



TYOLOGY OF CAPITALS: ON THE EXAMPLE OF MODERN COUNTRIES

Khamroev Eldor Otamurodovich

Independent researcher of the Academy of Public Administration
under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan

E-mail: eldor7101@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7989577>

Annotation: The article analyzes the views of foreign scientists on the typology of the capital. As a result, the author developed a typology of the capitals of modern countries according to various criteria. In particular, the capitals of modern states can be divided into types: firstly, by the ways of the emergence of the status of the capital; secondly, by their status as an administrative-territorial unit(subject), thirdly, by the interrelation of the capital's functions performed by the large-scale configuration of the capital's territory; fourthly, by the official designation of the capital and the performance of its functions.

Key words: typology, capital, administrative-territorial unit, state, historical capital, capital status, capital function, official capital.

There is no single approach to defining the typology of the capitals of modern states. This is primarily due to the fact that the capital cities have this status under the influence of various historical factors, and secondly, it can be seen that the capital has a different approach to this issue, based on the role of the capital in the country's constitutional system, social life, as well as the specifics of each country and the mentality.

One of the most famous classifications of capital typology belongs to the American scientist Peter Hall. He distinguishes seven types of capitals:

1. Multifunctional capitals (Tokyo, Moscow, London) that combine most of the roles at the national level.
2. Global capitals that combine national and international functions (Paris, Geneva, Washington).
3. Political capitals whose functions have been reduced to national administration (Lisbon, Kathmandu).
4. Super capitals serving as the headquarters of major international trade unions and organizations. A classic example of such a capital is Brussels, Addis Ababa and Jakarta (capitals of the European Union, African Union and ASEAN).
5. Former capitals, that is, cities that lost the official role of the capital, but retained an important historical or religious function in the country.
6. Former imperial capitals, which previously served as the capitals of entire empires.
7. Only provincial capitals of regional importance[1].

According to the degree of control, hard and soft types of capitals can be distinguished. The Italian writer Umberto Eco spoke about this criterion of difference in his speech devoted to the discussion of the concept and model of the new European capital of Brussels, its emergence and the main requirements for it[2].

Solid capitals (Eco calls them “capitals on the model of Louis XIV”) are characteristic of large centralized states; they dominate most areas of life and are often large cities that combine many functions at the same time.

Soft capitals are more typical of small polycentric European countries like Belgium or Switzerland. As a rule, they are compact and inconspicuous. If explained using a computer metaphor, soft capitals give the state only one of the scripts or programs (software), while hard capitals completely define the totality of economic and social relations (hardware or hard disk)[3].

In his research, I.Okunev proposed to divide these cities into 4 groups according to the management of the capital region[4]:

1. The capital region is the center of the country's region. In this case, the capital is both the center of the state and the center of one of its regions. For example, Rome is simultaneously the capital of Italy and the province of Lazio, and Bern is simultaneously the capital of Switzerland and the canton of Bern.

2. The capital region is part of the state region. In such a situation, the capital of the state will be the center of the state, but not the center of the region in which it is located. For example, Amsterdam is not the center of the province of North Holland in which it is located. The most paradoxical situation is observed in Canada, where a part of the government authorities is located in the official capital of Ottawa, which is part of the province of Ontario, the capital of which is Toronto, and another part of the government authorities is located in the province of Hull, Gatineau, Quebec, the center of which is the city of Quebec.

3. A city directly subordinated to the capital region. In this model, the city that performs the functions of the capital becomes an independent region: equal to other territorial units (Moscow, Berlin) or has an autonomous status that stands out against their background (Jakarta).

4. The capital region is a federal territory. According to the indicated model, the capital is directly controlled by the federal center and has a lower status compared to other regions. For example, the US District of Columbia, as well as all federal states in Latin America and capitals in some other countries.

In general, in our opinion, the capitals of modern countries can be divided into the following types:

1. According to the ways of establishing the capital status:

a) historical capitals, that is historically formed capitals. Such cities, as a rule, are the only cities in the country that perform the functions of the capital (for example, London (Great Britain), Berlin (Germany), Brussels (Belgium), Vienna (Austria);

b) capitals moved from one city to another existing city, for example, Tashkent (from Samarkand, Uzbekistan), Islamabad (from Karachi, Pakistan), Dodoma (from Darussalam, Tanzania);

c) purpose-built capitals, cities that were specially built based on a pre-planned plan to fulfill the functions of the capital, for example, Washington (USA), Canberra (Australia) and Brasilia (Brazil). For example, the main part of the population of Washington and Canberra is currently employed in the public service and service sector (trade, service, etc.).

2. According to its status as an administrative-territorial unit or subject:

a) a single city with the status of an independent and equal unit or entity. It has the same powers as other entities and these powers are exercised in accordance with the constitution,

other legal documents or agreements on the allocation of powers between the central government and the governments of the entities: Tashkent (Uzbekistan), Vienna (Austria), Brussels (Belgium);

b) one of several cities of republic (federation) significance with the status of an independent and equal entity or subject, for example, Moscow (Russian Federation), Berlin (Germany), Astana (Kazakhstan);

c) the capital as an administrative-territorial (municipal) structure that is a component of one of the equal-rights units (subjects) and is subordinate to its power structures (sometimes the authorities of the subject of the federation and the authorities of the capital city are compatible both formally and personally).

