

TRANSFORMATION OF THE POLITICAL SYSTEM OF SOCIETY AND ITS
INFLUENCE ON SOCIO-POLITICAL PROCESSES

Toshboev Jamshid

Teacher of Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

E-mail: yanajamshid@mail.ru

Tel: +99897 642 60 66

Annotatsiya: Mazkur maqola bir qator siyosiy manabalarga tayangan holda jamiyat siyosiy tizimi transformatsiyalashuvining ijtimoiy siyosiy jarayonlarga tasiri tahlil qilingan. Bunda siyosiy tizim transformatsiyalashuvi turli mamlakatlarda demokratiya tomon erkin o'tish, erkinlashtirish, demokratlashtirish masalalari yoritib berilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: Transformatsiya, siyosiy tizim, "Demokratiya taqchilligi", "Rangli inqilob", D.Rastov, "Demokratiya chiqaradigan konveyer", Z.Bjezinskiy, postkommunistik, liberallashtirish, demokratlashtirish, erkinlik, konsolidatsiya.

Abstract: This article analyzes the impact of the transformation of the society's political system on social political processes, relying on a number of political sources. The transformation of the political system, free transition to democracy in different countries, issues of liberalization and democratization are highlighted.

Key words: Transformation, political system, "Deficit of democracy", "Color revolution", D. Rastov, "Conveyor of democracy", Z. Brzezinski, post-communist, liberalization, democratization, freedom, consolidation.

Аннотация: В данной статье анализируется влияние трансформации политической системы общества на общественно-политические процессы, опираясь на ряд политических источников. Освещаются трансформация политической системы, свободный переход к демократии в разных странах, вопросы либерализации и демократизации.

Ключевые слова: Трансформация, политическая система, «Дефицит демократии», «Цветная революция», Д. Растов, «Конвейер демократии», З. Бжезинский, посткоммунистический, либерализация, демократизация, свобода, консолидация.

Introduction. Political transformation is a category of political science that refers to fundamental, meaningful processes that mean a change in the paradigm and meaning of political processes, a radical change in the existing political system based on free political choice. In this process, changes occur in the political culture of society, its choice of new political goals, and the definition of promising political values. Before our eyes, states with outdated ideologies and values, political and economic regimes are collapsing, and, on the contrary, countries capable of adapting to change and new realities, relying on their own lives, are emerging. The influence of the transformation of the political system of society on socio-political processes is an issue of interest to many political scientists. According to P. S. Seleznev, "the transformation of the

political system is a very complex, nonlinear movement of free transition to democracy, liberalization, democratization, and consolidation in different countries"[1]. The transformation of the political system in modern political science is often interpreted as the transition from an authoritarian or totalitarian system to a democratic one in society. The renowned political scientist D. Rastov, one of the first to study the concept and essence of the democratic transition, assessed it as a "historical transition period, a process immediately following the transition to democracy"[2]. Thus, the transformation of the political system can be explained as follows - this is a complex mechanism of methods and means that give an unpredictable result, implying that the process of gradual change will lead to a transition from one or another type of non-democratic (authoritarianism, totalitarianism) to a democratic form of government. Often, when studying the influence of the transformation of the political system of society on socio-political processes, the task of identifying its individual stages arises. This process is considered a dynamic phenomenon and is explained by the fact that it does not occur in one direction. Defining the specific stages of political transformation helps to determine its specific features and concretization.

Analysis of literature on the topic (Literature review). Attempts to determine the influence of the transformation of the political system of society on socio-political processes were observed in the research of Z. Brzezinski, K. Menges, V. Scheinis, A. Przhvorsky, O. Donnel, and F. Schmitter. The common view among researchers is manifested in the division of the transformation of the political system into stages of liberalization, democratization, and unification.

The impact of the transformation of society's political system on socio-political processes depends on objective conditions, the regime, and the strategy of actions chosen by the opposition. A.Yu. Melville wrote about this as follows: "in some countries, the consolidation of liberal democracy is being completed, democratic institutions and practices are being consolidated, in others, such institutions and practices are being consolidated with non-democratic, authoritarian structures, in others, formal democratic procedures are used only nominally to conceal new types of autocratic governance"[3].

