

FORMATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL AMONG COUNTRY

Jakhona Karimova O'ktamjon qizi

3rd year student of Tashkent State Pedagogical
University named after Nizami

Annotation: Organizational ability is a person's ability to organize. A person's ability to be a leader largely depends on the development of his organizational and communicative qualities. A leader is a person who controls people, organizes them. The leader leads as long as he is in the given social role. The leader and the organizer are similar in fulfilling their roles, but the leader differs from the organizer in that he has more authority. For example, the leader of the youth parties, the leader of the youth movement. The following article looks into the formation of organizational skills and its importance in school life.

Key words: Organizational Ability, Leadership, Spiritual Growth, Professional Growth.

Introduction

State formation is the process of the development of a centralized government structure in a situation where one did not exist prior to its development. State formation has been a study of many disciplines of the social sciences for a number of years, so much so that Jonathan Haas writes that "One of the favorite pastimes of social scientists over the course of the past century has been to theorize about the evolution of the world's great civilizations." The study of state formation is divided generally into either the study of early states (those that developed in stateless societies) or the study of modern states (particularly of the form that developed in Europe in the 17th century and spread around the world). Academic debate about various theories is a prominent feature in fields like Anthropology, Sociology, Economics and Political Science. State formation can include state-building and nation-building.

States are minimally defined by anthropologist David S. Sandeford as socially stratified and bureaucratically governed societies with at least four levels of settlement hierarchy (e.g., a large capital, cities, villages, and hamlets). Primary states are those state societies that developed in regions where no states existed before. These states developed by strictly internal processes and interaction with other non-states societies. The exact number of cases which qualify as primary states is not clearly known because of limited information about political organization before the development of writing in many places, but Sandiford lists ten likely cases of primary state formation in Eurasia, the Americas, and the Pacific.

Studies on the formation of **early states** tend to focus on processes that create and institutionalize a state in a situation where a state did not exist before. Examples of early states which developed in interaction with other states include the Aegean Bronze Age Greek civilizations and the Malagasy civilization in Madagascar. Unlike primary state formation, early state formation does not require the creation of the first state in that cultural context or autonomous development, independently from state development nearby. Early state formation causation can thus include borrowing, imposition, and other forms of interaction with already existing states.

Voluntary theories contend that diverse groups of people came together to form states as a result of some shared rational interest. The theories largely focus on the development of agriculture, and the population and organizational pressure that followed and resulted in state formation. The argument is that such pressures result in integrative pressure for rational people to unify and create a state. Much of the social contract philosophical tradition proposed a voluntary theory for state formation.

One of the most prominent theories of early and primary state formation is the hydraulic hypothesis, which contends that the state was a result of the need to build and maintain large-scale irrigation projects. The theory was most significantly detailed by Karl August Wittfogel's argument that, in arid environments, farmers would be confronted by the production limits of small-scale irrigation. Eventually different agricultural producers would join together in response to population pressure and the arid environment, to create a state apparatus that could build and maintain large irrigation projects.

In addition to this, is what Carencro calls the automatic hypothesis, which contends that the development of agriculture easily produces conditions necessary for the development of a state? With surplus food stocks created by agricultural development, creation of distinct worker classes and a division of labor would automatically trigger creation of the state form.

A third voluntary hypothesis, particularly common with some explanations of early state development, is that long distance trade networks created an impetus for states to develop at key locations: such as ports or oases. For example, the increased trade in the 16th century may have been a key to state formation in West African states such as Whydah, Dahomey, and the Benin Empire.

In the medieval period (500-1400) in Europe, there were a variety of authority forms throughout the region. These included feudal lords, empires, religious authorities, free cities, and other authorities. Often dated to the Peace of Westphalia, there began to be the development in Europe of modern states with large-scale capacity for taxation, coercive control of their populations, and advanced bureaucracies. The state became prominent in Europe over the next few centuries before the particular form of the state spread to the rest of the world via the colonial and international pressures of the 19th century and 20th century. Other modern states developed in Africa and Asia prior to colonialism, but were largely displaced by colonial rule.

Political scientists, sociologists, and anthropologists began studying the state formation processes in Europe and elsewhere in the 17th century—beginning significantly with Max Weber. However, state formation became a primary interest in the 1970s. The question was often framed as a contest between state forces and society forces and the study of how the state became prominent over particular societies. A number of theories developed regarding state development in Europe. Other theories focused on the creation of states in late colonial and post-colonial societies. The lessons from these studies of the formation of states in the modern period are often used in theories about State-building. Other theories contend that the state in Europe was constructed in connection with peoples from outside Europe and that focusing on state formation in Europe as a foundation for study silences the diverse history of state formation.

Based on the model of European states, it has been commonly assumed that development is the natural path that states will eventually walk through. However, Herbst holds that in the case African states, as well as in developing countries of other regions, development need not be the natural step. States that struggle their consolidation could remain permanently weak.

There are three prominent categories of explanations for the emergence of the modern state as a dominant polity: (1) Security-based explanations that emphasize the role of warfare, (2) Economy-based explanations that emphasize trade, property rights and capitalism as drivers behind state formation, and (3) Institutionalist theories that sees the state as an organizational form that is better able to resolve conflict and cooperation problems than competing political organizations. According to Philip Gorski and Vivek Swaroop Sharma, the "neo-Darwinian" framework for the emergence of sovereign states is the dominant explanation in the scholarship. The neo-Darwinian framework emphasizes how the modern state emerged as the dominant organizational form through natural selection and competition.

According to Hendrik Spruyt, the modern state is different from its predecessor polities in two main aspects: (1) Modern states have greater capacity to intervene in their societies, and (2) Modern states are buttressed by the principle of international legal sovereignty and the juridical equivalence of states. The two features began to emerge in the Late Middle Ages but the modern state form took centuries to come firmly into fruition. Spruyt notes that sovereign equality did not become fully global until after World War II amid decolonization. Adom Getachew writes that it was not until Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples that the international legal context for popular sovereignty was instituted.

Reference

1. Sodirjonov M. M. ETHNOSOCIOLOGICAL FACTORS OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION IN MODERN UZBEKISTAN //ACTUAL ISSUES OF FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENTIFIC SPACE. - 2020. - PP. 27-34.
2. Sodirjonov M. M. THE ESSENCE OF SOCIAL CAPITAL CONSEQUENCES AND THEIR INFLUENCES TO THE MODERN SOCIETY //Bulletin of Science and Education. - 2020. - No. 2-2. - PP. 113-116.

3. Sodirjonov M. M. ETHNOSOCIOLOGICAL FACTORS OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION IN MODERN UZBEKISTAN //ACTUAL ISSUES OF FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENTIFIC SPACE. - 2020. - PP. 27-34.
4. Mahamadinovich S. M. The essence of social capital consequences and their influences to the modern society //Bulletin of Science and Education. – 2020. – №. 2-2 (80).
5. Sodirjonov M. M. Some Thoughts On The Evolution Of Approaches To The Concept Of Human Capital //The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations. - 2020. - Vol. 2. - No. 08. - Pp. 144-150.