



Research Article

SOME CONCEPTS AND RECRUITMENT PARADIGMS OF THE POLITICAL ELITE

Submission Date: March 26, 2022, **Accepted Date:** April 03, 2022,

Published Date: April 16, 2022

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/social-fsshj-02-04-01>

Journal Website:
<https://frontlinejournal.s.org/journals/index.php/fsshj>

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

Khayrullo Tukhtaboev

Researcher, Department of Civil Society and Legal Education, National University of Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The article deals with priority issues and analytical issues of the theory of elites in the studies of the political elite by foreign and Uzbek scientists. Also, within the framework of elite theories, the modern character of the emerging Uzbek elite and some problems and ways to solve it are analyzed.

KEYWORDS

Society, state, government, elite, political elite, recruitment, nomenclature, leader, management, position, personnel.

INTRODUCTION

In political science, the term “elite” was introduced in 1897 by the Italian economist and

sociologist Vilfredo Pareto. After the term came into being, his compatriot Gaetano Mosca

developed the “ruling class theory” in 1881 and introduced the concept of “political class,” which is synonymous with the term “elitism,” into scientific circulation. In modern political science, the term “elite” is firmly entrenched in the works of American political scientist Harold Dwight Lasswell.

Although the concept of “elite” originally originated in other countries in ancient times, by the early twentieth century, as a result of research by political scientists Sorel and Pareto, it had become widespread in French political science. Even during the crisis of the tribal system, views were formed on the division of society into such qualities as high and low, noble and common people, aristocracy and common people. Such views were especially analyzed in the works of Confucius. Later, in the works of Plato, Pharoah, Machiavelli, Carleil, and Nietzsche, he was also given important prominence. But the elite theory was not deeply grounded in them. Elite theory was founded in the late 19th and early 20th centuries by Gaetano Mosca, Wilfredo Pareto, and Robert Michels [1. 283].

Modern political science refers to political elite as a small number of privileged groups, ie a group that has the necessary capacity to conduct active

political activity and is able to directly or indirectly influence decision-making and implementation with the help of political power.

The term elite translate from French to mean “selected”. In everyday life it acquires two different meanings. In this sense, “elite” is used in the form of phrases such as “elite grain”, “elite horse”, “elite army”, “elite variety”. Similar interpretations have been applied to the aristocracy (“aristos” meaning “elite power”), which emerged as elite in slavery and feudal societies [2. 279].

Mosca is derived from the principles of the model of permanentism, which states that human society does not change in its essence, despite changes in its ideological and social views. Hence, Mosca hypothesized that the power structure of society was fundamentally the same in both ancient and modern times. In any society, there is a ruling, political class. is. In his view, this class has its own variable characteristics of grief in any society. If the qualities of the elite, such as self-identification, self-awareness, are left aside, then only a purely technological and functional description of it will remain.



LITERATURE REVIEW

The term “elite” became popular in political science in the early twentieth century due to the work of Sorel and Pareto. However, it should be noted that the first ideas about political elites did not appear only during this period. In ancient times, that is, during the collapse of the tribal system, there were views that society was divided into upper and lower classes, the nobility and the common people, the aristocrats and the common people. In the works of Confucius, Plato, Machiavelli, Carlyle, Nietzsche, these ideas were logically substantiated and developed. However, such elite theories needed serious scientific analysis. Such modern, classical theories about elites appeared in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Their origin is associated with the names of Gaetano Mosca, Vilfredo Pareto and Robert Michels.

The study of the elite and its impact on the development of society goes back many centuries. Different eras and national cultures predetermined the diversity of research and the different theoretical schools that elites study. The foundations of elite theory, its basic principles were first developed by G. Mosca, V. Pareto, R.

Michels, M. Weber and a number of other elitologists. The services of the founders of this direction of the social sciences, first of all, in revealing the inevitability of the division of any society into elite and majority, to determine the causes of this division, the group of managers is the object of scientific research.

As a result of changes in society, the dominance of one of these two types of elites will be undermined, says V. Pareto. For example, if the dominance of “foxes” is effective in the quiet stages of history, they become useless when decisive action and force are required. Because their indecision exacerbates discontent in society. At such times, the counterrevolution (“lions”) in society intensifies, mobilizing the power of the people, overthrowing the ruling elite and establishing its own dominance.