T. Karl and F. Schmitter created a complete classification of possible options for the development of the democratic transition process after the democratization stage. According to these scholars, the possible outcomes of the democratic transition may be: consolidated democracy, unconsolidated democracy, a mixed regime, a return to authoritarianism[4].

Research Methodology (Research Methodology). The transformation of the political system is not always consistent, effective, and may not lead to democracy. For example, analyzing the transformation of the political system in Russia, it can be said that it includes two main stages - liberalization and democratization. The liberalization stage in the country's history was the Perestroika period of 1985 (1985-1991), during which the main goal of the reform was to change the existing system, but to preserve its basic foundation. Gorbachev attempted to implement the liberalization of socialism. The changes were met with great interest among the population: dozens of social and political organizations, parties, and movements (Democratic Russian Union, Russian Popular Front (RNF), Democratic Party (1989), Democratic Union (1988) and others) appeared. Certain types of previously prohibited activities have begun to be permitted.

A stage of democratization (from 1991 to 1999) occurred, which began with a complete replication of the Western model of transformation of the political system, without taking into account the historical past. Democratic principles and institutions adopted from the West have

led to their official enshrinement in legislation. Initially, both the government and the population themselves sought them, but the new systems of organization of social and state life did not yield effective results. The former political system was destroyed, the democratic institutions borrowed from the West did not take root properly, and accordingly, a new effective system was not formed. The ineffectiveness of the democratic transformations adopted by the West (the general economic crisis of 1998, the political leadership in the country that emerged after the privatization of a small circle of oligarchy capable of influencing society and power, the formation of a high level of socio-economic inequality in the country, etc.) was somewhat reduced. The political system, in the process of transformation, proceeds along the path of forming the foundations of governed democracy and strengthening the vertical of power. In Russia, along with the existing standard set of elements of democracy (the Constitution, the electoral institution, many political parties), features of authoritarianism emerged.

Thus, according to this point of view, Russia is composed of broken democratic elements and, on this basis, is inefficient and unable to ensure the further development of the country. The second point of view is loyal to it in assessing the existing regime in Russia. According to them, Russia's hybrid regime is unique. This is not a type of democracy, but the most effective regime. Such a regime not only ensures the viability of the Russian state, but also brings it to the forefront among other states. A supporter of this point of view, Vladislav Surkov writes: "Russia is a state of a new type, which currently does not exist in the world. Although it was formed in general by the mid-2000s, this country is still very little studied, but its uniqueness and vitality are clear. The stress trials he has endured and continues to endure show that it is precisely such an organically formed political structure that will be an effective means of survival and growth for the Russian nation in the coming years, perhaps decades, and throughout the entire century"[5].

The transformation of the political system in the Russian state, which we considered as an example, had a constructive and, in some cases, discursive influence on socio-political processes. This process, as in many countries of the world, occurred in two opposite directions in the countries that have gained independence: a) the formation of a pluralistic system, the transition to a democratic system; b) the legalization of the neo-authoritarian system, the limitation of political pluralism. In world practice, the course of these trends ended differently due to the presence of a number of factors.

Recently, we have witnessed the use of "technologies for advancing democracy" in the former Soviet space. Here it is appropriate to cite the opinion of Z. Brzezinski. The American scholar distinguishes three stages of the process of establishing democracy in post-totalitarian states. The first stage begins with the collapse of the communist regime, in which attention is paid to the renewal of power structures and the restoration of the economy. According to the scientist, this stage can last from 1 to 5 years. In the second stage, the functioning of the democratic system is ensured institutionally. Usually, at this stage, a new Constitution is adopted, a new electoral system is established, and democratic institutions are formed.

In essence, democracy is not a commodity that can be exported to the territory of another country without considering its national interests and characteristics. There is no universal model of democracy that meets the needs of all peoples. Therefore, democratic processes cannot be established through mere assimilation or copying; democracy must be formed on the basis of the natural development of society. It is understandable that those who want to establish a "conveyor belt" of democracy in young independent states are "searching" for democracy precisely in countries rich in oil and gas reserves. Such forces seek to receive payment for their "democratic

missionary work" in the form of natural resources. The color revolution organized in Kazakhstan in the spring of 2016 is the best proof of such an approach[7].

