

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access

COOPERATION OF STATE AND PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS IN THE FIGHT OF CORRUPTION

Arabov Baxtiyor Isomiddinovich

First Vice-Rector of Oriental University for Youth Affairs and Spiritual Educational Work, Uzbekistan

Abstract

The fight against corruption is a complex process, and only the participation of state bodies will not give the expected result. For an effective result, civil society institutions will also need to participate. The article analyzes the cooperation of state and community institutions in the fight against corruption.

Keywords Corruption, localism, cooperation, system, social institutions.

INTRODUCTION

According to the results of a sociological survey among the youth of Central Asia, there are three main problems in Kazakhstan: corruption 47.3%, unemployment 24.2%, and poverty 8.0%. For Kyrgyzstan: corruption 37.5%, unemployment 35.3%, poverty 8.5%. According to the youth of Tadjikistan: corruption is 42.0%, unemployment is 17.9%, and poverty is 12.0%. Answers of respondents from Uzbekistan: unemployment 44.0%, corruption 17.8%, employment 5.9%. The results of the sociological survey show that the problem of corruption is high in the region and requires systematic work to eliminate it.

If we look at the experience of countries that have achieved effective results in the fight against corruption and curbed corruption, we can see that civil society institutions are one of the main participants in the fight against corruption and the government in these countries. In general, the effectiveness of the fight against corruption cannot be achieved without the participation of civil society institutions.

The role of civil society institutions in the fight against corruption is manifested, first of all, in

determining the risk of corruption. The fact is that the threat of corruption is not considered a crime, and the state has not established responsibility for allowing it. However, the risk of corruption is always perceived negatively by the society, including civil society institutions, and the society, in turn, reacts to it accordingly. The reason is that the first corruption complications are first felt in society.

Researchers also put forward their approaches in this regard. In particular, according to A. Tursunov, "Analysis shows that the general public plays an important role in exposing corruption. In this regard, it is possible to cite many examples of cases of corruption that were not detected by state agencies and were exposed by the general public. At that time, there were bodies with special powers to determine the facts of corruption. This is because the public and the media cannot be deceived and misled. No matter how hidden it is, corrupt people try to hide such facts. Society and mass media will also learn about the facts of corruption".

In addition, it should be noted that one of the

important means of limiting or preventing corruption is transparency and accountability. The reason is that corruption always happens secretly. It takes root well in a space where transparency does not exist. Transparency cannot be ensured by the government itself without influencing the society. The issue of responsibility is the object and subject of such corruption, and a member of society. Society's sense of this responsibility prevents the individual from corruption.

Another aspect of the role of civil society institutions in forming an intolerant attitude towards any form of corruption is that corruption is not accepted by society as a normal social norm. If the society fights for this alone and the government or civil servant turns a blind eye to corruption or encourages it, then slowly the members of the society accept it as a normal situation or rather as a social norm. Now society is starting to get used to it instead of fighting against it. From this point of view, the firm attitude of the public to any form of corruption is extremely important in the fight against corruption.

In a word, civil society institutions should represent a comprehensive mechanism of formation, development, and implementation of society's opportunities and potential in the fight against corruption.

In addition, the public's reaction to corruption must be based on effective public pressure. As noted by A. Tursunov, although public pressure is not considered legal support, it makes it possible to implement civil initiatives in the fight against corruption, to effectively influence the actions of state bodies and officials .

At the same time, the effective participation of the society and institutions under its influence in the fight against corruption is determined by several aspects. In particular, according to A.Tursunov, the following is necessary for the effective participation of civil society institutions in the fight against corruption:

first, the society itself must realize the need for active participation of the public in the fight against corruption;

secondly, the state should encourage the

participation of civil society institutions in the fight against corruption;

thirdly, it is necessary to increase the role of the mass media in the fight against corruption, to constantly support their activities. In this regard, independent special mass media, at least programs covering issues of the fight against corruption, are important;

fourthly, it is necessary to develop cooperation between state and civil society institutions in the fight against corruption” .

At the same time, society always realizes or strives for the need to fight against corruption. In this regard, the government's initiative and intolerance to corruption are more important. Only after society feels this in practice, it starts to show its intolerance against corruption.

The authorities show their intolerance to corruption with the following efforts. First of all, the authorities need to coordinate the forces in the fight against corruption, that is, the capabilities of society and the authorities, and to monitor cooperation. These are important components of a comprehensive national anti-corruption strategy. Coordination will have to go both ways. The first is policy coordination in this regard, and the second is coordination of activities for its implementation. At the same time, monitoring and analyzing the implementation of anti-corruption plans and studying the level of corruption is also an important mission.

At the same time, there are tendencies to form specialized institutions that fight against corruption as representatives of the authorities. Researchers note the following as its main models:

☒ multi-purpose anti-corruption agencies with powers, law enforcement bodies, as well as institutions performing preventive functions are shown;

☒ appear as anti-corruption law enforcement bodies or anti-corruption departments in the law enforcement structure;

☒ corruption prevention, policy development, and coordination institutions appear as institutions that coordinate anti-corruption efforts

The first model represents a complex approach to problem-solving and is therefore significant.

The second model appears as a part of the existing anti-corruption institution and mainly uses force as part of the system. But in this case, one of the important missions of the specialized institute is repressive punishment rather than prevention.

In the third model, it is mainly an independent institution and is considered more strategic in the fight against corruption.

Institutions created according to the third model have the most diverse forms and differ in their organizational structure and degree of freedom. At the same time, according to the third model, the following types of institutions can be distinguished: 1) research institutes, studying corruption as a phenomenon, studying the risk of corruption in various fields. Areas of public life and improvement of legislation in this regard are also their main directions; 2) inspection of the conflict-of-interest control institutions and property declaration of civil servants; 3) commissions for coordination and monitoring of anti-corruption strategies and action plans, etc. In general, the above are the competent bodies of the state in the fight against corruption, and they differ based on their powers, duties, and the level of corruption in the state. Importantly, in the above models, society also appears as a helper in the fight against corruption.

Accountability and transparency are another aspect that encourages effective cooperation

between the state and society in the fight against corruption. It is this cooperation that limits any state institution from having absolute freedom. It restrains them in a certain sense.

However, the problem is that it is important to raise the above principles to the level of value in the state. For this, strong pressure from society on the authorities is required, and effective reforms are required from the authorities. In addition, in the matter of accountability, the government's accountability to itself may be more "independent". That is, the government cannot be accountable to itself, and it will not be effective. The government needs to be accountable to the society. Transparency is manifested more in the activities of the authorities, but the influence, request, and demand of the society play an important role in ensuring it. Two important institutions of society play a big role in this. They are mass media and NGOs.

REFERENCE

1. Социальные технологии: учебные пособие для бакалавриата и магистратуры / под ред. И.Б.Орловой. – М.: Юрайт, 2019.
2. Турсунов А.Участие институтов гражданского общества в борьбе с коррупцией// Том 1 № 1 (2021).
3. Горан Клеменчич, Янек Стусек Специализированные институты по борьбе с коррупцией: обзор моделей <https://www.oecd.org/corruption/acn/39972100.pdf>