Another scholar who contributed to the development of the theory of the political elite, Robert Michels, studied the social mechanisms that led to the elitism of society. While Robert Michels agrees with G. Mosca in interpreting the reasons for elitism, he emphasizes organizational skills. According to him, the organizational structures of society themselves serve to strengthen the elite, to raise the status of the



ruling class. Robert Michels concludes that the structure of society requires elitism and that the existence of elites is a law.

The idea that the "iron law of the oligarchy" applies in society also belongs to R. Michels. He expressed his views in "Political Parties. Essay on Oligarchic Trends in Democracy" (1911). According to the Iron Law of the Oligarchy, an integral sign of the development of society - the structure of large organizations - inevitably leads to the concentration of power in the hands of a minority (oligarchization) and the formation of an elite. Because not all of its members can participate in the management of such large organizations. The scientific works of G. Mosca, V. Pareto and R. Michels gave a detailed and comprehensive description of the category of political elite, showing its main features. For this reason, these scientists were recognized as the founders of elitology - a special scientific direction that studies the social strata that carry out political governance. In their scientific work, criteria have been identified that allow to distinguish and evaluate modern elite theories.

In recent years, practical research of political elites has been developing rapidly, on the basis of empirical materials analyzed the formation and

activities of the elite in various political systems, including the states of administrative-administrative socialism. The ruling class of these countries has been actively studied by Western scholars and their colleagues in some socialist countries, primarily in terms of criticizing its nomenclature feature.

Peculiarities of elite recruitment have become a research topic of CIS researchers, sociological portraits of elites, peculiarities of transforming the former Soviet nomenclature into modern elites, regional elite activities, elite institutionalization process and customer relations in new elite structures are analyzed.

The methodology of studying the mechanism of participation of the elite as a social group in the process of democratization of political life in Uzbekistan is to some extent in scientific research conducted by the following scientists N.Jo'raev, R.Jumaev, M. Kyrgyzbaev, A.Qodirov, I.Saifnazarov, Q.Quranbaev, U.Idirov, T.Alimardonov, H.Akhmedov, G.Jamolova, O.Jumaev, M.Mullajonova, I.Ergashev, A.Begmatov, M.Qirgizbaev, A.Sagdullaev, N.Komilov, A.Kholbekov, Sh.Paxrutdinov, T.Jo'raev, M.Bekmurodov, D.Rahimova, E.Nabiev, I.Mahmudov, B.Mirboboev, N.Boymurodov,

power in its own hands, and taking advantage of the privileges granted. The second class, on the other hand, is numerous, governed and managed by the former, and provides it (the former) with the material means necessary for the survival of the political organism” [3. 77-84].

Mosca made an in-depth analysis of the formation of the political elite and its peculiarities. He emphasizes that the elite is also distinguished from the rest of society by its material, spiritual and intellectual superiority.

Emphasizing the solidarity of the ruling class and their high place in public life, Mosca calls them a “political class”. This class tends to change on a regular basis. Two directions can be observed in its development: aristocratic and democratic. The first direction is manifested in the desire of the political class to pass from generation to generation as a legacy in practice, even if it is not legal. The predominance of the aristocratic direction leads to the “closure” of this class, its disintegration and, ultimately, social stagnation. As a result, the struggle of new social forces seeking a humble position in society will intensify.

At the end of the 19th century, G. Mosca was among those who made a worthy contribution to this process during the formation of political science. Mosca articulated his political concept in *Fundamentals of Political Science*. According to this concept, society is divided into two classes: management class and managed class. The ruling class is under the control of the ruling class without being sufficiently organized to form a majority in any country, recognizing the legitimacy of its rule as well as the acquisition of a violent character. Mosca has not yet used the term “Elite”. Instead, he used the terms “ruling class” and “managed class”. Political (belonging to the ruling class is determined by G. Mosca’s attitude to wealth, origin, church hierarchy, personal qualities, military courage, mastery of the art of management, etc.) [4. 114].

