication of the government and public, state and person is being carried out in new forms in the world practice today. According to one of the popular politicians J.Mavlonov, in the Western European countries of today this case is represented in the form that called social and civil communication [3, p. 31].

Communication with people should always be on the basis of ethics and mutual respect. Common, particularly, political culture of the people plays a great role in it. The high esthetic base of the communicative process of people and government is the political criterion of modern statehood.

Conceptual, theoretically this process is represented by the term "political discourse". The term "political discourse" is connected with the term "deliberative democracy", as the Russian scholars O.F.Rusakova and V.M.Rusakov said that its aim is to reach the mutual consensus that's an agreement on discussable questions by communication [4, p. 64].

If considered the problem by the method of analysis, one of the powerful and deliberate methods of historical, conceptual, civilizational approach and politology, the term "political discourse" is not new in the history of political science. If we look at the root of the problem, that's the historical characteristics, the first historical form of democracy – in the period of direct democracy the discussion of important questions between the state and public, that's among the

members of the polis was carried out in the attendance of all the members of the polis (the slaves were excepted – N.D.). One of the fathers of the theory of democracy – Aristotle witnessed about it too [5, p. 37].

In the ancient Greece city-countries, that's polises were usually formed by the optional joining of the neighbor people or conquering the other tribes by a powerful tribe.

“Polis” was not a family, but an organizational institution solving the polis, that's social state problems. In those periods of time the tradition of solving social problems by mutual amity and agreement was formed. The member of the polis who tried to solve the social problem by willfulness was called “tyrant” (“tiranos”).

By the term “Policos” the political system of that time and civil and political culture of today was meant [6, p. 8].

Not paying extra attention to the historical terminological and etymological problems of the political communication problems of today it is necessary to mention that the formation of public authority is not today's problem, it existed in Ancient Hellas and Rome in a simple and typical appearance. In Ancient Hellas direct democracy was developed. The extension of the city-country, the increase of the influence (power) of the population historically brought representative democracy.

Formation, foundation or achievement of public authority in today's utterance is in relative character that democratism was observed in all the periods of time too. Particularly, in Temurids state this principle was founded too, the word “mashvarat” (consultation) was appropriate to the meaning of the term “democracy”. Of course, the political decree, final decision was adopted by the ruler (governor). The morals of the Middle Ages proved it. Because, in the East the king was considered to be the assistant of Allah on the Earth.

In the nearby territory to Central Asia – in Ancient Iran the king considered himself to be the direct representative of God. For example, the king Doro I gouged out the Behustun writing on the rock at the end of the VI century BC. In this writing was said: “I am Doro, the Great King, the king of the the kings, the king of the Persians, the king of all countries, the son of Vishtaspa, Arsham, Ahmoniy... I am the king by the support of Okhura Mazda. Okhura Mazda did me a favour” [7, p. 390].

For both the rulers and the citizens settling the social problems is of a special significance, because the government gives the person an opportunity of having all the special privileges and chances with a certain position. Therefore the attempts to have the government were observed in all the historical periods of time.

Conceptually and methodologically, there will appear a question “Is public authority possible?”. There are different answers to this question. According to the opinions of Sh. Mamadaliyev, who studied the problem of public authority deeply and from all aspects, in the first social-historical step the necessity of living in teams, tribes developed the harmonious ideas in the mind of people and the skills of living and working together as well. But, according to the opinion of this author, “as soon as state and social institutes were founded, there appeared those who had power and those who had no power”: commander and executor subject and object. As the understandings about the government broadened, those subjects and objects were distinguished from each other and even they were put opposite to each other. The property relationships having got deeper, the government became the inseparable sign of the property owners” [1, p. 213].

“Thus, - the author concluded – the genesis, dialectics of public and government is directly connected with the appearance of social relationships and the changes happened during the process of their deepening. Public authority (democracy) is the socio-historical product of these changes” [1, p. 213].

Respecting the opinions of this author about public authority it should be mentioned that “public authority” – Greek “democracy” was emerged in the Ancient Athens though, philosophically and methodologically, this phenomenon, that's public authority, democracy “dogma” has not been stayed the same. It is difficult to agree the author's general conclusion saying “there is no place for democracy where there is individualism and personal activeness”.

“The reason why the democracy in Athens not living long is that too” [1, p. 213]. The author’s opinion saying that there where showing one’s individuality is widespread it is difficult to establish unity, admitting the common benefits, relying on them and servicing for them is controversial too.

In order to interpret the phenomenon of “Public authority” correctly political theory, politology should be addressed. For this the meaning of the central concept “policy” should be defined.

Classical concept and understanding about policy dates back to the definition of Aristotle, one of the patriarchs of the subject of politology, “Human is a political creature according to its nature” [5, p. 37].

Politics etymologically means social, state affairs (polis), differs from personal, individual and family affairs.

The philosopher of the West of the XIII century Wilhelm Merbenskiy translated Aristotle’s work “Politics” into Latin. He used the term “communication politica” instead of the concept “politika koinonia” [8, p. 29] (the first means political generality and the latter means political community – N.D.).

More complication and perfection of the relationships between the people in Greek society caused the mutual situation of state and person, high and low classes in the form of pyramids. Thus, in the ancient times politics turned out to be the concept meant the relationships of people with each other according to their social positions. Plato evaluates that political activity is appropriate to aristocrats; it is the activity and function of those with high intellectual abilities.

At the end of the Middle ages the Italian scholar Nikollo Makiavelli firstly tried to put an end to this situation and tried to distinguish religious ethics and policy. In the West during the reformatory time this idea was propagandized by the religious philosophers such as Martin Luter, Jan Kalvin and William Swingly. The French progressivists D.Didro, J.J.Russo, Walter tried to prove not the imagery of human sent by God, but the imagery of human expressing the struggle for the government in life.

In Uzbekistan from 2017 the tasks assigned in the fifth priority area of the strategy of development the policy of increasing and widening the dialogue with the public, state programs encouraging international and interreligious tolerance and the Presidential decrees and announcements will give the opportunity of pushing the negative features such as national ignorance, regionalism, nepotism and acquaintance out of the national spirit and mood. It will bring Uzbekistan to take the appropriate place in the leading rows of the world community as one unit for the national development like Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Germans. The politics of reforms by the President, the increase of his reputation in the international sphere and among the high-ranking organizations like the UN is creating progresses for uniting around the public authority and the national benefits in Uzbekistan not in words and papers but in practice, and the reputation of the toponyms as “Uzbekistan”, “Uzbek” to be admitted in the world community too. Because, only by establishing and improving the public authority in all the social fields it can be possible to establish modern democratic legal state and public authorities depending on the system of self-governing institutions in Uzbekistan.

1. Мамадалиев Ш. Халқ ҳокимияти. –Т.: Академия, 2003.
2. <http://prezident.uz/ru/list/view1370>
3. Мавлонов Ж. Коммуникативное основа деятельности институтов гражданского общества: тенденции и инновации. –Т.: “Adabiyot uchqunlari”, 2018.
4. Русакова О.Ф., Русаков В.М. PR дискурс: теоретико-методологический анализ. – Екатеринбург: УрОРАН Институт международных связей, 2008.
5. Аристотель. Политика. Афинская полития. –М., 1997.
6. Берве Гельмут. Тираны Греции. – Ростов на-Дону, 1997.
7. История Древнего Востоке. Текст и документы. Учебное пособие. Под. ред. В.И.Кузнецова. – М., 2002.
8. Жиро Т. Политология. – Харьков, 2006.