This type, in turn, is divided into two groups: in the first case, the capital is also the capital of the unit (subject) of which it is a part, for example, London (Great Britain), Bern (Switzerland), Rome (Italy), Palikir (Micronesia), Dodoma (Tanzania), Moscow (former USSR, part of RSFSR), Belgrade (former Yugoslavia, part of Serbia), Tashkent (until 1943, part of UZSSR, part of Tashkent region and its center). In the second case, the region (unit) that includes the capital will have a different center, for example, the capital of the Netherlands, Amsterdam, is part of the province of North Holland, but the center of this province is the city of Haarlem, not the city of Amsterdam;

g) a separate urban area directly subordinated to the federal center or the capital as a part of the city (federal area). In this case, direct appointment to the positions of heads of city management structures and services is carried out by federal authorities (as a rule, the head of state) and these heads are fully accountable to the official who appointed them, for example, Washington (USA), Canberra (Australia), Brasilia (Brazil), Caracas (Venezuela), New Delhi (India), Mexico City (Mexico).

3. In most cases, there is a certain connection between the large-scale configuration of the capital territory and the performed functions of the capital. According to it, the capitals can be divided into the following types:

a) "capital" = "whole city", that is, a certain city performs the functions of the capital within its administrative boundaries. Such capitals include Tashkent (Uzbekistan), Abu Dhabi (United Arab Emirates), Moscow (Russian Federation), Bern (Switzerland). This situation is explained by the reluctance of certain political subjects (primarily elites) to "share" the functions of the capital with other regions, to divide the capital region into parts;

b) "capital" = "city" + "suburbs". For example, Washington (USA) performs the functions of the capital within the borders of the Federal District of Columbia. Similarly, in the cities of Berlin (Germany), Brasilia (Brazil), New Delhi (India), Canberra (Australia), some functions are also distributed to the suburbs;

c) "capital" = "part of the city territory". This feature is characteristic of Buenos Aires, the capital of Argentina, in which the functions of the capital, that is, the central government bodies and embassies, are concentrated in one quarter of the city.

4. According to the official designation of the capital and the performance of its functions, the capitals can be divided into the following types:

a) There are no norms about the capital in the constitution and legal documents, but historically, the head of state, state authorities have been operating here, and since it is the capital of the country in historical, cultural, socio-economic terms, a certain city is the capital

city by itself. tangible capitals, such as London (UK), Paris (France), Lisbon (Portugal), Tokyo (Japan);

b) cities whose capitals are officially defined by the constitution and (or) law and fully perform their functions, for example, Astana (Kazakhstan), Beshkek (Kyrgyzstan). Tashkent is also included in the capitals of this group, Article 6 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan[5] defines it as “The capital of the Republic of Uzbekistan - the city of Tashkent” and in practice it is fully performing the functions of the capital;

c) cities officially designated as the capital, but not actually performing the functions of the capital (“de jure” and “de facto” capitals). Countries where the constitution officially designates a particular city as the capital of the country, but the functions of the capital city are actually or historically performed by another city. In particular, Article 32 of the current Constitution of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, adopted in 1983, stipulates that the King takes the oath of office and enthronement at an open joint meeting of both chambers of the States General in the capital of the country, Amsterdam. However, the government of this country has been operating in The Hague since 1588. Also, the King, the States General, the State Council, ministries, and the Royal Supreme Court work in this city. Such a situation can be seen in the case of Jerusalem (Israel, in practice Tel Aviv), Lima (Peru, in practice Sucre), Porto Novo (Benin, in practice Cotonou) and Tsimphu (Bhutan, in practice Punakha);

g) States in which a certain city is designated as the capital of the country by the constitution and legislation, but some functions of the capital are performed by other city(s) (“bi-capitalism” or “multi-capitalism”). In most cases, this situation is characteristic of new capital cities, and it is explained by the fact that some central state bodies and embassies remain in the old capital for a certain period of time. For example, Berlin (Germany, Karlsruhe, Frankfurt, Bonn), Prague (Czech Republic, Brno), Bern (Switzerland, Lausanne), Tallinn (Estonia, Tartu), Moscow (Russian Federation, St. Petersburg), Santiago (Chile, Valparaiso), Pretoria (South Africa, Cape Town, Bloemfontein).

In conclusion, it can be said that the typology of the capitals of modern countries can be distinguished according to various criteria. It is in creating a typology of capital cities that the legal science can be theoretically enriched. Therefore, it is appropriate to include the topic “Legal status of capitals of foreign countries” in textbooks, curricula and plans in the field of law “Constitutional law of foreign countries” in higher educational institutions of jurisprudence. The inclusion of this topic serves to further study the typology of the capitals of modern states.

References:

- 1.Hall P. The changing role of capital cities: Six types of capital cities / Capital cities: International perspectives. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1993.
- 2.Therborn, G. (2008). Identity and capital cities: European nations and the European Union. DOI:10.1080/12265934.2015.969416
- 3.Council Directive 2001/110/EC of 20 December 2001 relating to honey ... confirmed by those of the European Council in Brussels on 10 and 11 December 1993.
- 4.Окунев И.Ю. Столица государства как политический институт: типы и функции: диссертация ... доктора политических наук: 23.00.02, 2019.- 378 с.
- 5.The Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan, www.lex.uz.

