THE LEGITIMACY OF POWER STRUCTURES AS THE FACTOR FOR THE THREAT RESISTANCE OF SOCIETY

Pakhratdinov Shukritdin Ilyasovich
*Central Institute of advanced training of public
education workers named after A.Avloni,
Tashkent, Uzbekistan.*

Abstract: The factor of legitimacy of power structures, which is the basis of threat resistance of the society, has been analyzed in detail in this article. Special attention is also paid to the main criteria for the legitimacy of power. An attempt is made to identify and analyze the nature and main characteristics of the legitimacy of power. Considerable attention is paid to the relationship between the concepts of "legitimacy of power" and "legality of power". The methods used by the state to ensure political and economic manageability of citizens, taking into account the existing alignment of political forces have been studied.

Keywords: power, legitimacy, threat-resistant society, state, concept, factors, mechanism

I. INTRODUCTION

State power can function efficiently in society only if the population of a given country or territory supports power decisions and it does not issue of their legality. The state, no matter how solid it may seem at first glance, is sooner or later doomed to instability if the majorities of citizens do not recognize the legitimacy of the existing government and do not express their readiness to obey its laws.

II. METHOD

Chronological and systematic periodic data, comparative and quantitative methods have been used in the article. More than ten scientific papers on this topic are used to explain "The legitimacy of power structures as the factor for the threat resistance of society". In addition, the researcher also used various materials to collect data related to the study.

III. DISCUSSION

Russian novelist, philosopher A. N. Radishchev, even in the XVIII century arguing about the legitimacy of power and the strength of the state, wrote: "Every sensible person knows that the firmness of power and authority in the state has a basis in opinion, and that it makes the law lawful, that is, it makes it valid" [1].

Researchers identify the following criteria for the legitimacy of state power:

1) the use of violence by the authorities depends on the level of development of the political culture of the society and the degree of formation of political consciousness;

2) the level of compliance of power structures with certain norms, both mandatory and non-mandatory – it should be remembered that the norms are quite diverse and contradictory; they are often set by the state, but not always supported by society;

3) the level of electoral activity of the population of the state [2].

The concept of power is the core, the foundation of political science. According to J. Katlin, the concept of power is fundamental in political science. R. MacIver believes that everything that happens around us is somehow connected with power. This is the power that

ensures order and peace in the state. Political science is the field of study of social control, or more specifically, the control relationship between human and even animal relationships. It should be remembered that power is not something absolute; it is only an instrument that is used in relation to something.

As for M. A. Vasilik, "Legitimacy is considered to be the recognition in society of the legality of an action, event or fact". The task of legitimacy is to ensure consent in society, subordination of citizens to power without overawe and violence. At the same time, if the authorities need to use force, then its limits are also determined by legitimacy.

IV. THE OBTAINED RESULTS

There are the following means of maintaining legitimacy on the part of the authorities:

– amendments to the legislation and the mechanism of public administration in accordance with the new conditions;

- use of national traditions in law-making and in making specific political decisions;

- implementation of legal precautionary measures against a possible decrease in the legitimacy of the government;

- maintaining law and order in society, etc.

Indicators of the legitimacy of the government are:

– the level of coercion used to enforce the policy;

– attempts to overthrow the government or leader;

- the power of civil disobedience;

– results of elections and referendums;

- mass demonstrations in support of the government (opposition), etc.The legitimacy of power correlates with the opposite process of DE legitimization– the loss of trust, the deprivation of public credit for politics and power. The main factors of legitimization are:

1) the contradiction between the universal values prevailing in society and the egoistic interests of the ruling elite;

2) the contradiction between the idea of democracy and socio-political practice, which is manifested in attempts to solve problems by force, pressure on the media;

3) the lack of mechanisms in the political system to protect the interests of the masses;

4) increasing bureaucratization and corruption;

5) nationalism, ethnic separatism in multinational states, manifested in the rejection of Federal power;

6) the loss of the ruling elite's faith in the legitimacy of their power. The emergence of acute social contradictions within it, conflict with different branches of government [3].

