



**THE ROLE OF THE POLITICAL ELITE IN GOVERNMENT
ADMINISTRATION AND THE CONFLICT OF INTERESTS
WITHIN THE ELITE**

Nosirbekov Kozimbek ugli

Journalism and Mass Communications University of Uzbekistan
3rd-Course Student of "Political Science"

Sharobiddinov Shokhislombek Yasharbek ugli

Journalism and Mass Communications University of Uzbekistan
3rd-Course Student of "Political Science"

Phone: +998935967497

ABSTRACT

Analyzing the characteristics of the political elite, it should be noted that the relationship between the elites in government and those against it is very important in creating effective government administration and making effective decisions. This article mainly analyzes the essence and content of the concept of "Elite and political elite", their importance in the processes of government administration, especially in making political decisions, and the conflicts that arise between political elites.

KEYWORDS

Elite, political elite, political decision-making, government administration, the conflict between elites.

Introduction

For a modern democratic country, it is not the fight against elitism that is of paramount importance, but the solution to the problem of forming the most qualified, efficient, and useful political elite for society, its timely qualitative renewal, preventing the trend of alienation from the people and turning into a closed ruling privileged caste. In other words, we are talking about the need to create appropriate institutions that would ensure the effectiveness of the political elite and its accountability to society. The concepts of elitism are quite diverse. They take their origins in the socio-political ideas of ancient times. Even at the time of the decomposition of the tribal system, views on society appeared, according to which it is divided into higher and lower, noble and rabble, aristocracy, and ordinary people. However, this kind of elitist theory has not yet received any serious sociological justification. The concept of "elite" and its main synonyms have always played an important role in the theories and concepts of the humanitarian and military-political disciplines, especially in the political sciences. Justification of the role of the political elite in the life of Uzbek society is of particular relevance today.

For Uzbekistan, this is also due to the uniqueness of the historical period being experienced. And one of the ways out of the crisis, the stabilization of the situation, and the rise of Uzbekistan is the effective activity of elite groups that determine the strategy for the development of society. It is important to note that elite groups are necessary for any field of activity, be it science, politics, the army, or economic management.

The elite is those people who, by their strategic position, occupying senior positions in public and private organizations, are influential enough to make decisions and national policy depends on them. Having defined the concept of "elite", you need to find a way to identify this social group.

In modern science, one of three methods for identifying the elite is used:

- 1) Positional analysis;
- 2) Reputation analysis;
- 3) Analysis of decision-making.

The idea of the elite will be incomplete without clarifying the factors that have a direct impact on its formation. These factors include, in particular:

- the inequality of people, due to the individual characteristics of the psyche, which entails various leadership abilities;
- social inequality of people, which predetermines various opportunities for people to be ranked among the elite (to paraphrase Aristotle, this factor can be conditionally designated as “elite by blood” and “elite by the spirit”);
- unequal biological capabilities of people - a strong body, endurance, strength, etc.

The assignment of a person to an elite group can be regarded ambiguously and very conditionally. Analyzing the features of the political elite, it should be noted that it is internally differentiated not only from the point of view of an individual but also by taking into account the structure of the elite group. So, based on the presence or absence of government power, the political elite can be divided into the ruling one, which directly possesses government power (the political elite of power), and the opposition (counter-elite), and according to the criterion of the volume of power, into the highest one, which makes decisions that are significant for the entire government. , the middle one, which acts as a barometer of public opinion, and the administrative one, which is made up of employees-managers (bureaucracy). There are also political elites in parties and classes.

Being a multifaceted phenomenon, the political elite concentrates on all the signs of the formation of other elite groups. But the peculiarity of the political elite is that it functions, and develops not only based on social norms but also based on legal norms, which predetermine its constant renewal largely due to the principle of equality of all before the law.

Political observers have noted changes in the style and manner in which political power is exercised. In the last 10-15 years, "diplomatic" politics with the search for consensus and a tendency towards coalition actions began to give way to "hard" decisions, which can be seen in countries such as the USA, Great Britain, Italy, Israel, and Russia. Following the tradition of classical elitology, we conditionally designate this process as the displacement of foxes by lions.

For example, until the end of the XIX century. Classes were the dominant element of social stratification. However, the transformation in the XX century. From the industrial society to the post-industrial (and today - to the informational one) “blurred” the class polarization, subordinating it to

other stratification orders. In the middle of the XX century. The dominant stratification order was based not on classes and private property in the sphere of production, but on the government and various organizational systems (corporate, professional, municipal, etc.).

