



THE ESSENCE OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION IN SOCIO-POLITICAL PROCESSES

Kucharov Ilkhom Ruzimuradovich

Associate Professor,

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20621088>

Annotation. This article comprehensively analyzes the philosophical, sociological and political-legal aspects of the institutionalization of socio-political processes in the context of building a legal democratic state and civil society. The theories of representatives of the Western sociological school (J. Homans, P. Blau, T. Parsons, S. Huntington, K. Janda) on the problem of social order and institutionalization are comparatively studied.

Keywords: Institutionalization, social order, civil society, behaviorism, emergent properties, legal complex, political parties, legal institutionalization, political institutionalization, mass-legal status.

The process of building the foundation of a new Uzbekistan and forming a strong civil society requires not only the regulation of social relations, but also their transformation into stable systems - institutions that can meet the requirements of the time. The viability of any democratic changes is measured by how mature and stable political and legal institutions in society are. One of the most fundamental concepts of political science and sociology, "institutionalization", is the process of regulating social relations, bringing them into a legal and systematic form. This article provides an in-depth analysis of the theoretical and methodological foundations of the phenomenon of institutionalization in socio-political processes, the views of world sociological schools on this issue, and the laws of political parties becoming institutions in legal and political terms.

Changes in socio-political processes during the years of independence, reforms in the construction of a democratic state and civil society based on national and universal norms, effectively meet the requirements of the time. "The last decade that Uzbekistan has gone through has been a period of rapid formation and development of various civil society institutions, non-governmental non-profit organizations, supported by broad segments of our population" [1].

The concept of institutionalization is philosophically and sociologically related to the study of the problem of social order. This problem is widely covered in the works of sociologists (P. Berger, P. Blau, T. Parsons, J. Homans, D. Turner), who used the category of social order to define a variety of processes that help organize individuals, groups and other types of social units, regulate social relations. Within the framework of the behaviorist direction, the driving force of social activity is not macrosocial factors, but the behavior of the individual, which is mainly influenced by psychological (positive and negative) factors. In particular, George Homans notes that the organization of various individuals into associations is determined not by the needs of society, but by the needs of people [2].

Peter Blau, trying to explain the one-sidedness of the approach put forward by George Homans, described the mechanism of interaction of social and political structure with individual social relations as follows:

- ☒ social regulation of interactions with individuals in order to satisfy their needs;
- ☒ stratification of status and power depending on the deviation from the framework of direct social relations;
- ☒ their legitimation and organization [3].

In the theory of social structure proposed by Peter Blau, an important place is occupied by the emergent properties of the structure, understood as “a source of external constraints that individuals feel in themselves”, “the effect of these constraints indicates that they are only to a certain extent related to free will” [4].

Within the sociological approach to the study of the problem of social order put forward by T. Parsons, institutionalization implies, in addition to power relations, a number of mechanisms that include legitimacy in the Weberian interpretation and the support and implementation of social values and norms. Accordingly, the presence of official organizations in the circle of other subjects implies institutionalized normative boundaries and, in the scientist's own words, an "institutionalized or public-legal complex".

The institutionalization of parties is interpreted in constitutional law as the process of their legal formalization, the formation of their role in the state mechanism, their formation as a separate political and legal institution and regulation of their activities [5]. At the heart of such an approach is the understanding of a legal institution, first of all, as a set of norms regulating a similar group of social relations. In the study of institutionalization processes in political science, the party as a collective subject of the political process comes to the fore, and issues of legal regulation are considered as a means of illuminating its activities.

Both of the above interpretations are noteworthy because they note two sides of the same phenomenon: the process of political parties forming as voluntary associations and the consolidation of social relations arising in them in legal norms. In this regard, it is necessary to distinguish between the legal and political institutionalization of political parties. In general, by legal institutionalization of political parties it is necessary to understand the process of formation by the state of normative types of their activities, and by political institutionalization - the process of their structural and functional formation and development as a political institution with its own system.

Understanding political institutionalization as a process of regulating social relations, the formation and development of a political organization, and the acquisition of its own structural and functional (characterizing the party as an institution of the political system) features is also typical for Western researchers. For example, Samuel Huntington defines the institutionalization of parties as a process of strengthening their position, gaining significance and stability [6]. Kenneth Janda, drawing attention to the subjective side of the social order of parties, sees in institutionalization the degree of materialization of the party in social consciousness [7].