It is not difficult to understand what geopolitical, strategic, and economic goals and interests lie behind such arguments by those who proclaim the need to accelerate the democratization process in the CIS countries. "Democracy directors," disregarding the sovereignty of other states and interfering in their internal affairs, are actually imposing a Western lifestyle. What is this - neocolonialism? Why are human rights and the level of democracy measured differently in different countries? Why should "democracy," a "justice" favorable to external forces, be established in different countries, and not a democracy that meets their national interests and corresponds to their national characteristics?

In such a dangerous world, the idea of national independence manifests itself as a means of strengthening independence, protecting national identity, preserving cultural identity, and protecting against information attacks. Therefore, no state that thinks about the future of the nation and cares about the country's prosperity will ignore the issue of citizen upbringing. In the words of our President, "in the current dangerous situation, when various threats and conflicts of interest are intensifying in the world, the new system formed in Uzbekistan is fully justifying itself" [8].

Analysis and results (Analysis and results). It is no secret that under the banner of establishing democracy, the practice of interfering in the internal affairs of states and influencing socio-political processes is taking place in the world. A striking example of attempts to destabilize socio-political processes in such a country is the scenario of a color revolution. Color revolutions are attempts to change the regime under the influence of external forces in the form of "people's discontent." In many cases, the scenarios are similar to each other, the names are the same (called revolution) and are developing with Western information support. Usually, starting from 2000, some of these events took place in the post-Soviet space.

Analysis of internal political conflicts according to the "color revolution" scenario allows us to consider the elements of their viability according to specific legislation. Events in Georgia, Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan demonstrated the identical methods and mechanisms for carrying out political coups. In this case, the scenario that worked in one country is becoming very dangerous in another region under the "revolutionary expert" trend. A number of factors are involved in such revolutions.

The most important factor is the possibility of internal resistance (protest), which has accumulated over many years. The second is the state's socio-economic policy. In this case, the government's communication with the population, the normal relationship between them, is extremely important. The most terrible thing is that the relationship between the government and the people resembles the conversation of the deaf and mute. This cannot be between the responsible government and the people who elected it. Symbols (ideological and political platform for the development of power relations) [9], or a set of forms and organizational principles of the political process, are a kind of systemic practice of state power[10].

If certain problems in social, economic, and political life accumulate and do not find their solution, if public discontent intensifies and reaches a high point, if it reaches the level of "breaking the steam boiler," then the possibility of external influence opens up. No America, no Europe will be able to direct events in the necessary direction if the society itself, overflowing with patience, does not want radical changes. External influence yields results if the necessary conditions are created in society. Agreeing with the assessments of many experts, it is necessary to consider the events in Georgia, Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan in the context of a direct external

factor. At the same time, it is necessary to note the external forces that bring political leaders to power, which create a normal situation for relations. Researchers believe that today there are two main projects aimed at changing political power in the Eurasian region - conservative[11] and modernized[12], each of which is not only a system of political ideas, images, and symbols.

There is a certain technology for "promoting democracy" (events in Iraq and the Middle East). If a "deficit of democracy" is observed in a particular country, it is necessary to provide assistance to the peoples of that country to overcome the deficit. The technology of "color" change comes into play: the old government must leave as slowly as possible, without bloodshed, and a new government that meets this technology must replace it.

Analysis of events in countries that faced the "color revolution" shows that the main stages of coups include:

- Preliminary deepening of socio-political conflict. This stage has a continuous character, and its direct implementation is observed at this stage, with the gradual intensification of external influences aimed at uniting all forces interested in the change of power. At the same time, the main attention is paid to the removal of power and the "destabilization of the socio-political situation in the country." It should be noted that the prevailing political instability after "color revolutions" often creates conditions that allow direct interference in the internal affairs of a given country, i.e., serves the interests of external forces.

Direct revolutionary waves. This process is considered risky and will only begin on the eve of announcing the election results. In this case, as a rule, the voting results are declared falsified and are not recognized, referring to the data of "independent observers," international organizations, etc. One of the most important mechanisms for promoting "color revolutions" is the lack of democracy, systematic and sharp, direct external pressure based on political and economic criticism, using diplomatic and other methods.

It should be noted that the information and propaganda assistance provided by external forces also plays a special role in the process of promoting "governed democracy" in a particular state.

