

TYPOLOGY OF TYPES OF CORRUPTION AND ITS PHYLOSOPHICAL
REVIEW**Latipov Sardor Shavkatovich**

Internal Affairs Directorate of Navoi region

Head of the Department of Internal Affairs of Zarafshan city

E-mail: sardorlatipov086@gmail.com<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16760648>

Annotation: This article analyzes various theoretical approaches and criteria for the classification of corruption, where corruption is categorized based on objects, subjects, levels of authority, and territorial scope. Additionally, corruption is examined in its public and private, domestic and international, economic and political, administrative and business forms, and its impact on social relations is assessed as a systemic phenomenon. Furthermore, the article substantiates the necessity of in-depth study of corruption cases and the importance of their comprehensive classification.

Keywords: state, responsibility, legal reforms, anti-corruption, criminal law, legal analysis, methodology, theory, social risk, prevention.

Currently, different approaches to the typology of corruption are observed based on classification: by objects, subjects, by level of authority. However, it should be noted that at present, there are different approaches to the classification of corruption in the scientific literature. It should be noted that H.A. Akhmetova's statement that "most of the presented classification schemes are one-dimensional in nature, that is, they do not claim to fully reflect the forms and types of corrupt practices, but are limited to one, maximum two signs of the phenomenon under study" are not sufficiently justified, since not every classification can be divided and comprehensive.

S. Rouse-Ackerman proposes to classify corruption on two grounds:

- according to the type of bribe-takers – political and administrative, where the former is related to the adoption of laws, the main type of bribe-takers are representatives of the government and heads of state, the second – using state laws;
- By type of bribe market: centralized (there is a relatively small market for corruption proposals) and decentralized corruption (payment for services with bribes happens everywhere) [1].

Classifying corruption based on separate acts, S. Rottenberg identified three types of corruption. The first type of corruption means that there are circumstances in which the payment of corruption is receivable for such a service, which must be made without the existence of it. The latter, on the

contrary, involves taking a fee for not doing something that requires compliance with rules and norms. The third type of corruption occurs when the payment of a particular act involves a direct violation of the laws [2].

Within the framework of this classification, the first type of corruption concerns the ability of a civil servant to dispose of public resources and make decisions based on his own interests, and not based on the interests and needs of the state and society.

Parliamentary corruption is, in fact, various forms of lobbying the interests of certain social, very narrow groups, and consists of passing laws containing norms, which involve assigning a certain privileged position to a particular group.

As mentioned above, since an employee of an organization as well as an official may dispose of resources that do not belong to him, a corrupt attitude expressed by an act or omission that violates the interests of his organization may arise.

In foreign countries, often, the buying of voter votes during an election becomes a separate type of corruption.

The basis for the classification of corruption, proposed by I. Ahmedov [3], is the degree of participation of an official in receiving profits from the organization, in this connection he emphasizes progressive corruption, which includes corruption aimed at increasing profits by entrepreneurs obtained as a result of granting privileges and opportunities by an official, and creating certain obstacles to the implementation of entrepreneurial activities.

In the case of Eastern corruption, corruption gradually forms a certain system of social relations, which in turn is closely related to other social relations, including kinship, corporate, professional relations, which makes corruption in a particular state a systemic factor.

A number of researchers, including Yu.G. Naumov, classified corruption according to the goals of the subjects' activities [4]. Thus, a division into economic and political corruption is proposed.

Under economic corruption Yu.G. Naumov understands corruption aimed at ownership, redistribution, the use of all forms and resources of ownership, access to which is provided by an official position. At the same time, political corruption is understood as corruption in which individuals desire to redistribute power.



At the same time, in our opinion, it does not seem entirely correct to draw such a line of demarcation, since the political goal (power) is in defined terminology and the economic goal is the possibility of disposing of resources.

In our opinion, it is desirable to classify corruption on the following grounds: the status of subjects of corruption relations, the level of subjects, the scope of territorial coverage, the degree of recurrence of corruption relations.

Thus, according to the status of the subjects, corruption can be divided into public and private.

State type of corruption is the commission of acts of corruption within the competence of a state body. Perhaps this type of corruption is the biggest threat because separate groups of people use public power only for personal purposes and interests, not really under the control of society.

Recently, corruption in the private sector has been on the rise, including the concentration of vast resources in the hands of individual organizations.

The head of such an organization, like any other employee with the ability to allocate resources, can make and act contrary to the company's mission and vision, causing him certain damage, the purpose of which is to enrich himself.

It is also recommended to distinguish corruption processes by the scope of territorial coverage, dividing domestic (the situation in which corrupt acts are committed on the territory of one country, regardless of the status of the subject of corruption) and international corruption (actions aimed at corrupting officials of foreign states or joint corrupt activities of citizens and officials of several states).

Depending on the degree of repetition of corrupt acts, it is desirable to distinguish between single (or accidental) corruption, which involves single facts of corruption, and systemic corruption, which occurs during periodically repeated corruption interactions, which in one way or another covers all aspects of social life, gradually turning into a socially acceptable phenomenon.

Perhaps in its most general form, corruption can be divided into administrative and business.

Administrative corruption is related to the activities of public authorities. It is understood to be a deliberate alteration of the processes of proper execution of the rules and norms that govern a particular area in order to grant benefits to certain actors.

In conclusion, correctly classifying the various forms of corruption is essential for a deep understanding of the phenomenon and for effectively combating it. In the study, corruption is classified based on various criteria,



including objects, subjects, levels of authority, territorial scope, degree of recurrence, and areas of activity. Based on the approaches of scholars such as Rose-Ackerman, Rottenberg, Ahmedov, and Naumov, various types of corruption political, economic, administrative, public, private, systemic, and incidental have been examined. These approaches play an important role in identifying, assessing, and developing practical measures aimed at reducing corruption cases.

References:

1. Rose-Ackerman, S. Corruption and Government: Causes, Consequences, and Reform. Moscow, 2003, p. 150.
2. Rottenberg, S. Comment // The Journal of Law and Economics, 1975, Vol. 18.
3. Musheshe, N. NGO and Mobilization Against Corruption / Africa Leadership Forum. Corruption, Democracy and Human Rights in East and Central Africa. Entebbe, Republic of Uganda, December 12–14, 1994. Ibadan, pp. 133–134.
4. Scott, J.C. Comparative Political Corruption. New York, 1972, p. 88.
5. Proyava, S.M. Economization of Corruption. Counteraction Mechanism: Monograph. Moscow, 2008, pp. 32–33.
6. Akhmedov, I. Corruption Lawlessness // Monitor, April 10, 2003, No. 14.
7. Beken, T.V. A European View on the Russian Draft Federal Law “On the Fundamentals of Anti-Corruption Policy” // State and Law, 2002, No. 6, p. 118.
8. Naumov, Yu.G. Corruption and Society: Theoretical-Economic and Applied Research: Monograph. Vladimir, 2007, p. 44.

