SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

PHILOSOPHICAL AND PRACTICAL MANIFESTATIONS OF DEMOCRACY AND DEMOCRATISM IN SOCIETY

Saurov Ravshanbek Ruslanbek oglu
Associate Professor, Department of Legal Sciences, Tashkent International University

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra24610
DOI No: 10.36713/epra24610

ABSTRACT

This article examines the philosophical and practical manifestations of democracy and democratism as socio-political and kratological phenomena that shape state and societal governance. It explores democracy and democratism as interrelated yet distinct categories — democracy as an ideal of social progress and democratism as its practical realization through institutions, processes, and social consciousness. The paper provides an in-depth philosophical interpretation of the term "phenomenon," referencing classical thinkers such as Kant, Hegel, and Husserl, and applies this notion to the modern understanding of democratic development. The study analyzes the liberal-democratic concept as a dominant paradigm of modern governance and reviews its ideological foundations as developed by Western philosophers including Hobbes, Locke, Montesquieu, Kant, Hegel, Hayek, and Popper. Attention is given to the contradictions of Western liberal democracy in the post-Soviet and global context, as reflected in the works of Uzbek scholars B. Umarov and B.A. Talapov. The article concludes that while democratism as a method and instrument can be adapted or manipulated, the democratic ideal remains immutable as a guiding principle of human freedom, social equality, and just governance. Democracy, therefore, persists as both a philosophical ideal and a practical objective in the moral and political consciousness of humankind.

KEYWORDS: *Democracy; Democratism; Phenomenology; Liberal democracy; Kratology; Political philosophy; Social justice; State governance; Human freedom; Democratic development.*

The principles of democracy and democratism are phenomena related to socio-political reality, state and societal governance, and kratology. Therefore, it is necessary to approach democracy and democratism as distinct phenomena intrinsically linked with the socio-political space, political system, life, and processes. In philosophical and encyclopedic literature, the notion of "phenomenon" and its reality are defined as follows:

1. a phenomenon is a particular event perceived through experience and emotions;
2. it is an object of sensation and observation that differs from noumena and the foundations of essence. Classical philosophers consider a phenomenon to be the manifestation or expression of essence or ideas (Neoplatonism, Leibniz, Schelling, Hegel); the knowable existence — the world of phenomena apprehended through scientific methods and the a priori systems of the transcendental subject (Kant and the Neo-Kantians); or subjective experiences and mental states into which all reality and experience finally resolve (Berkeley, Hume, phenomenalism). In Husserlian phenomenology, a phenomenon is an event connected with intellectual cognition; Plato's "eidos" and the praphenomenal differ and the "pure consciousness" aspects are interpreted as phenomena [1]. In short, in philosophy the term "phenomenon" denotes particular things and events whose essence is grasped through consciousness and reason. Its immanent property is its relation to subjective representation, distinct from objective things and real existence [2]. Kant and Hegel understood phenomena as sensations, religion, and subjective realities. Kant regarded the phenomenon (phenomenology) as an event of external sensations. Hegel does not provide a strict definition but includes consciousness and related realities in his *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Nevertheless, both philosophers interpret phenomena as distinct realities and events [2]. These interpretations have been continued by Uzbek scholars. Doctor of Philosophy, Professor S.D. Norqulov and Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor F.S. Umarova write: "Recently, there has been a tendency to ascribe political-axiological significance to the concept of 'phenomenon.' For example, Academician of the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor M. Sharifkhodjayev presents it as a unique, singular virtue that differs from others and is prepared to overcome any obstacles in manifesting itself and its identity. This approach exaggerates the political-axiological aspect of the phenomenon and thereby emphasizes the phenomenon's uniqueness as a socially and politically axiological reality or event. From a socio-philosophical perspective, a phenomenon is a thing distinct from existing things; it is unique and socially valuable" [2].