One of the factors underlying the determination of the effectiveness of the process of legitimation of power and the level of legitimacy of power is the support and recognition of such institutional foundations by the people.

T. Y. Falkinabelieves that the level of legitimacy is influenced by such factors as "the electoral system in general and elections in particular, institutions of local self-government, participation of the population and certain regions to assess the performance of entities that have authority, assessment of the effectiveness of the government in the form of an index of trust of citizens, the direct participation of the population in the functioning of certain state institutions; an inclusive recognition of the ability to implement their rights and legitimate interests through legal procedures; the degree of personification of power in the mass consciousness; criteria and indicators of citizens 'trust in power structures at the level of regional and local authorities; the presence of elements of transforming the needs of the population and its assessment in relation to power structures"[4].

In political theory, there is a concept of "crisis of legitimacy". It occurs "when the status of the main social institutions is threatened, when the challenges of the main groups of

society are not perceived by the political system" [5]. The emergence of such a crisis is also possible in the updated socio-political structure, if for a long time, for one reason or another, the government can not justify the trust of the broad popular strata. Note that legitimacy is a political category, and legality is a legal one (it is established and guaranteed by the authorities).According to current estimates, the potential impact of geopolitics and security disasters – civil and inter – state conflicts and social unrest-has increased significantly since 2015. This increase reflects the combined high level of political turbulence in developed countries, which encourages relations between civil society and states, as evidenced by the rise of populism, as well as risks to global trade and global security. This is the only threat that has increased overall. Also, the ability of cyber-attacks to cause serious economic damage increases as the number and severity of incidents increases, but the ability to protect against them also improves [6].

Special attention is paid to threats of a political nature in the capital of the state. In the absence of a dominant ideology, the existing pluralism of opinions and ideological trends can lead to violations in the sustainable development of cities, the loss of political orientations by the population, and political manageability by society, including damage to the political system of the city and state [7].

"The modern period has marked the beginning of a trend towards differentiation of opportunities, separation of the potential of individuals, groups and organizations from subjectivity in the perception and promotion of security. During the discussion of topical issues at the world political forum (Yaroslavl, September 9-10, 2010), foreign scientists noted: "The period of modernity marked the beginning of new social relations that were no longer directly related to cultural, religious and even global realities, but were perceived in a contractual context. The modern spirit of "possessive individualism" has given rise to acquisitive societies." When creating states, the focus shifted from supranational power sharing to the monopolization of legitimate power by national monarchs. Changes in the nature of the war further brought tsars and oligarchs closer together: the latter provided income to the former in exchange for protection and security. This process gave rise to a new idea that became the quintessence of the modern period – the idea of an eternal, territorial, impersonal state [8].It is worth noting the following: M.Weberconfirms that submission to the state is not only a habit for people, but also the result of their attachment to the state and to those complex interests that they can satisfy by virtue of obedience to it [9].

It is natural that the state can be considered as a means of maintaining the sense of loyalty of a person, a force that is able to fulfill the wishes of its citizens. Weber considers these desires legitimate, because they themselves do not depend on politics or the struggle for power in the state. In addition, Weber argues that a belief in the legitimacy of the state is close to an employee occupying a certain workplace agreeing to their employer's rules in order to qualify for payment [10].From a utilitarian point of view, legitimate political power should be based on the principle of utility. This concept of legitimacy is necessarily moralized: the legitimacy of political power depends on what Mora demands. In addition, since personal interests play a role in maintaining obedience in the state, it can be argued that there is a purposeful element of obedience. In other words, society is most interested in the fact that the state protects it from various threats (terrorism, violence, hunger, discrimination based on nationality, environmental problems, etc.) and contributes to improving the level and quality of life of citizens, their well-being in intellectual (decent, relevant for a certain time, affordable education), physical and psychological aspects. M. Weber supports this concept when he argues that those who have latent motives or intentions for personal gain are interested in submitting to the state because it is the source of their desires.

