



## Conceptual Foundations of Modern Democracy

*Kurbanov E. E.*

*Gulistan State University, Independent Researcher*

*Ochilov I.*

*Gulistan State University, student*

**Abstract:** This article highlights from a scientific point of view the question of the criteria of modern democracy, its improvement on the basis of modern ideas as a result of the transformation process. In addition, as a result of the modernization of democracy, the emergence of specific new tasks between the state and citizens is justified by the views of political scientists through scientific and statistical indicators. It is known that the question of democracy in many cases was embodied in the conditions of the state only in some cases as a defender of the rights of citizens. As a result of numerous disputes between representatives of the conservative and liberal movements, new signs and rules of democracy have been formed. It is in the article that the ideas of scientists engaged in views on modern democracy are revealed through statistical indicators. In addition, the importance of the role of state political institutions in the development of democracy is substantiated.

**Keywords:** democratic idea, democratization of society, phenomenon, state capacity, polyarchy, index of statehood, empirical data, pandemic.

### INTRODUCTION.

Scientific conclusions that the improvement of ideas about democracy, the effective course of democratization processes depends on many complex factors, are justified by many world scientists dealing with the issue of democracy. Currently, this process is causing heated scientific debate.

By the beginning of the XXI century, peculiar views were traced in the studies of world scientists on the topic of democracy. These were conceptual ideas related to the importance of the quality indicator for democracy and its development in connection with the changing potential of the state.

Now the task of comparative analysis of many scientific studies and the development of relevant conclusions and recommendations is transversely. Firstly, in previous studies, the practice of correlating the potential of the state with the economy prevailed. Secondly, today, although a single stop has not been reached on the issue of the potential of the state, there is a need for a scientific understanding of its importance for democracy. "In addition, the evolution of ideas is growing that the state has the potential to put forward new ideas for the democratization of society, the ability to make and implement political decisions in a privileged way in the interests of national recovery is the main condition for democratic development" [1,P.40]. The same approach has become a phenomenon of the XXI century. Even the views of the exponents of the idea of liberalism have changed that at one time, in a democracy, the state performs only the function of a "night watchman". Representatives of "neoliberalism" claim that in order to build non-traditional societies [2,P.51].

### LITERATURE AND METHODOLOGY.

Political scientists A.Melville, D.Shtukal and M.Mironyuk noted that "today, comparative political science studies mainly raise the problem of the state, statehood and state potential (state capacity), on

the one hand, and the problem of changes in the system of democracy and democratization, on the other" [3, p.43]. Studies concerning the potential of the state, especially its specifics for the political regime and democracy, have been developed by Western scientists Ch.Tilli (2010), V.Van Kreveld (2013), Minsk (2014), Banholyen (2017), Memoli (2015).

Russian scientists M.Mironyuk, V.Ivanov (2015), A.Melville (2016), D.Shtukal (2016), Efimov (2016) also conducted serious research on this issue" [4, p.10]. In this regard, a large-scale scientific base has been created.

## RESULTS.

Outstanding Western scientists dealing with the theory of democracy X.Lints and A. Stepan believe: "without the influence of the state, no modern democracy can exist" [5, p.34]. It is no secret that democracy, by the means of its existence, requires the participation of a huge number of subjects in political processes. American political scientist R.Dahl called this state "polyarchy".

At a time when there was a discussion about the state of the state and its potential, that is, about the possibility of supporting democracy, about high security, one of the outstanding political scientists of our time was F.Fukuyama points to the "three leading institutions" that are primarily necessary for the development of democracy and, most importantly, are practiced in cooperation. These are: the state, law and democracy. The correct establishment of the relationship between them, according to the scientist, leads to the democratic development of society. According to S. Huntington, the teacher F.Fukuyama, it is necessary first to build strong state institutions, and only then to develop democracy." [6, P.27].

One of the major representatives of modern political philosophy A. Melville, Russian political scientist M. Mironyuk, according to studies of some countries, "provides information on the index of state capacity, according to which, in a ratio of 10 points (1995-2001 - 2015), stable countries of the world with high potential are listed" [7; P.29].

## DISCUSSION.

The fact that democracy requires the participation of not one, but several actors in political processes indicates that it is directly related to the quality of the State and its institutions. The reason is that the ability to direct the activities of political actors based on the interests of democracy may be at the disposal of the State and its resources.