The relationship between legal and political institutionalization is determined primarily by the general laws of the interaction of social and legal relations. Just as any social relationship cannot be regulated by legal norms, many aspects of the relations that arise in the process of the formation of political parties cannot be measured by normative criteria. These include the subjective reasons for the formation and organizational disintegration of parties, the importance of the provisions of the party program for voters, and the conjuncture factors of party-political regrouping. The unity of political and legal institutionalization is manifested



in the unity of the social object: the regulation, formalization, and standardization of social relations and relations associated with the activities of political parties. The incompatibility of the concepts of political and legal institutionalization is explained by the fact that they denote interconnected, but different processes; in which citizens solve the tasks of organizing parties, optimizing their work, and the state determines their mass and legal status and the legal basis of their activities. In addition, the formation of mass and legal institutions proceeds more slowly than the changes in the dynamics of political and group processes [8].

The political institutionalization of parties is the main and most important factor in their legal institutionalization. However, to explain the phenomenon of legal institutionalization of parties only by their formation, development and solid position in the political system would be to deliberately distort the essence of the problem. After all, if political parties have existed for several hundred years, their position in the political system occurred much later. The legal institutionalization of parties was prompted by qualitative changes in the state mechanism of many countries: the increase in the role of parties in the political system, the strengthening of their interaction with state institutions gradually came into conflict with the lack of a broad legal framework for party activities.

The scale of political parties' interactions with other elements of the political system and civil society structures reached such a level that internal corporate norms were no longer able to fully cover the complex of social relations in which they were implemented. The unclear legal status of parties sometimes created problems associated with ensuring the transparency of their financial activities, establishing clear rules for interaction with entrepreneurs and interest groups, and maintaining security in the state and society. Finally, the creation of a broad legal framework for party activities, regulating their rights and obligations, and establishing certain privileges also corresponded to the interests of parties.

In general, the institutionalization of political parties, in the words of A. Bodnar, is determined by the recognition of their role in the system of state power and the need for restrictions that ensure that the activities of political parties do not exceed the limits of the legal system [9].

In conclusion, it should be noted that institutionalization in socio-political processes is a fundamental transformation that turns chaotic or random social relations into a system of strict rules, norms and stable structures. As world sociologists such as P. Blau and T. Parsons have proven, the process of institutionalization is a formula for social order that ensures the golden balance between the needs of the individual and the mass-legal mechanisms of the state.

In the case of political parties and civil society institutions, it is clear that political institutionalization (materialization of the organization in the consciousness of society and its functional maturity) and legal institutionalization (granting legal status by the state) are two sides of the same coin. If the delay in the elements of the legal framework leads to problems of clandestine financing, loss of transparency and security, on the contrary, dry legalization of norms for which society is not ready leads to the weakness of institutions (corporate weakness).

The constitutional reforms being implemented in the new Uzbekistan are aimed at ensuring precisely this legal and political institutionalization of civil society institutions and political parties. Recognition of the role of public organizations in the system of state power and a clear definition of their mass and legal boundaries are the main guarantee of the safe, stable and



evolutionary development of political transformations in our country in accordance with international standards.

List of used literature:

1. Karimov I.A. Concept of further deepening democratic reforms and developing civil society in our country / Report at a joint meeting of the Legislative Chamber and Senate of the Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan / Xalq so'zi.
2. Хоманс Ж.К. Возвращение к человеку // Американская социологическая мысль. – М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1994. – 55-б.
3. История социологии в Западной Европе и США. – М., 1993. – 297-б.; Блау П. Американская социологическая мысль. – М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1994. – 23-б.
4. Парсонс Т. О социальных системах. – М.: Академический проект, 2002. – 61-б.
5. Юдин Ю.Л. Политические партии и право в современном государстве. – М.: Форум – Инфа-М, 1998. – 5-б.; Евдокимов В.Б. Правовое регулирование политических партий в буржуазных странах: Автореф. дисс. – Свердловск, 1990. – 9-б.
6. Hantington S.P. Political Development and Political Decay // World Politics. 1965. \fol.17. №3. P. 394.
7. Джанда К. Сравнение политических партий: исследования и теория // Современная сравнительная политология. – М.: МОНФ, 1997. – 95-б.
8. Баранов С.Д. Группы давления в политическом процессе современной России: Автореф. дисс. – М., 1998. – 8-б.
9. Боднар А. Реферат академического пособия: Наука о политике. – Варшава, 1988. – 28-29-б.
9. Bodnar A. Referat akademicheskogo posobiya: Nauka o politike. – Varshava, 1988. – 28-29-b.