For this reason, if a person obeys the orders of the authorities and receives from the state what corresponds to his personal interests and needs, it naturally follows that such a state is recognized as legitimate, since loyalty is rewarded by satisfying his needs [11].

As M. Foucault noted, the system of mercantilism applied in the practice of fighting the deficit, which the state once used to prevent famine, had adverse economic and political consequences. In theory, mercantilism was thought to work because it could limit real food shortages by putting food on the economic market as soon as possible, which seemed to allow for a wide turnover of goods. Since, theoretically, goods moved at more than sufficient speed, it could be argued that if the flow of goods did not stop, the mercantilism of the masses could permanently guarantee the absence of hunger [12]. On the other hand, by prohibiting exports, accumulation, price increases, and the production of certain goods, those states that use mercantilism tend to experience sharp economic fluctuations. In addition, since the disadvantages of mercantilism can cause negative economic consequences, such as highly inflated prices of goods, including food, which can lead to famine, the risk of social unrest and popular protest increased in such states. The grim economic realities that are a key cause of revolutions make the state vulnerable to the threat of revolutionary uprisings that could challenge its legitimacy and authority. In order to eliminate this threat, a number of states have taken a course to transform the new ideology into an economic practice that could help preserve and strengthen the legitimacy and power of the state. Consequently, the society's threat tolerance to hunger is being formed, which, for example, is in the third place in the rating of fears among Russians. According to Foucault's observations, after the failure of mercantilism, state leaders began to correct the problems caused by it in various ways. First of all, economic approaches that failed at the state level were revised. The government allowed the people to set their own prices, trade food, and make savings. Food control bans were lifted, not only to avoid political unrest and starvation, but also to get more money into the state's coffers. The leaders argued that the state would benefit from applying a more liberal approach to its political economy, because with greater freedoms for merchants, there are prospects for increased competition and profit. According to Foucault, the state apparatus, by giving people the freedom to have more control over their grain, caused the emergence of a new raised state.

Foucault calls this new approach to political economy liberalism. He argues that in a liberal economy, people are free to set prices for their goods, as this helps them avoid damage and obtain the necessary means of subsistence. In addition, by setting the price of grain themselves, people help the state avoid an economic disaster, since with this approach, in times of good harvest, when grain prices are low, free manipulation can raise the price of grain. In turn, when grain prices rise, this indicates that there was a poor harvest and that the supply of grain does not match the demand for it.

Therefore, the state, allowing people to save and accumulate excess surplus grain, thereby guarantees that this market will not be seriously damaged in any case [13].In addition, to maintain market stability, the state can levy import taxes on foreign grain in order to balance prices within the country and freely export the product to where there is consumer demand and market.

It should be noted that by liberalizing the economy, when the state allows its people to manipulate prices, save goods, and move goods and trade them, it creates conditions for the people to have financial stability in life [14].In addition, by helping its people escape poverty, the state reduces the risk of major political unrest and, consequently, contributes to the formation of a threat-resistant society.

Jeremy Bentham rejects Hobbes's idea that political authority is created by a social contract. According to Bentham, it is the state that makes contracts possible. The problem of

legitimacy faced by a state is which of its laws is justified. Bentham believes that legitimacy should be determined by whether the law contributes to the happiness of citizens[15]. Those who associate political legitimacy with the problem of justifying power tend to view political coercion as the only way that legitimate states can use to secure their authority. Leslie Green, "obliged threats provide a secondary, reinforcing motivation when the political order fails in its primary normative technique of authoritative leadership"[16]. According to the concept of the second group of scientists, on the contrary, the main function of legitimacy is to justify the force of compulsion. In interpretations based on coercion, the main problem that the concept of legitimacy must solve is to distinguish the legitimate use of political power from simple coercion. One way to understand this is to analyze whether legitimacy is focused on the legitimate use of political power or constitutes political power. Taking consideration M. Mill, both individual freedom and the right to participate in politics are necessary both for the self-development of individuals and for the progress of society as a whole, and this are one of the guarantees of the threat-resistance of society. T. Hobbes notes that political power is the result of a "social contract".

