

THE ROLE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE PROPORTIONAL ELECTORAL SYSTEM IN THE MODERNIZATION AND DEMOCRATIZATION OF SOCIETY

Bekzod Djamiev

PhD, Associate professor, Tashkent state named after Islam Karimov technical university Almalyk branch, Uzbekistan

KEYWORD

majoritarian electoral system, modernization, democracy, democratic elections, political party, multi-party system.

ABSTRACT

This article examines the role and importance of the majoritarian electoral system in terms of its impact on the modernization of political institutions and the strengthening of democratic processes. The article pays special attention to how the majoritarian electoral system contributes to the development of political culture, citizen participation in political life and representation of power.

INTRODUCTION

The introduction of a majoritarian electoral system plays an important role in organizing elections and forming a political system in which the winner receives the majority of votes in a given electoral district. This method of election is of great importance for the development and strengthening of a democratic society. It helps to ensure direct representation of voters, stability of government, and the formation of effective parliamentary structures.

The majoritarian electoral system (derived from the French word “majorite”, meaning majority) is the first electoral system in history. According to it, the candidate who received the largest number of votes of voters in the relevant electoral district is elected. Depending on the degree, majoritarian systems based on a relative, absolute, and a specified majority (qualified majority) vote are distinguished. In a majoritarian electoral system based on a relative majority vote, the candidate who received the largest number of votes among the other candidates participating in the election in the relevant electoral district is considered elected (for example, the USA, Great Britain). In a plurality system based on the absolute majority of the voters, a candidate who receives more than 50 percent (50% + 1) of the total number of votes cast is recognized as elected (for example, France, Russia, Kazakhstan). In some cases, a plurality system based on a specified supermajority (qualified majority) is used.

<https://aimjournals.com/index.php/tprjms>

In this case, candidates who receive two-thirds or three-quarters of the total votes are considered to have won the election (for example, Chile, Azerbaijan).

In a plurality system, a minimum number of voters may be set for the election to be considered valid. Until 2024, elections to the Oliy Majlis in Uzbekistan were held based on the majority electoral system. According to Article 44 of the Law “On Elections to the Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan”, 33 percent of voters are required to participate in the election for it to be valid.

Uzbekistan has a single-member majority system of elections that will be in effect until 2024, meaning that a candidate who receives more than half of the votes cast is considered elected. If no candidate receives an absolute majority, a runoff election is held between the two candidates who received the most votes [1].

International experience shows that an open and transparent electoral system is essential for strengthening the role of political parties, increasing the political activity of citizens, and ensuring cohesion between the state and society.

After all, election is an important sign of a Democratic state. In developed countries of the world, there are successfully tested electoral procedures, within which, especially in the experience of State Construction, the most productive use of the mojaritarian, proportional and mixed types of the electoral system is made.

Until 2024, the electoral processes in our country were held in a non-partisan manner, and the deputies of the legislative chamber were elected on the basis of this electoral system, that is, in a territorial single-mandate district.

The practice of the period in force in Uzbekistan and the experience of foreign countries in general, along with the positive aspects of the conflict electoral system, are showing a number of self-serving disadvantages.

In particular, in the formation of the parliament, the votes of the voters, and not each of the votes cast, are taken into account, but the votes cast for the winning candidate. That is, on the basis of the will of the citizens who elected the winning candidate, representative bodies are formed, and the votes of the remaining voters will not matter [2].

The Mojaritar electoral system differs from the proportional electoral system in that the winner receives a separate electoral district mandate, usually the candidate with the highest number of votes. This system has its own characteristics and significance for the democratic structure of society:

Direct representation: in a conflict electoral system, voters choose a specific representative for their territory. This facilitates direct contact between the voters and the elected MP, strengthening the connection between the population and its representatives.

Political stability: since most systems often contribute to the formation of two-party or two-block

systems, they can provide a more stable government. Parties can form a clear majority in parliament, which simplifies decision-making and the implementation of political programs.

Accountability system: in most systems, it is often easier to identify and punish ineffective or corrupt political leaders. Voters can more easily assess the work of their representative and decide on his re-election in the next election.

Increased voter participation: in conflict systems, each vote is more relevant in determining election results in individual districts. This may encourage voters to participate more actively in elections, as their vote directly affects the result in their district.

Conflict electoral systems help to better represent the interests of regional communities, as constituencies can be structured taking into account geographical and cultural characteristics. However, most systems may also have disadvantages, such as the lack of proportional representation and the possibility of violating voters' actual privileges due to restrictions on the diversity of political views in Parliament. It can also lead to the neglect of Minority Interests and the escalation of political fragmentation under certain circumstances.

As we know, in most electoral systems, political parties often seek to form specific majority views that facilitate decision-making. This is especially important in times of crisis or in the need to respond quickly to changing conditions. Many electoral systems help to strengthen local self-government and develop regional initiatives. Elections in certain constituencies allow voters to directly influence the composition of local representatives and the level of support for various local initiatives.

In some cases, conflict systems help to limit political faction and reinforce centrist or consensus-based approaches to governance. This can reduce political polarization and facilitate the search for compromises. Also, in the mojaritar electoral system, election results are often more accurate, which reduces the likelihood of political obstacles or long periods when the government cannot work effectively. In different countries, different models of mojaritar systems can be used, adapted to local conditions and traditions. This helps to strengthen democratic institutions, taking into account the peculiarities of each society [3].

However, when implementing conflict systems, it is important to consider their potential disadvantages, such as the possibility of limiting minority representation and less flexibility in reflecting the diversity of political views. Proper adaptation of the conflict electoral system and strengthening democratic institutions can reduce these risks and contribute to the effective functioning of democracy. Conflict electoral systems are an important tool in building and strengthening democratic societies, ensuring transparency, responsibility and the participation of citizens in the political life of the country. Conflict electoral systems play an important role in strengthening democratic processes, direct representation, government stability and ensuring the participation of voters in the political life of the country.

