Theoretical analysis of the social characteristics of corruption

Aripov Alisher Sayfiddinovich

Independent Researcher of The Department Of "Social Sciences" Of Navai State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract: The social characteristics of corruption and the specific importance of its prevention, the results of identifying corruption through a philosophical approach, the negative impact of corruption on social life, and philosophical methods for eliminating it are described.

Keywords: Social characteristics of corruption, fight against corruption, prevention of corruption, negative impact of corruption.

Introduction: The nature of corruption, its causes and consequences, and anti-corruption measures are the subject of constant debate. The complexity and multifaceted nature of this phenomenon largely determine the research difficulties that arise in its study, and also create certain difficulties in its precise definition.

The analysis attempts to show in detail the essence of the phenomenon of corruption as a social phenomenon and reveal its main features. First of all, it should be noted that, in our opinion, in order to methodologically simplify the study of the phenomenon of corruption, it is appropriate to distinguish two meanings of its understanding - broad and narrow.

At the same time, it should be immediately noted here that such a division has already been made. In the broad sense, it is understood as the use of a social position for personal gain, for personal gain, and in the narrow sense, as the giving of a bribe to an official. This division does not fully correspond to the goals and objectives of our study and therefore differs from the given definition.

In the narrow sense, we understand corruption itself, that is, the taking of bribes, giving bribes or any other conduct by a person in charge in the public or private

sector, which violates his obligations arising from his official position as a public figure, private employee, independent worker or other similar status, and is aimed at obtaining an illegal advantage for any person.

We introduce the following meaning into the broad aspect of corruption: this is a certain system of informal relations that replace the formal relations in social relations between an official and an addressee and are based on a violation of the rules of permissible behavior.

As can be seen from the proposed definition, we consider corruption in a broad socio-philosophical sense and as a relationship between individuals included in a certain network of interactions, that is, as a social relationship and as some structural disposition that is mastered by an individual in his interaction with society.

The thesis that corruption is always reciprocal seems obvious to us. This assumption is based on the etymology of the word "corruption" mentioned in the previous chapter, which comes from the Latin word soggishrege.

At the same time, a number of researchers have expressed the opinion that the presence of a second party - a counterparty - is not at all necessary for the implementation of a corrupt act. In this sense, corruption is understood as a violation of moral, socially significant norms, a deviation of a person's behavior from universal human norms.

We have already decided in this section that we will consider corruption as a relationship between individuals. For us, corruption is, first of all, one of the parties to the relationship, in which an official is one of the parties, "but not all, but only those who have an administrative function and therefore have the opportunity to use the shortcomings of the system for personal corruption purposes." On the other hand, he is opposed by a subject interested in receiving certain services (goods, etc.).

It should be noted that considering corruption as a relationship between two subjects does not deny the existence of the other side - society. Despite the fact that society is not directly involved in the act of corruption, its implementation is carried out at the expense of a corrupted society.

By social relations we understand the system of various relations that arise between individuals in the process of their economic, social, political activities. However, despite the fact that the relations under study are essentially interpersonal relations, we distinguish them from personal relations, that is, relations based on direct contacts, the purpose of which is to know a

person, his essence, moral experiences. Here we follow Engels, who, speaking of the relationship between workers and capitalists, noted that "the relationship of the producer to the worker is not human, but exclusively economic."

Thus, participants, most often, in corrupt interactions, see each other not as a means of obtaining material wealth or profit, but as individuals (a slightly different interaction occurs in corrupt practices such as blat).

In other words, during a corruption intervention, society can be conditionally divided into two large unstable social groups: the corrupt, that is, those who have the ability to manage resources, while seeking personal gain, and the corrupt, that is, those who are trying to obtain this or that resource, taking advantage of the corrupter's desire to get rich.

A distinctive feature of the described phenomenon is the variability, instability, dynamics, constant changeability of the indicated social groups. The same person can act in different ways. At a certain moment, an employee acts in accordance with the role of a corrupter, and at the next moment - as a corrupter.

We believe that the social relations of individuals with each other are determined primarily by interests, which depend on the place of each individual participant in the social hierarchy and determine the incentives and direction of activity. The interests of individuals may or may not coincide, and therefore, in our opinion, these two groups exist dialectically. If this interaction is beneficial or necessary for both groups, social relations are expressed in cooperation.

If there is no urgent need or the requirements of representatives of one social group in relation to representatives of the other are too high, then representatives of these groups enter into antagonistic relations, a conflict of interests arises. In our opinion, such conflicts are permissible only if these requirements are met by one of the participants in the corrupt interaction. Otherwise, that is, if it is impossible to resolve the conflict in this way, this will lead to the exposure of one of the participants in the corrupt interaction.

In addition, some authors understand corruption as a situation in which the person (or employee) involved has reasons to object to the implementation of a corrupt act and therefore brings corruption to light. For example, analyzing the causes of corruption in France, V. Ruggiero formulated his own approach to this problem. In his opinion, only the corrupt actions of some of the above participants, which cause discontent, force them to "implement" it and declare it corruption.

It should be noted here that if there is no interest on the

part of one of the participants, then corruption relations do not arise. So, for example, an official who refuses to take a bribe does not enter into the relationship of corrupt - corrupt participants. On the contrary, the applicant, unwilling to give a bribe, does not become a corrupt employee. Therefore, in the described cases, such social relations as corruption do not arise.

Of course, the above-described scheme of the emergence of corruption as a social relationship is essentially an ideal model, since often the corrupt person has no choice but to give a bribe to solve certain problems. At the same time, we emphasize that such a solution to local problems ultimately leads to the collapse of the social system as a whole and should not be considered by individuals as the only possible mechanism for implementing their ideas and solving problems with magical power.

Here we can highlight another feature characterizing corruption: its hierarchy. Of course, corrupt officials cannot act without the implicit consent (and sometimes with full approval) of top management. Examples of investigations in the field of combating corruption indicate that the majority of employees of some military commissariats, specific battalions of the road and post service, hospitals, educational institutions, etc. are involved in corrupt practices.

The interaction scheme between the management level (A) and its subordinates (P) often looks like this: P, having received a certain profit from a corrupt employee, divides it with A, and A, in turn, transfers part of the funds to the top management (B). At the same time, A and B try to protect both themselves and their subordinates. In other words, this scheme actually acts as a rent for the opportunity to carry out corrupt practices.

At the same time, it should be noted that the above-mentioned interaction scheme can take on other features in cases where some significant profit is obtained and its "fruits" are used. At the same time, in such interactions, the hierarchical structure of the corruption network is not violated: and thus the level of loyalty to its activities by P is maintained.

In addition, we can talk about the extreme density of ties that characterize this type of social relations, where the transition from one social group to another can be carried out with almost one hundred percent success rate. The simplicity of this transition is largely determined by the nature of corruption. As noted above, corruption is a system of informal relations. In other words, corruption is systemic. Therefore, we need to define the concept of a system - "a system is a finite set of interacting elements" . The elements of

this system are individuals. Moving within this system (horizontally and vertically), they create new ties within it.

REFERENCES

Кузьминов Я. Говорим - власть, подразумеваем - коррупция // Московские новости. 1999. № 45.23-29 ноября.

Miller S.,Roberts P., Spence E. Corruption and Anti-corrruption: An applied philosophical approach (Basic Ethics in Action), 2004.

Руджиеро В. Франция как проявление недовольства // Коррупция и бюрократизм: истоки и пути преодоления. М. 1998. С. 58.

Аверьянов А.Н. «Системное познание мира». М., 1985. С. 43