Treating democracy and democratism as phenomena means, first of all, recognizing that they are not yet fully realized: they exist in their ideal form and occupy a place within socio-political life and kratological doctrines. The uniqueness of democracy as a phenomenon lies in the absence to date of a fully formed appearance, ready model, and norms. From this perspective, it is perceived as an unfulfilled ideal or a kind of fantasy. Established democratic societies and political regimes that profess popular governance are often assessed not by democratic models but by manifestations of democratism principles. Democracy remains an ideal of social

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

progress. In all "ideal state" or "ideal society" models, the principle of democracy and democratism is stated as a primary objective and aim. From this viewpoint, the ultimate goal of socio-political processes is to establish democracy and consolidate popular governance within it. This ultimate goal guides socio-political processes, giving them purpose and direction.

Concepts of democratic development indicate that purposeful, conceptual ideas in socio-political processes ensure effective state and societal governance, make relations between the state and the citizen and between society and the individual rational and permanent, and give rise to a need for meritocracy. According to democratic development concepts, one can evaluate kratological views in society and observe the operation of democratism principles. Therefore, philosophical-kratological and socio-political literature pays special attention to studying concepts of democratic development and the real-life embodiment of democratism principles. Today, the liberal-democratic concept of development is widely manifesting itself in socio-political life.

Liberal-democratic ideas primarily emerged in the West, and the philosophical-axiological and legal values promoted by influential international organizations such as the UN, UNESCO, UNISF, and the EU largely rest on these ideas. Thinkers whose intellectual legacy significantly contributed to the spread of liberal-democratic ideas in Europe include T. Hobbes (1588–1679), B. Spinoza (1632–1677), J. Locke (1632–1704), C. Montesquieu (1689–1755), B. Franklin (1706–1790), D. Hume (1711–1776), I. Kant (1724–1804), Hegel (1770–1831), J. Mill (1806–1873), K. Marx (1818–1883), É. Durkheim (1858–1917), F. von Hayek (1899–1992), and K. Popper (1902–1992) [3]. We do not intend here to analyze that legacy in detail; it is beyond the scope of this topic. These philosophers contributed greatly to the dissemination of liberal-democratic ideas in Europe.

Key features of the liberal-democratic concept include prioritizing individual liberty, shaping social relations based on a market economy, viewing human rights as the criterion of democratic development, establishing mechanisms for protecting these rights through the judiciary, regarding individual freedom as non-interference by the state in the private life of the person rather than political activity alone, and building civil society institutions and associations to secure human rights. Individual freedoms and rights are values promoted and defended by liberal democracy [4]. The impact of Western liberal democracy on socio-political processes has often been contradictory, and seeking salvation in it can appear as a one-sided approach. In the 1990s, the dissolution of the USSR and the decline of communist ideology prompted the post-Soviet states that had newly embarked on independent development paths to turn to Western liberal democracy. This turn even reached the point of absolutizing it and denying or belittling national democratic experiences. However, some researchers openly pointed out the negative effects of Western liberal democracy. For example, Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor B. Umarov writes: "Lately discussions have increased regarding the crisis of liberal doctrine and its obstruction of the path for developing countries. Some authors accuse this doctrine of damaging moral values and the ethical foundations of the family; others argue that it cannot impartially evaluate world events, approaching processes with double standards… Indeed, the absolutization of individual rights and freedoms within liberalism, and the evaluation of various countries' socio-economic and moral-educational lives solely on the basis of liberal ideas and views, may harm those countries' national values, traditions, and even independent development. This situation was manifest in the economic, socio-political, and cultural life of former Union republics that gained independence at the end of the last century" [5]. Similar views were expressed earlier by the Italian philosopher and jurist V. Pareto in the early 20th century. He claimed that Western democracy and liberal ideas, under the influence of private property, the accumulation of capital, the devaluation of human rights, and the struggle of interests, lost value and ceased to serve social progress [6]. Today, against the backdrop of the Russia–Ukraine war, the hypocritical and inhumane aspects of Western liberal democracy have become even more evident. Western liberal democrats who champion the protection of human rights, led by US and European policymakers, have openly engaged in policies that seize the private property and assets of businessmen and entrepreneurs from Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and even Central Asian businesspeople, violating international norms and agreements. For example, the European assets of our compatriot, prominent entrepreneur and philanthropist A. Usmanov, were confiscated. One might say that whereas Soviet totalitarianism once sought global dominance, today an Anglo-Saxon totalitarianism based on the dollar and euro aspires to global domination. This is an event that reflects the core nature of Western liberal democracy. The Western socio-political life is built to globalize its liberal-democratic ideas, paying little heed to national values, peculiarities of social development, and ethno-cultural traditions. Nevertheless, it must be said that the false liberal-democratic states of today's Western political scientists do not diminish the importance of the sociopolitical and philosophical-legal heritage of major thinkers such as T. Hobbes, Montesquieu, Kant, Hegel, and Popper. They were advocates of liberal-democratic ideas grounded in the equal rights of all peoples and nations; this legacy is valuable for its humanistic nature.