While Mosca’s theory of political class had a strong influence on the development of elite ideas, it was criticized for its absoluteness of the political factor and insufficient attention to the economy. Although such an approach is not very appropriate for modern pluralistic societies, it should be noted that the theory of “political class” is reflected in many totalitarian states. In these countries, economic and other spheres of social

life were subordinated to politics. A bureaucratic nomenclature similar to the “political class” described by Mosca has emerged. In totalitarian states, those who were part of the political nomenklatura, close to power and government, gained both economic and social dominance as a “ruling class”.

Vilfredo Pareto, like Mosca, said: “The world has always been ruled and ruled by a select minority called the elite. Those who are part of the elite are distinguished by their psychological (innate) and social (acquired as a result of upbringing and education) features.” In his Treatise on General Sociology, he writes: “Whether some theorists like it or not, human society is not the same and people are physically, spiritually and mentally different.” In his view, a group of people whose activities in a particular field are distinguished by their efficiency and high performance constitute an elite.

In V. Pareto’s theory, the elite is divided into dominant and non-dominant - counter-elite. When the ruling elite participates directly or indirectly (but effectively) in governance, the counter-elite is made up of people with elite-specific qualities, but they are deprived of the right to govern because of their social status and

various barriers to lower classes in society. He stressed that internal solidarity, cohesiveness, the constant struggle to maintain its dominance are the hallmarks of the ruling elite. Developing the theory of the scientist N. Machiavelli, the development of society, in his opinion, there are two main types of elites: Occurs as a result of the occasional exchange of “foxes” (clever leaders who use “flexible” management methods such as negotiation, concessions, courtesy, flattery, and persuasion) and “lions” (mostly tough and determined leaders who rely on power) [5. 8-29].

Elite degradation is the process of losing the status of elite groups associated with global social dysfunction: the elite group can no longer dominate the old ways and offer new ways to suit the masses. Elite degradation rates vary, and degradation can occur in both evolutionary and revolutionary forms. However, one thing remains common: a new elite group will not come to power until the old one has functionally finished itself.

It is well known that V. Pareto showed that the social system strives for equilibrium and will return to it over time when it is unbalanced. The process of oscillations in the system and its return to the “normal state” of equilibrium constitute a

social cycle; the course of the cycle depends on the circulatory nature of the elites. Pareto sought to depict the historical process in the form of a perpetual circulation of the main species of the elite [6. 13].

In our view, the circulation of the elite is a complex concept. Often this process hides various components within itself, leading to uncertainty in its use. The context of the concept of elite circulation should also always explain what it actually means. In many respects, this situation was the result of a number of inconsistencies in the works of V. Pareto, the multiplicity of interpretations of his views by different authors.

Indeed, the circulation of the elite as a concept has the following meanings: 1) as a social circulation, it is understood as the replacement (alteration) of the social substrate of the elite. 2) political circulation, understood as circulation within the elite - the process of changing groups within the ruling elite that exercises power.

Social circulation is the most basic process that characterizes the dynamics of the elite as the major social groups that exercise power in society. In the context of social circulation, we

distinguish two different processes: the change of the elite and the renewal of the elite.

The change of elites is a very rare process in history, consisting of the change in power of historically certain types of elites. These shifts are primarily related to significant shifts in the development of technologies that will lead to industries or even new economic structures that make up the new system. Under their influence, the formation of social groups that form the social basis of new networks takes place. The new subelites that emerge at their base begin to fight for power in order to secure more comfortable positions of power for themselves.

Other criteria may include: 1) changes in the recruitment pool of the ruling elite; 2) the repetition of social practices specific to the new elite group by the entire ruling elite or its majority; 3) change the structure of the ruling elite by renewing its elements. The “mercenaries” do not necessarily constitute the majority of the ruling elite, they can determine the policy of the ruling elite, and the ruling group of the ruling elite, in general, can reproduce itself; 4) change in the social carrier of elite functions, mainly, the social carrier of elite functions is based on new technologies, industries, new technological rules

or new methods of domination; 5) A new philosophical and ideological rationale is being formed for the new elite group, which can often be incorporated into the old forms, adapting to the old elite to formally maintain continuity [7. 14-15].