The history of the conflict electoral systems has undergone a lot of modernization processes depending on the country and its political system. Some important points and historical contexts related to conflict electoral systems:

One of the first countries to introduce a Hungarian electoral system is the United Kingdom. The mojaritar system for single-member constituencies was introduced in the 19th century and became one of the main features of the British political system.

In the United States electoral system, conflict elements also have a long history. By voting in collegiate elections, the presidential election system also demonstrates the American method of congressional election conflict system using mojaritarian systems in single-member districts. Many countries that became independent in the 20th century inherited the mojaritar electoral systems from the colonial authorities. This contributed to the spread of such systems in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world.

In Europe, most electoral systems in single-member constituencies have a variety of conflict systems, ranging from mixed systems combining elements of conflict and proparsionalism. In recent decades, there has been a trend to change and adapt mojaritar systems. For example, in some countries, elements of proportional representation are being introduced to promote broader political pluralism. Conflict electoral systems often form a particular political culture based on competition between candidates in single member constituencies. This can contribute to more intense and personalized campaigns. Here, each candidate seeks to attract the maximum number of votes from their constituency.

In the modern context, some countries seek to integrate conflict and proportional elements in their electoral systems. This approach allows you to combine the advantages of both systems and minimize their shortcomings, ensuring more fair and representative political representation.

In the process of social and political changes in society, conflict systems are often reformed and modernized. This included changing the size of constituencies, introducing new technologies to improve the electoral process, and increasing the transparency of elections.

Despite its many advantages, conflict electoral systems are also subject to criticism, as are most other electoral systems. One of the main arguments is not to adequately reflect the diversity of political views and interests in Parliament, especially in multiethnic or multicultural societies [4].

An important aspect of the development and adaptation of conflict systems is the consensus on changes in public discussion and electoral procedures. This will help strengthen democratic institutions and maintain the legitimacy of the political system.

The historical experience of most electoral systems emphasizes their diversity and ability to adapt to changing political conditions. In the context of strengthening democratic institutions and ensuring the effective expression of the interests of citizens, it is important to take into account their

advantages and potential limitations.

The following examples can be cited regarding the countries where the conflict electoral system is used and their importance in building a democratic society:

1. Elections to the House of Commons (House of Commons) of the Parliament of the United Kingdom use the mojaritar system. Each constituency elects one representative (MP) who receives a majority of the vote. This system contributes to the formation of stable parliamentary structures and the direct representation of voters in places.
2. In Canada, it uses a plurality-based system called the "through first purpose" system. Under this system, the winner in each constituency becomes the MP with the highest number of votes, contributing to indirect representation and stability in the Legislature.
3. The United States (in some states) although the United States uses a proportional representation electoral system for congressional elections at the federal level, some states use the mojaritar system to elect members of Congress and other regional officials. This includes the "winner-take-all" system (winner gets all), where the winner in each district receives all representative mandates.
4. France uses a combination of plurality and proportional representation in various types of elections. For example, for elections to the National Assembly (the Lower House of Parliament), a two-stage conflict system is used for individual candidates.
5. For elections to the Lower House of Parliament (lok Sabha) of India, the mojaritar system, known as the "first post-post" system, is used. Each constituency elects one MP with the highest number of votes.
6. Japan uses the mojaritar electoral system to hold elections to one of the parliamentary chambers (National Assembly). Depending on the type of election and Region, different versions of the mojaritar system can be used.
7. South Korea uses a single-county mojaritar system for elections to the National Assembly, where the winner receives all representative mandates for that district.
8. New Zealand uses the mojaritar system for elections to the unicameral parliament. This system is combined with elements of proportional representation to ensure a more equitable and diverse political representation [5].

These examples illustrate the diversity and adaptation of the conflict electoral system in different countries, highlighting its importance in the formation of effective and sustainable political structures within a democratic society.

Thus, in most democratic countries, conflict electoral systems remain an important means of strengthening democratic institutions and ensuring representative governance. In order to increase their ability to reflect and protect the interests of the whole society, great effort is being put into

their development and reform.

The Hungarian electoral system is an important tool in the political system of many countries, contributing to the strengthening of democratic institutions and the direct representation of voters.

The use of this system in elections ensures the stability of the government, accurate and transparent results of elections, and also helps to form responsibility to voters.

Examples of the use of the mojaritar system in different democratic countries show its adaptation and effectiveness in different political and cultural contexts. This system remains an important element in ensuring a balance between building a democratic society, the stability of government and the expression of the interests of a wide range of citizens.

REFERENCES

1. Mojaritar electoral system. Constitutional law. Encyclopedic dictionary. <https://www.lex.uz/dictionary?Word=%d98>
2. Qulmatov Sh. Reform of the electoral system-the requirement of the period. <https://parliament.gov.uz/oz/articles/1826>
3. Kyrgyzboev M. Partology. - Tashkent: Academy, 2007. – 94 b.
4. Djamiev B.A. The multiparty system is an important factor in ensuring human rights in the country. Proceedings of International Conference on Modern Science and Scientific Studies. Volume 2, № 1. 284-292 бет
5. Kyrgyzboev M. Civil society: political parties, ideologies, cultures. - Tashkent: East, 1998. - 160 b; Adilgoriev X. T., Tulteev I. T. Bicameral parliament. - Tashkent: Kyiv Academy of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 2005. – 344 B; parliamentary election: national legislation and foreign experience. - Tashkent: Institute of monitoring of current legislation in the president of the Republic of Uzbekistan khuzuri, 2009. – p. 286.