

THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF LEGITIMIZING SOCIAL REFORMS THROUGH PUBLIC DIALOGUE

Yunusova Yulduzkhan Shokirjonovna[1]*
[1]Independent researcher of Fergana State University
*ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1110-1970
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23905597

Abstract: The article examines public dialogue and the legitimacy of social reforms. Information, consultation and substantive public justification are distinguished. Participation counts are challenged as a sufficient basis of legitimacy. Inclusion, responsiveness and revisability are developed as assessment criteria. The findings offer a normative framework for evaluating reform dialogue.

Keywords: public dialogue, legitimacy, social reform, deliberation, inclusion, justification, accountability.

INTRODUCTION

Explaining a decision to the public and justifying a decision before the public are not the same activity. In the first case, a finished result can be delivered; in the second, its reasons need to be questioned and verified with alternative views. This article examines this distinction as a philosophical problem of legitimizing social reforms. In the analysis of the modernization of New Uzbekistan through dialogue, it is necessary to determine not only the number of meetings or opinions, but also how they are connected with the decision. Sh. Nazarov covers the dialogue between the state and civil society from a theoretical and legal point of view [1]. F.B. Najimov discusses the legal and institutional foundations of public control in Uzbekistan [2]. These sources define the local research area of dialogue and control. This article, on the other hand, focuses on determining under which conditions communication contributes to the normative acceptability of a decision, rather than resetting specific legal norms. The quality of practical justification with the existence of a legal form are separate issues.

Legitimacy is here interpreted as an authority that can be justified before the affected persons, as opposed to the mere existence or public approval of the decision. This normative sense of acceptability is related to, but not equal, real credibility and consent. A decision may be widely supported, while also circumventing some reasonable objections. Rather, a controversial decision can be normatively defended through open evidence and the possibility of revision. These differences are the initial working definitions of the study.

The purpose of the article is to substantiate the legitimizing conditions of public dialogue through criteria of inclusion, justification, response, and revision. According to the main thesis, dialogue itself does not legitimize a decision; its structure and impact on the decision are crucial. The article does not assess a specific reform. It proposes to indicate which questions should be asked in assessing existing discussions and to indicate the boundary between organizing approval and open justification. L.V.Smorgunov analyzes participatory public administration through platforms and cooperation [3]. M.F.Sirazetdinova discusses the foundations of soli-

ORCID: Shokirjonovna: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1110-1970

darity in relation to subjectivity, predictability and common perception [4]. These sources allow collective coherence not to be explained by command or emotional intimacy alone. The article asks them analytic questions about the need for dialogue participants to have an independent stance and that mutual expectations should be understandable; it does not move their empirical context. G. Smith examines the institutionalization of deliberative democracy through democratic innovation and broader deliberative system communication [5]. This approach encourages the individual meeting not to be judged in isolation from the general decision-making system. Even a well-organized discussion may have limited significance if the outcome does not reach the competent institution. Therefore, this article analyzes together the intrinsic quality of the event with its subsequent political or organizational direction. D. Runciman discusses the relationship between political theory and realpolitik in the age of the internet [6]. J. Habermas advances ideas and hypotheses about the subsequent structural change in the political public space [8]. These sources raise the question that meaningful general discussion does not automatically emerge from the existence of the digital channel. The article does not portray the Internet as merely a liberating or only disruptive tool; it proposes an examination of how the appearance of information, audience communication, and the exchange of grounds are organized. C. Lafont links the political applicability of small discussion groups to broad civic participation [7]. This debate is important so as not to automatically substitute the judgment of the selected group for the judgment of the whole community. The article does not deny the subgroups of the selected group; they can help to uncover the problem and the facts. Their legitimizing contributions, however, depend on how they interact with the public. Representation, consultation and decision-making authority should not be taken for granted.

METHODS

The study was built on a normative-conceptual analysis. Eight sources were selected to compare the changes in local state-society dialogue, participatory governance, deliberative system, and public space. The aim is not to cover all theories of dialogue, but to identify the key concepts and conditions that lead to conclusions about legitimacy. Empirical participants, survey results, or real-world discussion statements were not used as an independent database of this study.

In the first stage, informing, consulting, deliberation, and justification were distinguished. Informing means communicating information, consultation means gathering opinions, and deliberation means being open to sharing reasons and reconsidering a position. Justification means showing in front of those affected why the decision was chosen as acceptable. These differences do not mean that each form of communication remains on only one level; they can come together in one process, but do not automatically prove each other's existence.

In the second phase, thought counter-examples were constructed. A process in which many points were collected but not answered was compared with a process with a lesser, but more reasonable, discussion and observable response. Quantitative results were not included. The aim was to show that it was not possible to make a direct transition from the amount of participation to the quality of legitimacy. Similarly, a situation in which all participants agreed but some of the affected groups were left out was also considered as an analytical test.