The existence of many approaches to elite theory today, especially in the study of the elite of societies in transition, is explained not only by the objective reasons for the development of elitology, but also by the subjective factor of nature. Therefore, they sometimes act as clients of real elitological research, in which the real world is “modeled” taking into account their political attitudes.

The concept of “political elite” is explained by everyone in the same way as the concept of “elite” because there are different criteria for studying them. The multiplicity of definitions of this concept is due to the fact that political elites are constantly growing in the course of their historical development. For example, G. Ashin explained that the political elite is a unique social community, albeit different, combined with similarities of values, stereotypes and norms of behavior, referring to those who make political strategic decisions [8. 88-84]. Another Russian

researcher, O.V. Krishtanovskaya calls the country’s political elite people who make national decisions: the country’s top leadership, government, parliament, and regional elite.

G. Lasswell described the elite very broadly, including “members of the opposition with great political influence, with whom officials have to reckon” [9] According to the theory of the elites of G. Mosca and V. Pareto, the elite is formed as a political class through social procedures such as inheritance, co-optation, choice / election. They argued that the real elite was exactly the ruling elite and that under certain conditions it could be replaced by the counter-elite (i.e. the opposition). According to V. Pareto, “there are two sub-classes in the main class: the ruling and non-ruling elites” [10. 163-165].

According to the pluralistic approach to elite theory (V. Pareto, P. Bakhrach), in democratic societies there are at least two elites - the ruling and the non-ruling (opposition elite), among whom there is constant competition, the results of which are determined by elections. The Russian researcher M.A. Cheshkov, taking into account the elites of developing countries, considered the attitude to the system of power as a whole as one of its features, and thus divided the



elite into dominant and “dependent-elite”. In fact, for a politician, skill and professionalism, the ability to respond to criticism correctly and in a timely manner, the ability to work with specific people rather than with a non-personal electorate, and the ability to make decisions are very important qualities.

British political scientist J. Willerton stressed that it is impossible to avoid sponsorship in recruiting new members and even promoting them among the elite in developed countries. And the Russian political scientist O.V. Krishtanovskaya describes clients as a system of informal political relations. It is also important to study kinship among them in research on political elites. For example, the Italian political scientist and sociologist V. Pareto described the social stratification of society in the form of a pyramid, with a small elite at the top and a base of the majority of the population.

As R. Mills, a well-known American sociologist on the left, points out, there will be a certain minority in any society that has power, dominates within the ruling institutions, and is distinguished by three main characteristics: unity, uniformity of formation, and aristocracy. This group, according to R. Mills, actually opposes the majority, which

has no influence on the government, and manipulates it in its own interests.

The renewal of the elite is manifested as follows:

1) by a partial renewal of the personal composition of the elite groups. Both with this natural demographic process, situational factors may be associated with the influx of representatives of new subgroups that have emerged under the influence of certain social processes; 2) Partial update of the set of elite subgroups. As a rule, this is due to the natural processes of development of new production, which is carried out on the basis of demographic, economic, geographical factors; 3) the emergence of new social practices in the ruling elite that are marginal, “exotic”, “inappropriate”, even perceived as criminals in a certain system of moral coordinates, etc; 4) the emergence of new alternative ideologies that reflect the views of subelite groups.

The renewal of the elite will inevitably become a process of elite exchange. In this sense, the renewal of the elite is a “piecemeal” change of the elite. The renewal of elites always works as the longest process in their cycle, before the relatively dynamic process of elite change. These processes are interdependent and

interdependent, and the renewal of elites manifests itself as a natural precursor to the exchange of elites.

The process of evolution is seen as a continuous, slow but steady ongoing transformation (according to V. Pareto) over many years and long periods [11. 314]. However, there are certain differences between evolution and transformation. If the evolution of the ruling elite as a process goes through a gradual change of individual representatives of the ruling elite, the transformation is a specific evolutionary process consisting of changes in the internal conditions of a historical type of elite.