In essence, the state of society at any moment is a kind of intermediate result of resolved intergroup conflicts. Their extensive network as a whole is determined by the social differentiation of society, but it is changeable. Accordingly, the configuration of the “conflict field” should also change.

Accordingly, the nature of intergroup conflicts: they have become, as it were, “smaller”, but on the other hand, more diverse and even “motley”. The subjects of conflicts are increasingly being groups not only “social”, that is, created based on belonging to some socio-professional category, but also “targeted” or “initiative”, that is, uniting people by the specific task they solve (environmental, consumer, human rights). Varieties in the fabric of intergroup conflicts are also added by the uneven social development of the modern world: in some countries, conflicts of the traditional type, determined by class and even tribal structures, prevail; in others, more advanced, new social movements set the tone.

Thus, the modern world tends to complicate the overall picture of intergroup conflicts, to increase their diversity and interweaving,

As a result, we single out the main positions of the sociological vision of the mechanisms for the emergence of intergroup conflicts:

- the general basis of intergroup conflict is the social differentiation of society, the main type of which is the division of labor;
- the fundamental irremovability of intergroup conflicts is determined by a specific type of historical progress carried out according to the principle: “loses a part - wins the whole”;
- many intergroup conflicts are a way of maintaining social balance, the balance of group interests;
- the main source of intergroup conflicts is the unsatisfied needs of social groups;
- the object of intergroup conflicts is social resources, statuses; values;
- the totality of intergroup conflicts tends to become more complex and diverse.

Intergroup conflicts - a clash of individual groups about the emergence of conflict contradictions between them. These contradictions can be due to a variety of reasons. For example, the struggle for limited resources, the desire for dominance, the satisfaction of needs, etc. All these contradictions are also inherent in other types of conflicts. However, intergroup conflicts have their characteristics.

Intergroup interaction is based on such concepts as social identity and social comparison. These concepts involve dividing people into insiders and outsiders, separating one's group (we-groups) from the general mass of other groups (out-groups). Through comparison and opposition, individual individuals identify themselves with a certain social community and ensure the relative stability of intra-group relations. Attributing oneself to any group generates a negative image of "external others, even if there is no real clash of interests and any long history of intergroup relations."

The phenomenon of social (group) identity includes the following main provisions:

- the desire of the individual to maintain a positive image of "I" and their own social identity;
- belonging to a group;
- assessment of the group according to the principle of comparison;
- a positive assessment of the merits of one's group and a negative assessment of outgroups.

Thus, along with the positive function of ensuring the psychological well-being of the individual, social identity stimulates the negative process of social comparison (opposition) and discrimination of outgroups.

Social group interests collide in three problematic “fields”, which are:

- social resources (economic - finance, equipment, technology, food; power, information, etc.);
- social status (equal - unequal, higher - lower, central - peripheral, main - marginal);
- sociocultural values (religious, moral, conservative, liberal, ethnic, etc.).

These three “apples of discord” are the object of intergroup conflicts.

The distribution of resources, the correlation of statuses, and adherence to certain values are very mobile elements of the social organization of life. Their momentary state is determined by the correlation of forces of interested social groups. And if any group is aware of its infringement on one of these parameters, it means that it is “ready for conflict”.

The phenomenon of unity in the face of an external threat is often used by leaders of groups and large social communities to maintain intra-group unity and strengthen personal power. To the greatest extent, such a "policy" is inherent in closed groups with an authoritarian system of control. For example, the Iranian dictator Saddam Hussein constantly provokes external conflicts to maintain his regime of personal power.

In open groups with democratic management methods, group balance is maintained within the group due to the multiplicity of conflict situations, and the variety of ways and mechanisms for their resolution. “In conditions of structural flexibility, heterogeneous internal conflicts are constantly superimposed on each other, thereby preventing a global split of the group in any one direction.”

The interaction of various groups in society can be built on various grounds. Groups may maintain relative neutrality concerning each other; cooperate based on the separation and addition of functions in joint activities; compete in certain areas and activities; wage an uncompromising struggle to destroy each other.

