

# Parliamentary Journalism in Uzbekistan

Elmuradova Ruxsohra Talibjonovna

Lecturer at the Higher School of Translation Studies, Linguistics and International Journalism, Uzbekistan

**Received:** 22 April 2025; **Accepted:** 18 May 2025; **Published:** 20 June 2025

**Abstract:** The article explains the various stages involved in the formation of parliament, discussing personal, contentious and peaceful issues, as well as issues of interaction with neighbors. Such discussions are studied as a historical representation of parliament or as an initial stage of its formation.

**Keywords:** State, parliamentary politics, society, governance, humanity, attitude, discussion, social.

## Introduction: The Emergence and Development of Parliamentary Journalism in the World

The formation of parliamentary journalism in the world is directly related to the emergence of parliaments themselves. Modern perceptions of parliament are based on the people's millennia-old governance methods. Later, scholars began to refer to this governance system as "democracy." In its ideal form, democracy assumes that all citizens have the right to vote and be elected, gathering in one place to discuss pressing issues. Decisions are then made through voting. Naturally, this system is effective in small communities—but how about on a national scale? Could 10 million or more people gather in one place? Even if they did, how many days would such a gathering last? After all, by rule, every citizen must be given the floor to express their opinion. This led to the necessity of electing a representative to speak on behalf of the larger population. Of course, this was no longer "pure democracy" because an elected representative brings their own worldview and opinions. A modern example of pure democracy can be seen in Switzerland's system of governance, where "Amtmänner" (deputies) are elected annually. They develop laws professionally, and the citizens with voting rights either approve or reject them. This type of governance is called "plebiscitary democracy." The term "plebiscitary" comes from the Latin plebiscitum, meaning decision-making through public discussion. In such systems, the law text cannot be altered—only a "yes" or "no" vote is given.

With the growth of the population and the increasing

complexity of socio-political governance, the need arose for "representative democracy," and the term "representation" began to be used instead of "democracy." Today, this function is performed by the parliamentary system. The word "parliament" is derived from the English Parliament, but its origin lies in the French verb parler—to speak. It is worth noting that before the French Revolution, only courts in remote regions of France were referred to as "parliaments," which is why the term was later adopted into English.

Looking back through human history, we can see that public assemblies existed even at the turn of the first millennium—in cities like Athens and Rome, and later in England and Spain, as well as in ancient Novgorod in the form of "veches." Among older parliaments, Spain's "Cortes" can be mentioned. Iceland also claims to have the oldest parliament. Historians attempt to prove that several large stones near Iceland's capital Reykjavik mark the site of the world's first open-air parliament, still known today as "Althing." Icelanders believe that ancient Vikings gathered here to discuss and resolve state issues.

Citizens or "chosen ones" (elders, representatives, princes, nobles) gathered at these assemblies to discuss urgent issues concerning their regions. The limited size of these regions allowed such gatherings to be held regularly. Over time, the issues discussed expanded to include not just personal or judicial matters, but broader national concerns such as war, peace, and interregional relations. These discussions can be seen as the historical prototype or early stage of

the formation of parliament.

The second stage in the development of parliaments refers to their emergence as state forums. England is considered the birthplace of parliament. As early as the 12th–13th centuries, the English Parliament began to play this role and was recognized as a classical model. The monarchy limited the assembly of major feudal lords (lords), high clergy, and representatives from cities and counties. Later, in the 16th–17th centuries, parliament became a corporative-authoritative institution acting as a council to the king. Similar class-based institutions later emerged in Poland, Hungary, France, Spain, and other countries. Eventually, these developed into the modern form of governmental institutions.

The third stage in the development of parliament spans from the late 17th to the late 19th century. During this period, the ideas of parliamentarism fully took shape. In the works of European philosophers such as John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Montesquieu, and Voltaire, as well as in the political treatises of the “founding fathers” of the 1787 U.S. Constitution, the concepts of popular sovereignty and the social contract between rulers and citizens were developed. According to the theory of the separation of powers by Locke and Montesquieu, the role of parliaments was primarily limited to exercising legislative power.