CONCLUSIONS

Modern theories of the political elite have deep scientific and philosophical foundations that date back to the time of the ancient world (Confucius, Plato, Aristotle). It was then that the foundations of a theoretical understanding of the nature of political law were laid, and the criteria for their professionalism and the effectiveness of government were formed. This tradition continued during the medieval Renaissance. In substantiating the initial concept of inequality, N. Machiavelli argues that the elitism of any society

makes the relations of domination and subordination absolute, that it is up to the ruling groups to retain power by all means.

The elite is characterized in different ways: individuals who have the highest performance in the relevant field of activity (V. Pareto); the most active political people oriented to power (G. Mosca); individuals with the greatest prestige, wealth, status in society (G. Lasswell); individuals with a high sense of responsibility (X. Ortega and Gasset); individuals in power in organizations and institutions determine their lives in society (T. Dai); a narrow group of people who held leading positions in the political, economic, and cultural life of a society (T. Dai, H. Ziegler), and others. There are other approaches to the definition of the term under study.

We can draw conclusions based on a brief analysis of the theories of political elites. The theory of political elites under consideration can be considered as an open structure, representatives of society, based on the concepts that they fight to protect oligarchic elite groups of a closed type.

The society is already acting as a communication rival of the elite that can offer its own alternative



agenda. Hence, the development vector of modern theories of the political elite depends on the dynamics of the democratization process and the features observed in their development. Such theories began to consider the peculiarities of power in an increasingly informed society. Recently, in the context of the evolving information society, more and more attention is being paid to the process of democratization of elites. The transition to this new reality requires the elite to rebuild the old (traditional) value system.

The elite is characterized in different ways: individuals who have the highest performance in the relevant field of activity (V. Pareto); the most active political people oriented to power (G. Mosca); individuals with the greatest prestige, wealth, status in society (G. Lasswell); individuals with a high sense of responsibility (X. Ortega and Gasset); individuals in power in organizations and institutions determine their lives in society (T. Dai); a narrow group of people who have taken leading positions in the political, economic, and cultural life of a society (T. Dai, H. Ziegler), and others.

REFERENCES

1. Kirgizbaev M. Poliology. –Tashkent: Yangi asr avlodi, 2013. –p. 283
2. Kyrgyzbaev M. Poliology. –Tashkent: Yangi asr avlodi, 2013. –p. 279
3. Fundamentals of political elitology. Textbook / Ashin K., Ponedelkov A.V., Ignatov V.G., Starostin A.M. -M.: PRIOR, 1999. -pp. 77-84.
4. Political science. Aliev B. and others. – Tashkent: “Adib” publishing house, 2010.- p. 114
5. Zotov A. Pareto elite theory: its formation and connection with modern elitology / Ed. ed. A.V. Duka. St. Petersburg: Intersotspress, 2011, -pp. 8-29.
6. Power and elites / Ch. ed. A.V. Duka. T. 1. St. Petersburg: Intersocis, 2014.- p.13
7. Power and elites / Ch. ed. A.V. Duka. T. 1. St. Petersburg: Intersocis, 2014.- p.14-15
8. Fundamentals of political elitology. Textbook / Ashin K., Ponedelkov A.V., Ignatov V.G., Starostin A.M. -M.: PRIOR, 1999. -pp. 77-84.
9. Lasswell G. D. The language of power // Political Linguistics. Yekaterinburg, 2006. Issue. 20

10. Fundamentals of political science. Part I.-
M.: Lomonosov Moscow State University,
1996. -pp. 163-165.
11. Pareto V. Compendium of General
Sociology. – Moscow: - p. 314.
12. Karimov, N. R. (2020). A True Successor of
Great Central Asian Scholars. Journal
«Bulletin Social-Economic and
Humanitarian Research,(7), 62-69.
13. Doniyorov, A., & Karimov, N. (2020). An
incomparable book of a great scholar.
Bulletin Social-Economic and
Humanitarian Research, (8), 63-71.
14. Tashanov, A. (2022). Opinions of Central
Asian Thinkers on Educational
Leadership. International Journal of Early
Childhood Special Education, 14(1).
15. Tashanov, A. (2015). THE EFFECT OF
CONSTRUCTIVE AND DESTRUCTIVE
IDEAS AND IDEOLOGIES IN SOCIETY.
Theoretical & Applied Science, (9), 172-
174.