In market conditions, the strategy and tactics of individual and group survival objectively presuppose intergroup competition and struggle for resources. This struggle is especially aggravated during periods of major socio-political, economic, and socio-cultural changes, when norms, values, attitudes towards power, property, and moral principles change. During such periods, the intergroup struggle for the distribution and redistribution of resources turns into an open "war of all against all" without rules and morality.

An important aspect of the theory of political elites is the question of the mechanism of their formation and reproduction. The social representativeness and qualitative composition of the political elite largely depend on the systems of their recruitment (selection). These systems determine: who, how, and from what environment carries out the selection, what are its order, criteria, and motives.

There are two main systems for recruiting elites - entrepreneurial and guilds. In reality, they are combined in one form or another, and the disadvantages of one are offset by the advantages of the other.

The entrepreneurial system is distinguished by:

- openness, wide opportunities for representatives of any social groups to claim leadership positions;
- a small number of institutional filters, that is, formal requirements for holding positions;
- a wide range of participants in the selection, which can include all the voters of the country;

- high competitiveness of selection, sharpness of rivalry for leadership positions;
- the paramount importance of personal qualities, individual activity, and the ability to find the support of voters.

This system is democratic and most acceptable for people who are dynamic, educated, and capable of innovation.

Its disadvantages are the frequent change of course due to changes in the ruling elite, poor predictability of political decisions, conflicts within the elite, and a significant likelihood of promotion of unprofessional people prone to populism and external effect.

In general, as practice shows, the entrepreneurial system is most consistent with modern realities.

For the emerging post-industrial society, the main criterion for recruiting the elite is ability, but the factors of origin and property also retain their significance.

The guild system is characterized by:

- closeness, selection of applicants for high positions mainly from the lower strata of the elite itself, their slow gradual advancement through the ranks of the service hierarchy;
- a high degree of institutionalization of the selection process, the presence of numerous filters - formal requirements for holding a position: party membership, age, work experience, education, level of the previous position, positive characteristics, nationality, etc.;
- a narrow, relatively closed circle of the electorate, which, as a rule, includes only members of a higher governing body or even one first leader - the head of the government or firm, the first secretary of the district party committee, etc.;
- the tendency to reproduce the existing type of elite, arising from the above characteristics.

The guild system prevailed in totalitarian countries. Its elements are available in the UK, Japan, Germany, and other countries.

The operation of this system can be illustrated by the example of Germany. To make a career, the top step of which would be an entry into the ruling elite, it is necessary, at a minimum, to meet the following requirements.

First, the origin of the candidate's parents must be high enough. Compensation for an insufficiently representative origin may be a marriage to a representative of a higher social group.

Secondly, a certain type of education is needed, which, as a rule, can only be obtained in a big city, in conjunction with a university education.

Thirdly, a candidate for the elite must profess one of the two main religions and adhere to a certain system of views.

Fourthly, he must have a profession or occupation that opens up great chances for advancement.

With some modifications, these conditions determine the selection of the elite in other Western countries as well.

The guild system also has its advantages and disadvantages.

Among its strengths are the high predictability of political changes, the continuity of political courses, and the low probability of internal conflicts.

At the same time, the guild system generates bureaucracy, conservatism, and conformism. Without the addition of competitive mechanisms, it leads to the gradual degradation of the elite, its separation from society, and its transformation into a privileged caste incapable of effective management.

List of Used Literature

1. Bottomore, T.B. *Elites and Society*. London: C.A. Watt and Co. Ltd. 1964.
2. Crozier, M.; Thoenig, J. The regulation of complex organized systems, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1976.
3. Hay, C.; Richards, D. *The Tangled Web of Westminster and Whitehall: The Discourse, Strategy and Practice of Networking within the British Core Executive*, Public Administration, 2000.
4. Lodge, M. *Administrative Patterns and National Politics*, In: *Handbook of public administration*, ed. by B. Guy Peters and Jon Pierre. London: Sage Publications, 2003.
5. Pareto, Vilfredo. *The Mind and Society. A Treatise on General Sociology*. New York: Dower. [1916] 1935.
6. Provan, K.; Kenis, P. *Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness*, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 2007.
7. Ашин Г.К. Правящая элита и общество. *Свободная мысль*, 1993, №7.
8. *Основы политологии и социологии* В.С. Боровик, Б.И. Кретов; Москва, 2011 г.
9. Титов В. Н. *Политическая элита и проблемы политики*. СОЦИС, М., 1998, №7.