Conclusion/Recommendations. In general, the method of "promoting democracy, freedom, and prosperity" does not differ much from the idea of "building communism," which was well known to older citizens of Uzbekistan and was practically used by the Bolsheviks at the time. The organizers of the "color revolution" did not succeed in creating anything new (neither ideologically nor methodologically) to realize their interests.

The implementation of the "color revolution" will disrupt all the main socio-political and economic processes in the country. In this case, first of all, during the "personnel cleaning," the processes of separation of political power and the replacement of senior management take place. The country will disintegrate into structural units, one of which does not recognize the other, does not want to take steps towards mutual rapprochement. In general, the consequences of "color revolutions" lead to:

- an increase in the likelihood of a political crisis associated with the weakening of the political situation, the loss of a country's political strategic orientation, and the escalation of long-term open conflicts between various political groups:

- the persistence of discontent and general tension in society, which in the future may lead to additional conflict situations and even "color revolutions";

- A change in the geopolitical orientation of the state, leading to the discrediting of the country's activities in certain international alliances, communities, and organizations, leads to a

sharp deterioration in relations with states that have previously been the country's main strategic partners.

As a result, the country becomes completely dependent on those who helped it organize the "color revolution." Their government becomes a "doll." This very situation implies the strategic goals of states that promote their geopolitical, geo-economic, and other interests under the guise of "democracy."

References:

1. Селезнев Павел Сергеевич Модернизация постсоветской России: от «Демократического транзита» к инновационному развитию // Изв. Саратов. ун-та Нов. сер. Сер. Философия. Психология. Педагогика. 2014. №2-1. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/modernizatsiya-postsovetskoy-rossii-otdemokraticeskogo-tranzita-k-innovatsionnomu-razvitiyu>
2. Растоу Д.А. Переходы к демократии: попытка динамической модели // Полис. 1996. № 5. С. 5-15. [электронный ресурс] URL: <http://read.virmk.ru/R/Rastou.htm>
3. А. Ю. Мельвиль [и др.]. - Политология: учеб. / М. : Московский П50 государственный институт международных отношений (Университет) МИД России, ТК Велби, Изд-во Проспект, 2008. - 618 с
4. Карл Т. Л., Ф. Шмиттер Демократизация: концепты, постулаты, гипотезы (Размышления по поводу применимости транзитологической парадигмы при изучении посткоммунистических трансформаций) // Полис. 2004. №4. С. 6-27.[электронный ресурс] URL: http://www.civisbook.ru/files/File/Karl_2004_4.pdf
5. Сурков В. Долгое государство Путина//Независимая газета. 2019. URL: <https://ideologs.com/mnenie/statja-v-surkova-dolgoe-gosudarstvo-putina/>
6. See: "Inostrannye SMI nazvali sobytia v Aktobe 'sudnym dnem'," 6 June, 2016, available at [<http://www.zakon.kz/4797635-inostrannye-smi-nazvali-sobytaja-v.html>], 13 July, 2016.
7. Mirziyoyev Sh.M. O'zbekiston Respublikasi mustaqilligining yigirma to'qqiz yilligiga bag'ishlangan tantanali marosimdagi nutqidan . Xalq so'zigazetasi 2020 yil 31 avgust
8. A.D. Bogaturov, P.A. Kosolapov, "Neliberalnye demokratii i liberalnaia ideologia," *Mezhdunarodnye protsessy*, No. 2, 2006
9. A.R. Agamirov, I.A. Sarychev, A.Y. Mordovcev, A.Y. Mamychev, "Legal Mindset as Factor in the State in the 21st Century," *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 6, No. 36, 2015, pp. 235-240.
10. A.G. Glinchikova, "Modernizatsia, traditsia i evoliutsia chastnogo interesa," in: *Politiko-filosofskiy ezhegodnik*, 2011, Issue 4, Moscow.
11. See: A.A. Auzan, "Koleia rossiyskoy modernizatsii," *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost*, No. 6, 2007
12. I. Mkrtumova, A. Dosanova, I. Karabulatova, V. Nifontov, "The Use of Communication Technologies to Oppose Political-Religious Terrorism as an Ethnosocial Deviation in the Contemporary Information-Digital Society," *Central Asia and the Caucasus*, Vol. 17, Issue 2, 2016, pp. 54-61.