According to the laws of nature, the existence of every human being is threatened from birth, and this, Hobbes argues, makes it reasonable for all citizens to agree to a pact that authorizes a certain person (sovereign) or group of persons capable of guaranteeing protection to all to perform power functions. When there are no such leaders in society, an "institution of sovereignty" can be created, but in this case political power can also be established by subordinating power as authority. Both methods of determining the sovereign are equally legitimate. And political power will be legitimate as long as the sovereign protects citizens: as Hobbes points out, the natural right to self-preservation cannot be revoked. However, beyond this, there can be no further questions about the legitimacy of the sovereign. In particular, according to Hobbes, there is no distinction between effective power and legitimate power. It can even be argued that Hobbes does not distinguish between legitimate power and the mere exercise of power[17]. However, according to more recent research, this distinction is clear: trying to rule without legitimacy is an exercise of coercive force, not power.

According to M. Weber, the defining characteristic of the state is its total dominance and the exclusive right to use legal force to assert its legitimacy within the sphere assigned to it. In other words, the state can compel people under its jurisdiction to use the means of power or legitimate violence to maintain and assert its dominance, because the state monopolizes and controls the means to achieve an end that only it can accomplish. Weber believes that the state is the only entity that can legitimately assert its power through force. Speaking about decision-making, we note that T. Christiano and N. Kolodny argue that the legitimacy of democratically adopted decisions originated from political equality, which is provided by democracy and only by democracy. As for Cristiano, only in a democracy people are publicly treated as equals. According to Kolodny, political legitimacy can be compromised not only by unequal access to political, social and economic institutions, but also by unjustified epistemic privilege.

Researchers propose the concept of democratic legitimacy, according to which political decisions are considered legitimate if they are the result of a debatable democratic decision-making process that satisfies certain conditions of political and epistemological justice. At the present stage, the most important task of social development is "changing the dominant non-labor motivation for work". In contrast to the feudal era, today's population consists of people who are free to pursue careers at will. Freedom to choose the type of activity determines two roles that a citizen must perform: first, the role of a member of the

state, obedient and obedient to its authority; and second, the role of a contributor to the General welfare of the state.

Since all people are free to pursue whatever career they like, the state can not only earn more money, but must also use more innovative methods to ensure that its population remains politically loyal and at the same time economically active. Before you begin to analyze the methods used by the state to ensure the political and economic subordination of citizens, you should first understand the alignment of political forces and the interests that they usually represent.

According to Foucault, the government is not only a body that implements state projects, but also a part of the state structure and state structure. In other words, civil servants and political leaders not only shape the logic of the state, but also take a position based on the structure and needs of the government. The modern state is characterized by political specialization and the existence of political professions[18]. This leads to the fact that the function, rather than the person, comes to the fore, and the depersonalization of the political sphere occurs[19]. The main task assigned to modern authorities is to act legitimately, in the interests of the state and society.

As V. K. Levashov notes, " citizenship and patriotism are the most important moral qualities of a person, which express their participation in their Homeland, people, state, their history and culture, their ability to participate in joint actions for the benefit of society, their readiness to defend and protect public foundations and national interests." In order for the state to be threat-resistant, it is necessary to find a balance between the interests of the people and the state, while taking into account traditions and moral values, conducting ideological and educational work to strengthen patriotism in society, which will become a kind of core of the state.