The concept of national (popular) representation, which emerged in the 18th–19th centuries, can be summarized as follows:

1. National representation is established by the constitution;
2. The nation (the people), as the holder of sovereignty, authorizes parliament to act on its behalf in exercising legislative power;
3. For this purpose, the people elect their representatives (deputies, senators, etc.);
4. A member of parliament is not only the representative of their electorate but of the entire nation, and they are not bound to their voters—nor can they be recalled by them.

As legal philosopher Léon Duguit emphasized: “Parliament is the mandate of the nation.” Thus, the relationship between the concept of representation and parliaments exists across all nations. However, when we interpret “mandate” and “representation” semantically, the actual relationship may differ from what was originally intended.

Half a century later, French politician Marcel Prélot wrote: “The expression of the voter's will ends with the act of election. The elected representative's role is defined only by the constitution and laws, and voters

have no further influence.” He emphasized that the word “mandate” should be understood in the context of the 1789 doctrine, whereas “representation” carries a different linguistic implication. In other words, an elected individual, as a direct and free expression of the nation's will, has complete independence. Parliament, therefore, knows what the nation wants and expresses the people's will through laws and decisions without external control. The will of parliament is the will of the nation. This is the essence of representative governance.

French thinkers—from E.-J. Sieyès to Marcel Prélot—considered this model to be non-democratic because it denied citizens the right to control the will they had entrusted to parliament. Jean-Jacques Rousseau promoted the idea of supreme unity of power, from which emerged the notion that the legislative power should oversee the executive. In the doctrine of the separation of powers, parliament was given great importance as the legislative branch.

In developing countries, particularly in parts of Africa and Asia, parliaments were often built as formal copies of those in developed Western countries. However, in practice, they often had no real power and simply recorded decisions made by centers of authority outside parliament. Parliament is a legally authorized body that makes supreme decisions on behalf of the people and expresses the will and interests of all citizens of the state. Its significance as a national or public representative body stems from this function.

The fourth stage of parliamentary development spans the 19th century. During this time, parliament fully developed as a state institution. Electoral laws laid the foundation for regular elections of parliament members. Parliament became the sole source of legislation, holding exclusive rights to enact laws. At that time, parliamentary institutions also began forming working procedures, the status of deputies, and relationships with the executive, political parties, and the press.

The fifth stage of parliamentary development occurred in the 20th century and was marked by the increasing importance of parliament. While in the first half of the century parliaments had to prove their relevance within state structures, in the post–World War II era, the idea of parliamentary supremacy gained widespread recognition. The global community embraced this principle. Parliaments began to play a central role in public life by actively reflecting and influencing public opinion. Their maturity became an indicator of a democratic civil society.

Parliamentary institutions gained significant experience, and their interaction with other branches

of government became a dynamic factor in state governance. Based on the scope of their authority, parliaments can be categorized into three types:

1. Parliaments with unlimited authority;
2. Parliaments with strictly limited authority;
3. Parliaments with relatively limited authority.

In most states with a parliamentary system of governance, parliaments are considered to have unlimited authority. The British Parliament is a classic example. According to British legal scholars, parliamentary supremacy implies the following:

1. The Primacy in Lawmaking. Only the Parliament has the authority to adopt laws, and the law occupies the highest position in the hierarchy of normative legal acts.
2. The Right to Approve the State Budget and Introduce Taxes.
3. Government Accountability Before the Parliament.
4. The Right to Confirm Judges in Office.
5. The Absence of Competing Authorities with Similar Powers to Parliament.

Legal scholar P. Bromhead supports the idea of an absolutely competent Parliament. According to him, there should be no restrictions on the content of laws or obstacles to their adoption. The Constitution of Japan, which defines the Parliament as the supreme representative and sole legislative body of state authority, does not specify the powers of Parliament in detail. This, in turn, confirms the unlimited authority of the Japanese Parliament. The limitation of parliamentary powers within a specific framework allows us to consider it as a relatively limited authority. For instance, Articles 34, 35, and 49 of the Constitution of France define the list of matters that can be resolved by Parliament through legislation. Other matters are primarily handled by the government. If the French Parliament enacts a law outside of its authority, the Constitutional Council may annul the document based on a government decree.