ORCID: Shokirjonovna: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1110-1970

In the third stage, the chain of communication was divided into stages of problem posing, organizing participation, sharing evidence, responding, and reviewing the decision. This division is a normative scrutiny tool, rather than a rigorous organizational standard. At each stage, it was clarified which requirement would weaken the legitimization claim if it was not met. The status of the results is theoretical; their practical evaluation requires specific process documents, participant interpretation, and traces of decision change.

RESULTS

The first result is to distinguish legitimization from the gathering of consent to a ready-made decision. A justified objection can be seen as a failure of the process if the goal of the dialogue is only to increase a supportive attitude. In the normative approach, however, the objection serves to determine the weak cause of the decision. This means that the dialogue towards legitimacy does not pre-ablutize the outcome. This does not mean that all decisions must remain open indefinitely; their justifications are required to be able to respond to criticism.

A second consequence is a broader understanding of inclusion than the formal openness of the door. Even if participation is announced, implicit requirements for informational language, time, place, or knowledge may exclude individual individuals. The article does not claim to be as widespread as such exclusion is in practice. It distinguishes between the possibility of participation and its actual usability. Whoever is affected by the discussion must be a justifiable form of hearing that experience.

A third result is to distinguish the response as the central connecting joint of the dialogue. When the connection between the proposal and the decision is not seen, the feedback becomes an outward sign of participation. A meaningful response indicates what change occurred when the proposal was accepted, and the reason when it was rejected. This requirement does not mean approval of the entire proposal, but rather a reasonable assessment of their significance. Smith's emphasis on the deliberative system allows us to see this connection beyond the confines of a single event [5].

A fourth consequence is that legitimacy is not identified with a final agreement. Open discussion can reduce some contradictions and make others more clear. The persistence of disagreement does not necessarily mean that the process is invalid. The important conditions are the openness of the reasons, the procedure for making the decision, and the possibility of revisiting it if there is new evidence. Thus dialogue is not the only source of legitimacy, but is interpreted as an essential normative condition that binds authority to verifiable grounds.

The chart aims to evaluate public communication through its internal and institutional quality, rather than the external scale of the event. The questions it contains provide a direction for practical scrutiny. They are not a rating of a real process or a pre-approved measure of effectiveness.

Table 1. Legitimizing Conditions of Public Dialogue

Criterion	Normative Demands	Texthiruv Savonian
Agenda Entry	Alternative Positions in Posing the Problem	Who determined which issue to discuss?

ORCID: Shokirjonovna: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1110-1970

Criterion	Normative Demands	Texthiruv Savonian
Inclusion	Hearing Impacted Experiences	Who couldn't take part in the practice and why?
Exchange of the basics	Contentful view of the argument and the objection	Are the thoughts responding to each other?
Response	Explanation of acceptance or rejection of the proposal	Is there a reasonable answer to every important objection?
Link to decision	Traceable trace of discussion outcome	What did the dialogue change in the decision?
Repreview	Openness to new arguments and errors	Under what circumstances will the decision be reevaluated?

In evaluating the process, it is necessary to distinguish between the possibility of revision and the indecision. A decision may be necessary within a certain period of time, but this does not justify ignoring the new argument later. Similarly, while an explicit statement is an important trace of dialogue, its existence does not prove that all interests have been heard. When the criteria are applied together, it better illustrates the difference between external formalization and substantive justification.

DISCUSSION

The first objection is that broad public dialogue requires time and resources, while some decisions need to be made quickly. The article does not propose to put the entire issue in the same order of discussion. The scope of the process should be justified in accordance with the impact, likelihood and urgency of the decision. Urgency may shorten the previous consultation, but it does not negate the entire form of further clarification and revision. Thus, the requirement for dialogue is not a denial of the deadline, but a requirement to justify the restriction itself.

The second objection concerns the unequal possibilities of knowledge and speech among citizens. To admit as valid an opinion that can speak only in a complex scientific language can marginalize experiential knowledge. The article does not deny the quality of the argument, but it does not identify it with the way it is expressed. An individual's daily experience can indicate a problem, while an expert can investigate its cause. The task of the discussion is not to pit these two types of knowledge against each other, but to determine their boundaries and connections.

A third objection is that selected subgroups can better discuss a complex issue. Lafont's argument does not deny this possibility, but asks for its engagement with the general public [7]. The author's suggestion is that the outcome of the subgroup should serve to uncover facts and alternatives, rather than taking the place of final authority. Once it is clear how the group was chosen, what it discussed, and how its conclusion influenced the subsequent decision, it will be possible to make a reasonable assessment of its contribution.

Finally, there is a danger of equating the scale of digital dialogue with its deliberative quality. Habermas' hypotheses about the transformation of the public space [8] and Runciman's analysis of theory and real-politics [6] complicate this issue. Visible activism may not be an ex-

ORCID: Shokirjonovna: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1110-1970

change of common causes. Therefore, the openness of the digital channel and the way ideas are heard, interconnected, and institutionally responded must be examined separately.

