



## THE IMPORTANCE OF DEMOCRACY AND DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT IN UZBEKISTAN

Aytboyev Mansurbek Yusupovich

PhD,  
Tashkent State Agrarian University,  
Uzbekistan

### ANNOTATION

*This article examines democracy and democratic development in the social life in Uzbekistan. Their various interpretations have been given in the scientific and social philosophical literature. Some interpretations are artificially abstracted, while others do not take into account ethno-political and ethno-social traditions, territorial features. Although democracy and democratic development are becoming universal values, they are manifested in the life of every people, nation and state as a reality with its own, differentiated features. Ignoring these features makes the idea of democracy and democratic development a tool for the formation of a totalitarian system of government.*

**KEY WORDS:** *democracy and democratic development, social life, people's receptions*

### DISCUSSION

The article describes the democratic changes taking place in Uzbekistan today, the reasons for calling it a "new stage", the political and philosophical essence of the Action Strategy. It is obvious that the idea of public service is based on the goal of increasing the social activity of the people, ensuring their active participation in the ongoing reforms in the socio-political life of the country and ensuring a high level of human rights and freedoms.

Today, the topic of democracy is widely discussed in scientific and philosophical research. This is not in vain, because humanity connects its development, its future with the spread of democracy, liberal democratic ideas. After the French explorer Alexis de Tocqueville traveled to America and published "Democracy" in America, the European continent also embraced democracy as its ideal. The author of the work himself was a supporter of the constitutional monarchy. But he faces Americans who value freedom, free thinking, and self-confidence above all else. These qualities exaggerated "government paternalism."

The French researcher, who saw the activism of American citizens and their desire to determine their own destiny, concluded that "the individual, society, city, people must determine their own interests, and no one can interfere in their affairs until these interests harm others." At the same time, Alexis de Tocqueville sees that American democracy,

freedom, is associated with making a lot of money. The pursuit of money and wealth was at the heart of American pragmatism, he said.

It is well known that pragmatism leaves no room for metaphysical or speculative observations. Therefore, in American democracy, it is the priority of the individual to pursue his own interests rather than theoretical observations. "Americans look for philosophy in themselves, they don't take it from the margins or from books." This personalism could not fail to arouse certain problems in social existence, because the absoluteness of personalism is dangerous, first and foremost, for the individual himself.

Only when the individual and society, the interests of the individual and the social interest are aligned around the goal of democratic development, and achieve a balanced unity, will both parties be satisfied with their actions and lives. If personalistic aspirations take precedence and run counter to the interests of society, even if a person fully satisfies his material needs, he will sometimes feel that he is dissatisfied with his life, that his life, which is a divine blessing, has been wasted. The essence of human life is that it can be spent by others, as well as for the future and development of society.

That is why personalism, egoism, which is inherent in American democracy, is criticized in the scientific literature. D. Dewey, one of the founders of the philosophy of pragmatism, also points out the



negative aspects of American democratic development. He writes that democratic change removes barriers in the areas of commerce and communication, removes the things that make people hostile to each other on earth, binds them together, and in turn guarantees a lasting peace. Revolutions in science lead to progress, make the scientific worldview a reality in people, social life is built on reason, people communicate freely with each other, establish democratic institutions and live in accordance with the requirements of freedom and equality, which are the basis of the political system. With the eradication of illiteracy and the leading influence of enlightenment, despotic, repressive state administrations will be abolished, the political power of the state will gradually diminish with the spread of knowledge and democratic institutions, and the pursuit of freedom in human nature will establish legal order.

The increase in labor productivity, the introduction of new technologies will absolutely eradicate poverty on earth, everyone will have the things they need to live a full life, the comforts, the types of housing and labor. "But the events of recent years have clearly shown," Dewey writes, "that those who lived with these high hopes have been severely deceived. Contrary to the hopes of those who believed in peace on earth, two world wars of unprecedented, global, destructive power took place. Demonstrate freedom of conscience and identity instead of the continuous rise of democratic freedom and equality we see the flourishing of powerful totalitarian states that will completely destroy the world, surpassing all despotic regimes in history. In the field of lawmaking and jurisdiction, which is the most important tool created to ensure the freedom of the majority, government arbitrariness is constantly increasing today. Instead of approaching victory over economic stability and poverty, we are today facing the horrific complications and depths of the industrial crisis, in which many employees are barely finding a job. Social instability has reached such a point that if this tradition is not eradicated, it could be the beginning of a revolution.

The revolution the philosopher predicted did not take place, but the anxieties he identified persisted in both the United States and Europe. "Today, more than ever, we know that the whole problem is where we are going: backwards or forwards, or the harmony of humanity and nature, both in theory and in practice."

D. Dewey himself seeks an answer to this question and admits that deciding democracy is not an easy task. "Democracy is not an easy path to accept," he wrote. On the contrary, if we talk about its introduction in the current complex conditions, this path will not be absolutely smooth. In general,

we need to be inspired by the success of our journey."

It can be said that democracy comes from the law, and eventually returns to the law. Positively assessed law makes democracy a reality, while negatively assessed law discredits democracy. So which normative norms are positive and which laws are negative? Lawyers know that there is no negative law, that any law serves this or that purpose, the fulfillment of a duty. Yes, there is no absolute negative law, but there may be norms, norms that lag behind the requirements of the time, the dynamism of social life, which negatively affects this or that area.

In conclusion, we must not forget that democracy is a social ideal, and law is a means and a mechanism to achieve this ideal. Just as democracy requires law, so law requires democracy. If democracy seeks self-determination without rights (it is difficult to imagine such a situation), it becomes a dry utopia, a raw fantasy. Therefore, democracy can become a reality only when it is based on the rule of law. If, from this approach, the law seeks to self-determination without democracy, it becomes a means of totalitarian rule that seeks human rights and freedoms. Therefore, just as democracy and democratic development are based on the phenomenon of law, so is law bound to rely on the requirements of democracy. The dialectical connection between democracy and the phenomenon of law must be studied in order to know what values are a priority in the life of society and what are the foundations of development.

## REFERENCES

1. Philip P. Wiener. *Evolution and the Founders of Modern Pragmatism* Cambridge, Mass., 1949;
2. Djems V. *Pragmatism* St. Petersburg: "Shipovnik", 1910.
3. Tokvil Alexis de. *Democracy in America* Moscow: Progress, 1992.
4. Dyui D. *Reconstruction in philosophy. Human problems.* - Moscow: Respublika, 2003.