In many developing countries, parliaments often have relatively limited powers. In states such as Senegal and Gabon, which were formerly French colonies, parliaments were modeled after the French system. Parliaments with limited authority are more common and are typical of federal or decentralized unitary states. In such states, the powers of the central government are limited by the rights of federal subjects, and accordingly, Parliament may act only within the scope restricted by local authorities. For example, the U.S. Congress may exercise only those powers explicitly stated in the Constitution. The

Constitution of Spain establishes a similar procedure, under which matters not directly included in the scope of national authority are transferred to autonomous communities based on their statutes.

Overall, the type of powers Parliament possesses depends largely on the structure of the state, its system of governance, and political order. In addition, the level of democracy in the country and its political orientation also influence parliamentary authority. For example, in presidential republics, Parliament has limited involvement in the formation of the government and limited control over the executive branch. In parliamentary republics, Parliament actively participates in forming the executive branch, elects the head of government, and exercises strong oversight over its activities.

In totalitarian political systems, even if the Constitution and laws grant broad powers to Parliament, they are often not effectively implemented. Among the most important functions of Parliament are adopting laws, exercising financial powers, ratifying and denouncing international treaties, and participating in the formation of state bodies. Financial powers include approving the state budget and introducing taxes. The budget is typically adopted in the form of a law. This procedure is followed in countries such as France, Germany, and Russia. In contrast, countries like Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States develop their state budgets in the form of a program, composed of several laws.

The power to introduce taxes is of great political significance, as it allows Parliament to influence the entire economic life of the state. This authority is often explicitly defined in constitutions. For example, Article 60 of the Bulgarian Constitution states that taxes and duties, as well as privileges and obligations in this area, must be established by law, and their introduction falls under the exclusive competence of the National Assembly.

Ratifying and denouncing international treaties is also one of Parliament's important powers. Ratification is the final consent of the state to join a treaty. Traditionally, the authority to ratify international treaties was granted to the head of state. However, over time, international treaties have become increasingly integrated into domestic legal systems, and states that sign treaties are obliged to align their national legislation with the norms and principles stated therein. Today, under the constitutions of Germany and Austria, international treaties are recognized as integral parts of federal law. According to the Constitution of France, ratified international treaties take precedence over national legislation. This

strong influence of international treaties on domestic legal systems has made it necessary for Parliament to participate in the ratification process. Otherwise, the head of state could use their absolute authority in this area to modify or annul even laws passed by Parliament by joining international treaties.

Regarding the role of Parliament in the state mechanism, theorists of the separation of powers such as John Locke and Montesquieu sought to limit its authority primarily to lawmaking. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in contrast, spoke of the unity of state power and promoted the idea of legislative oversight over the executive branch.

The modern Parliament is the supreme representative body of state power, exercising legislative functions. This includes a number of financial powers, such as adopting the state budget and overseeing its implementation. Depending on the system of government, Parliament may also have various levels of oversight over the executive branch. For example, under the Constitution of Spain, the General Cortes (Parliament of Spain) exercises legislative power, approves the state budget, and supervises the activities of the government.

## **CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, global practice shows that in some cases, Parliaments may come under the influence of government policy and lose their independence. This can clearly be seen in the example of the Parliaments of former Soviet states. Moreover, in some developing African and Asian countries, supreme representative bodies, though modeled after those of developed countries, may operate in practice without real power. The representative nature of Parliament lies in its acting on behalf of the entire nation and its citizens. Therefore, the terms "national" and "people's" are often used in naming parliaments. The concept of national representation, which emerged in the 17th–19th centuries, can be recognized as a combination of the following principles.

## **REFERENCES**

Белоусов Михаил Сергеевич Конституционное право зарубежных стран. - М.: Array Литагент «Ай Пи Эр Медиа». 2008.

Бромхед П. Эволюция Британской конституции. М., ЮЛ, 1978,

История политических и правовых учений. Учебник / Под ред. доктора юридических наук, профессора О. Э. Лейста. – М.: Издательство "Зерцало", 2000.

История российского парламентаризма : учебно-методическое пособие для студентов исторического факультета Тувинского

государственного университета / составитель З. Ю. Доржу, Е. М. Ондар. – Кызыл : Изд-во ТувГУ, 2020.

Парламентаризм в России: исторический опыт, проблемы и перспективы : курс лекций. - [Томск, 2007]