In order to apply the criteria of the article to the modernization of Uzbekistan, it is proposed to study the documented path of concrete reform discussion. Nazarov's analysis of state-society dialogue [1] is one of the theoretical starting points of this direction. The review can distinguish when and by whom the problem was raised, what options were considered, and whether public opinion was asked before or after the decision. These questions do not constitute a ready-made positive or negative assessment.

In linking public control with dialogue, in addition to the acceptance of the appeal, the observable outcome of the response must also be studied. The normative assessment with the legal and institutional frameworks [2] that Najimov discussed is consistent with this point. The party responsible for the decision can indicate by what criterion he accepted or rejected the proposal, and explain what action was taken on the identified defect. However, this article does not confirm that the current legal order works in this way.

It is useful to compare three types of material in a research design: formal announcements and statements, participants' experiences, and changes in the final decision. Only one source may not indicate the entire quality of the process. While an official record describes the possibility of participation, a personal interpretation reveals how it went in practice. A trace in the decision, on the other hand, helps to examine the relationship of the discussion to the organizational outcome. For such a comparison, time, selection, and coding criteria should be developed separately.

The aim of using legitimization as a practical recommendation should not be to eliminate all dissent. A reasonable disagreement can be maintained in the context of different interests. The normative task is not to hide it, but to explain why the decision was made in this particular way. Dialogue is thus seen as an opportunity to critically examine and modify its decisions if necessary, rather than as an external information supply of modernization.

The study did not measure the outcome of real public discussions or the level of support for reforms. The proposed criteria focus on the normative side of legitimacy. Their practical coherence should be tested in different forms of discussion and types of decisions. In particular, the development of observable criteria to distinguish between a formal response and a meaningful response is an important task of further work.

CONCLUSION

Legitimizing social reforms through public dialogue is not equivalent to gathering approval for a ready-made decision or increasing discussion activities. The article distinguished informing, consulting, sharing mutual reasons, and justifying the decision as separate activities. The main result is to link legitimizing dialogue with the possibility of inclusiveness, meaningful response, and revision. A large scale of participation does not automatically prove the acceptability of a decision, while the unanimity of all parties is not a normatively unified outcome. An important condition is that the affected interests are heard, alternative reasons are investigated, and the path of the decision is understandable. For the philosophical analysis of the modernization of the New Uzbekistan, this approach proposes to transform dialogue from external information activities to a process that is relevant to the decision itself. Small discussion

ORCID: Shokirjonovna: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1110-1970

groups, digital channels, and public oversight should be evaluated through their communications in the overall accountability system, not exclusively. The article does not endorse the legitimacy of explicit reform; empirical material is needed for such an assessment. The proposed criteria serve to test the relationship between the authority of a decision and its justification. Dialogue can only make a reasonable contribution to improving the normative quality of modernization when it is directed towards responding to the objection and, if necessary, correcting the decision, rather than eliminating it.

References / Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar / *Литература*

1. Nazarov Sh. State-Civil Society Dialogue: Theoretical and Legal Analysis and Modern Trends. Jurisprudence, 5(4), 2025. (p. 21–29).
2. Najimov F. B. Legal and Institutional Foundations of Public Control in Uzbekistan. Journal of Science-Innovative Research in Uzbekistan, 3(2), 2025. (p. 91–99).
3. Smorgunov L. V. Participatory State Management: Platforms and Cooperation. Vlast, 27(5), 2019. (p. 9–19). DOI: 10.31171/vlast.v27i5.6712
4. Sirazetdinova M. F. Rossiyskiye sotsiologiki ob osnovanakh solidarnosti: sub'ektivnost', predictability i obshchestvennost' chuvstva [Russian sociologists on the foundations of solidarity: subjectivity, predictability and community of feelings]. Bulletin of the Institute of Sociology, 15(1), 2024. (p. 70–90). DOI: 10.19181/vis.2024.15.1.3
5. Smith G. The Institutionalization of Deliberative Democracy: Democratic Innovations and the Deliberative System. Journal of Zhejiang University (Humanities and Social Sciences), 4(2), 2018. (p. 5–18). DOI: 10.3785/j.issn.1008-942X.CN33-6000/C.2017.06.134
6. Runciman D. Political Theory and Real Politics in the Age of the Internet. Journal of Political Philosophy, 25(1), 2017. (p. 3–21). DOI: 10.1111/jopp.12087
7. Lafont C. Can Democracy Be Deliberative & Participatory? The Democratic Case for Political Uses of Mini-Publics. Daedalus, 146(3), 2017. (p. 85–105). DOI: 10.1162/DAED_a_00449
8. Habermas J. Reflections and Hypotheses on a Further Structural Transformation of the Political Public Sphere. Theory, Culture & Society, 39(4), 2022. (p. 145–171). DOI: 10.1177/02632764221112341

ORCID: Shokirjonovna: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1110-1970