Today (February 25, 2023) internet reports circulated that US and European countries announced intentions to pressure China and India to cut ties with Russia and to impose sanctions on third countries maintaining relations with Russia. The inclusion of Central Asia, including Uzbekistan, on such lists once again confirms the true motives of some supporters and politicians of Western liberal democracy. Thus, the democratism practiced by politicians (their methods and instruments) can always reject or tarnish the democratic ideal. Therefore, while democratism can be modified or adapted to other objectives, changing the democratic ideal is difficult. Peoples accept liberal democracy as an ideal; their belief in this ideal expresses trust in the popularization of state and societal governance. Leaders and institutions that preside over the governance of socio-political processes exist today, but they can

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

be dismissed as unnecessary under the influence of objective factors. Democracy, as an ideal, remains stable in the aspirations of peoples and in their confidence in the future.

REFERENCES

1. *Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1983. p. 717.*
2. *Norqulov, S.D.; Umarova, F.S. Modernization and Renewals in Uzbek Ethno-Thought. Tashkent: Fan va texnologiyalar Publishing and Printing House, 2021. p. 18.*
3. *Anthology of World Political Thought. Moscow: Mysl, 1997; History of Political and Legal Doctrines. Moscow: NORMA, 2000; Ashin, G.K. Elitology: Formation and Main Directions. Moscow: MGIMO Publishing, 1996; Power. Essays on Contemporary Western Political Philosophy. Ed. E.V. Osipov. Moscow: Nauka, 1989; Pugachev, V.P., Soloev, A.I. Introduction to Political Science. Textbook, 2nd ed. Moscow: Aspect Press, 1995; Hayek, F. The Constitution of Liberty. London, 1994; Popper, K. The Open Society and Its Enemies. Moscow: Cultural Initiative, 1990; Alder, I. Constitutional and Administrative Law, 2nd ed. London: The Macmillan Press Limited, 1994; Schweitzerhgtrg, R.G. Sociologie politique. Paris, 1998.*
4. *Talapov, B.A. Democracy and National Democratic Development in Uzbekistan. Namangan: Ziyo, 2022. p. 23.*
5. *Umarov, B. Contradictions of Globalization. Tashkent: Ma'naviyat, 2006. pp. 70–71.*
6. *Pareto, V. Transformation of Democracy. Collection. Moscow: Publishing House "Territory," 2017. p. 5.*
7. *Saurov Ravshonbek Ruslanbek ogli, The Role of I.Fichte, G.Hegel and A.Schopehauer's Philosophical-Cratological Views in The Formation of German Constitutionalism, https://doi.org/10.36713/epra19361*
8. *Saurov Ravshonbek Ruslanbek ogli, Social Democratic Foundations of Public Administration, https://eprajournals.com/IJMR/article/13290/abstract*
9. *Saurov Ravshonbek Ruslanbek ogli, The Social State as a Tool for Achieving Social Justice, Https://Eprajournals.Com/Ijmr/Article/11234*
10. *Saurov Ravshonbek Ruslanbek ogli, German Constitutionalism and Philosophical-Cratological Teachings, https://doi.org/10.36713/epra18922*