As many scientists of the world now confirm, "the potential of the state has its multifaceted aspects. This situation today is explained by the expansion of the functions of the state, and when concluding about the potential of the state, special attention should be paid to the effects (results), consequences and factors of its activities. The American scientist F. Fukuyama, commenting on the potential of the modern state, recommends proceeding from its leading functions [4, p.11].

It is worth noting that "in subsequent years, even in the conditions of the 2020 pandemic, the factor of a strong national state has shown its resilience. Therefore, interest in the study of the state and its nature is growing." [8, P.149].

If we approach the state factor from the point of view of the development of democracy, then most experts recognize it is important to pay attention to the state, statehood, and state potential as an important methodological rule. Here the concept of statehood means the status of the state, that is, its internal and external sovereignty. The concept of the potential of the state means the evolution of its volumetric qualitative indicators in the process of state-building. Among other things, these conclusions are expressed in the studies of Russian scientists M. Ilyin, E. Meleshkina" [9, pp.9-10].

In our opinion, the processes of state potential leading to effective democracy will not be smooth and trouble-free. At the same time, the quality of State institutions and the interests of democratic development should be coordinated at a high level. Naturally, such a result can be achieved only through the effective implementation of state policy and a political idea that is fully embraced by the values and interests of democracy.

The political ideas of democracy occupy a firm place in society in the form of State institutions that serve its needs.

Let's explain our opinion here. The concept of "state capacity" used in research is revealed by Russian scientists through the category of "state capacity", and by British scientists through the category of "State capacity".

"Based on the collected theoretical and empirical data and scientific data, it is safe to say that democratization is effectively carried out where the potential of the state is relatively high" [10, p.57]. Of course, this thought is close to the truth.

As the analysis of the correlation between state capacity and democracy shows, it is necessary to take into account the ability of the state to manage and the high level of "citizenship" of society members.

An important aspect of the case is that the development of democracy requires political activity of members of society and citizens. While maintaining the link between the level of civic responsibility and political culture with the needs of democracy, the democratic potential of the state and the potential of society are being harmonized. "In such free conditions, the flow of aspirations, goals, motives and changes in them in the civil activity of the state will be transferred to the role of a management system, and society will be effectively managed" [11, p.93].

The conclusion is that any electoral activity does not serve the interests of democracy. Democracy requires the political activity of its citizens. Getting out of any rut, succumbing to emotions, can lead to the opposite result, and not to democracy.

The social capital of democracy in the form of members of society should have the characteristics of serving as a source of democracy in terms of its qualitative indicators and political goals. In this regard, F. Fukuyama's thoughts deserve attention. As stated in the work "Social Capital" edited by S. Huntington, "it is necessary to manage citizens' initiatives (for the benefit of democracy). Social capital cannot be allowed to be absolutized. Civic activity does not always lead to general well-being" [12, p.129-130].

Therefore, democracy directly depends on the ability of a citizen to feel the norm of the need for a high-precision attitude on the part of society. The potential of citizens is very high, and citizens' initiatives that damage democracy are not supported [13].

According to A.Volkova, "The following signs of civil potential are distinguished:

- be able to form common values characteristic of society, and be able to think and debate on this issue;
- demonstrate the possibility of forming positive political views;
- development of the social capital of civil society by establishing horizontal cooperation in society;
- strengthening of interaction with public administration bodies in terms of improving the efficiency of public administration;
- the use of humanitarian (non-manipulative) technologies of cooperation" [14, p.46].

One can partially agree with these opinions of the scientist. Proceeding from the fact that civic potential is a comprehensive concept, if we pay attention to the fact that human capabilities are limitless, and there are many undisclosed sides of human genius in the field of democratic development, then high civic potential is the basis for the effectiveness of state policy aimed at democratic development. At the moment, this will accelerate the creation of a consensus-based political environment, which is essential for democracy at the national level. When solving various conflict situations in society, the authorities will prevent the use of "two different" or "three different" standards" [11, p.96].

If we consider its essence, then "democracy is at the same time a factor of a political institution. The reason is that a citizen can participate in the activities of state power only through "demos". That is why the demand for democracy by society as a whole, that is, the presence in society of a large social

stratum of the population extremely inclined to democracy, is one of the important conditions for democratic development" [15, pp.133-134].