Answering the question of what factors allow the government to maintain its influence and be durable, Foucault believes that the primary role in this is played by ways to ensure the security of the state, that is, in the context of this study, the formation of threat resistance of various groups of the population, in order to convince them to contribute to the implementation of political / economic tasks facing the state. To this end, according to Foucault, the state should pay attention, including to disciplinary normalization, that is, the consolidation of such patterns of behavior of citizens that would contribute to the achievement of the goals of the state. At the same time, if the behavior of citizens does not meet the established standards, special state institutions arise to correct various anomalies in people's behavior. There is no doubt that threat tolerance should be formed by the combined efforts of the entire society. On this aim Foucault, the modern state takes measures to ensure the security and threat-resistance of its "social body"(that is, the population) through various methods, including the use of knowledge. According to Foucault, the state, the government controls this body, acting as a kind of "super-ego", it determines the standards of behavior, which ultimately affects the nature of the desires and needs of citizens, as well as the level of awareness of their behavior. To influence citizens and regulate their behavior, the state has such an institution as education. The state finances educational institutions, which means that they must comply with the requirements and standards set by the state.

Consequently, according to Foucault, teaching has a political aspect, focused on persuading students to submit to the state. At the same time, the more intelligent a society is and the wider its access to high-quality and demanded education, the more threat-resistant such a society is.

V. CONCLUSION

Today, one can hear arguments about the legitimacy (illegitimacy) of political regimes so often that one gets the impression that we are talking about some universal parameter of

"right"(perfect) states. Trust in the institutions of public power is, of course, closely linked to the problem of its effectiveness. In Western democracies, the change of parties or party coalitions in power is primarily due to constant changes in the requirements of politically active groups of citizens to the level of state potential.

REFERENCES

[1] Radishev A. N. About the statute // Selected philosophical and socio-political works (On the 150th anniversary of the death. 1802-1952). - M.: Gospolitizdat, 1952. - P. 473.

[2] The strategic vector of ensuring international information security: collection / comp. M.A.Vus, O.S.Makarov; foreword: boxv. - SPb.: SPIIRAN, 2016 . –P.122.

[3] Life safety / E.I.Kholostova, O.G.Prokhorova. - M., 2017 . –P. 456.

[4] Falkin T. Yu. Legitimation of power as a factor of its stability // Bulletin of the Ural Law Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia. - 2016. - No.4. - P.18-19.

[5] Krasnov B. Theory of power relations of power // Socio-political journal. - 1994. - No. 3-6. - P. 84.

[6] Castells M. Information era: Economics, society and culture. - M., 2000. – P. 67.

[7] Life safety / E. I. Kholostova, O. G. Prokhorova. - M., 2017 . –P. 456.

[8] Pabst E. Market State and Post-Democracy // Democracy and Modernization: Toward a Debate on the Challenges of the 21st Century / Ed. V. L. Inozemtseva; Center for Post-Industrial Society Studies. - M.: Europe, 2010. - P. 318.

[9] Weber A. B. Sustainable development as a social problem (global context and the Russian situation). - M., 1999.

[10]   Conflicts in modern Russia: Problems of analysis and regulation / RAS. Center for Conflict Management. Institute of Sociology; under the editorship of E.I. Stepanova. - M.: Editorial URSS, 1999.

[11]   Kristakis N., Fowler J. Connected by one network: How people who we have never seen affect us. - M .: United Press, 2011 . –P. 361.

[12]   Sanzharevsky I.I. Political science: dictionary-reference book. - M.: Political Science, 2010. –P. 745.

[13]   Foucault M., Senellart M. ed., Burchell G. trans., Security, Territory, Population. – New York: Picador, 2008. – P. 38-39.

[14]   Astore R. A. Defining the Legitimacy and Power of the State Through Webern Foucault. – 2016. – Vol. 8.N 05.–P. 1-2.

[15]   Binmore Ken. "A Utilitarian Theory of Legitimacy," in Economics, Values, and Organization / Ben-Ner, Avner and Louis G. Putterman (eds.). – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. – P. 101-132.

[16]   Green Leslie. The Authority of the State. –Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988. – P. 75.

[17]   Hobbes T. Leviathan (1668) /ed. By Edwin Curley, Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994.Ch. 21.

[18]   Fukuyama F. The Great Break / trans. from English under the general ed. A.V. Alexandrova. - M .: AST: AST MOSCOW, 2008.

[19]   Levashov V.K. Socio-political stability of a society: theory, measurements, strategies. - M., 2010 . –P. 370.