At the same time, we should not forget that the civic capacity necessary for democracy is "the continuous accumulation of people's experience, which occurs through the strengthening of close cooperation. Because citizens who are constantly involved in political participation and brought up in this way develop the qualities and direction of activity that guarantee democracy" [16, p.169]. The analysis shows that by the 21st century, new features are being added to the traditional signs of democracy. Currently, scientists refer to the universal signs of democracy: "the desire of the country's population for democracy, according to K. Welzel, the paradox of the desire for democracy" [17, p.121] is an important factor for the full realization of democracy, at the same time it acts as its important sign and attribute.

## CONCLUSION.

It is concluded that the expression of a strong passion for democracy among the population leads to the expansion of social resources, which is extremely necessary to strengthen the democratic potential of the state.

There is a strong link between State capacity and democracy and the process of democratization in the country. Both of them can develop with the support of each other, taking into account the immediate needs of society. The essence of such development lies mainly in strengthening the strategic capabilities of the State, expanding freedoms, human rights and principles of social justice in society. This law will become the leading foundation of modern democratic development.

An important aspect of the case is that when the interests of democracy and its development are combined with the capabilities of the state, "there may be a great danger of a retreat of democracy, i.e., de-democratization. It is known that the emergence of de-democratization at the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century represented the fading of the last wave of democracy" [5, p.35].

## USED LITERATURE:

1. Идиоров У.Ю. Замонавий демократик тараққиётида ёшлар инновацион фаолиятининг роли. - Т.: Bayoz, 2019. 120 Б.
2. Лункин Р., Филатов С. Борьба “за” и “против” идентичности во внутривнутриполитических процессах // Мировая экономика и международные отношения. 2019. №9. 128 С.
3. Иванов В. Концепция государственной состоятельности: сравнительные межстрановые рейтинги против государственной легитимности // Вестник РУДН, серия Международные отношения. 2015. №3. 250 С.
4. Ахременко А., Горельский И., Мельвилль А. Как и зачем измерять и сравнивать государственную состоятельность разных стран мира? // Полис. 2019. №2. 192 С.
5. Лебедева М. Современные мегатренды мировой политики // Мировая экономика и международные отношения. 2019. №9. 128 С.
6. Лебедева М., Харкевич М., Зиновьева Е., Копосова Е. Архаизация государства: роль современных информационных технологий // Полис. 2016. №6. 193 С.
7. E.E.Kurbanov. Modern foundations of democratization of state institutions// Paradigmata Poznani. 2022. №1. 39 P. [http://sociosphera.com/journals/journals2/paradigmata\\_pozn\\_n\\_-\\_2022\\_-\\_1/](http://sociosphera.com/journals/journals2/paradigmata_pozn_n_-_2022_-_1/)
8. Лапкин В. Государство во временах и пространствах: многообразие и изменчивость // Полис. 2020. №6. 192 С.
9. Мелешкина Е. Исследования государственной состоятельности: какие уроки мы можем извлечь? // Политическая наука. 2011. №2. 360 С.

10. Мельвиль А., Ефимов Д. Демократический Левиафан? Режимные изменения и государственная состоятельность – проблема взаимосвязи // Политическая наука. 2016. №4. 440 С.
11. Соловьев В. Государство как производитель политики // Полис. 2016. №2. 193 С.
12. Фукуяма Ф. Социальный капитал. Культура имеет значения. – М., 2002. – 316 С.
13. Например, протесты граждан против результатов выборов, прошедших в Кыргызской Республике осенью 2020 года, оказали очень серьезное негативное влияние на политическую стабильность и социальный мир в стране.
14. Волкова А. Управляемость государство и гражданская состоятельность // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведения. Вопросы теории и практики. - Тамбов: «Грамота», 2014. №4. 219 С.
15. Патрушев С., Филиппова Л. Массовая политика: опыт институциональной реконцептуализации // Полис. 2016. №2. 193 С.
16. Кочеров О. “Грядущая философия” международных отношений и апофатическая демократия Фреда Даллмайра // Полис. 2020. №6. 193 С.
17. Салмина А. Взаимосвязь понимания демократии и отношения к ней в России и Европейских странах // Полис. 2019. №2. 192 С.