

Published by the decision of the Scientific Council  
of Khachatur Abovian  
Armenian State Pedagogical University



Department of Philosophy and Logic  
named after Academician Georg Brutian



# W I S D O M

2(26), 2023



*WISDOM is covered in Clarivate Analytics' Emerging Sources  
Citation Index service*

ASPU Publication

YEREVAN – 2023

## METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS OF CORRUPTION

Yeranuhi MANUKYAN<sup>1,\*</sup>  | Ani STEPANYAN<sup>2</sup> | Marina ILYUSHINA<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Yerevan State University, Yerevan, Armenia

<sup>2</sup> All-Russian State University of Justice, Moscow, Russian Federation

\* *Correspondence*

Yeranuhi MANUKYAN, Ajapnyak, Bashinjaghyan 188, apartment 56, 0054, Yerevan, Armenia  
E-mail: e.manukyan@ysu.am

*Abstract:* Corruption remains a pervasive global issue with far-reaching consequences for societies, economies, and the rule of law. To effectively understand and combat this complex phenomenon, a robust methodological foundation is essential for socio-philosophical and legal analysis. This article explores the key aspects of corruption analysis, highlighting the multidimensional nature of the problem. It emphasizes the need to examine systemic factors such as institutional weaknesses and transparency deficits, alongside understanding the individual and collective motivations that drive corrupt behavior. The article advocates for a multidisciplinary approach that integrates empirical research, theoretical frameworks, and ethical considerations to unravel the intricate dynamics of corruption. By delving into the economic, social, and political impacts of corruption, this analysis contributes to a comprehensive understanding of corruption's roots and consequences. The insights derived from this methodological exploration can inform the development of effective strategies to combat corruption and strengthen the foundations of a just and accountable society.

*Keywords:* corruption, anti-corruption, civil law, social problem, legal analysis, transparency, international cooperation, personal gain.

### Introduction

Corruption is a complex social phenomenon that has various forms of manifestation, which can be destructive and are able to disintegrate society, limiting its further development. In the professional literature, there are various formulations of the concept of corruption, which are not very characteristic and do not provide an opportunity to reveal the negative sides of the given issue.

The root of this phenomenon originates from the Latin concept “corruption”, which means “destruction” or “violation”, moral decline or immoral behavior. It is formed from a combination of the Latin words “corei” - “when several participants are in binding legal relations to one person and there is an object of dispute” and “rumpere” - “violation of anything” and particularly is considered as abuse of ethical set of norms by individuals for one’s own benefit. Ac-

ording to one of the most accepted interpretations, corruption is considered as the use by an official of the powers and rights entrusted to him for personal gain, contrary to the accepted laws and regulations. An obvious manifestation of corruption is the conflict between the actions of an official and their employer, or the actions of an elected person and the interests of society (Korabanov & Melkin, 2010). This type of conflict can be seen as a manifestation of corruption due to several specific reasons.

Firstly, when an official or elected person prioritizes their personal interests over the interests of the organization or society they serve, it indicates a deviation from their ethical and professional responsibilities.

Secondly, such conflicts often involve the abuse of entrusted power or authority for personal gain, which is a fundamental characteristic of corrupt behavior.

Thirdly, these conflicts undermine the principles of transparency, accountability, and integrity in public service, eroding public trust in the system.

Lastly, the persistence of such conflicts suggests the presence of systemic deficiencies in governance, oversight mechanisms, or ethical standards, all of which facilitate and perpetuate corrupt practices. Therefore, conflicts between officials or elected individuals and their employers or society serve as a clear indication of corruption and the urgent need for socio-philosophical and legal analysis to address these issues.

It is obvious that from time immemorial, issues related to the analysis of corruption, as well as measures to combat this phenomenon have been and continue to be faced by scientists from various points of view, but first of all, the legal analysis of corruption is of particular interest. Moreover, in the context of digitalization, the legal analysis of issues related to combating corruption becomes especially acute.

Corruption is one of the priorities and highly relevant topics for the Russian Federation (hereinafter referred to as the RF) and the fight against it should be aimed at creating an effective system of legal, economic, educational and other measures to prevent corruption (Ilyushina, 2017). The anti-corruption policy in the country should follow the path of improving the legal and regulatory framework of a wide profile.

Conducting a legal analysis of corruption, the

authors propose not only to improve the current legislation in this area, but also to create an effective system of legal, economic, social and other measures to prevent corruption.

## Legal Analysis of Corruption

The legal foundations of corruption in the RF are enshrined in the Federal Law of December 25, 2008 N 273-FZ “On Combating Corruption” (2008). On the first page the legal concept of corruption is fixed, which is understood as:

- a) abuse of official position, giving a bribe, receiving a bribe, abuse of authority, commercial bribery or other illegal use by an individual of his official position contrary to the legitimate interests of society and the state in order to obtain benefits in the form of money, valuables, other property or services of a property nature, other property rights for themselves or for third parties, or the illegal provision of such benefits to the specified person by other individuals;
- b) the commission of the acts specified in subparagraph “a”, on behalf of or in the interests of a legal entity.

In many states, the issues of legal regulation of corruption and the problems of combating it are among the most acute and comprehensive, requiring consideration from various perspectives.

If we consider corruption as a social phenomenon, then there is a strong reason to characterize corruption as opposing the interests of the elite to the interests of the majority, the possibility of illegal use of material and other benefits (Okutina, 2022). According to the sociologist Yu. Levada (2000), the essence of corruption lies in the mass readiness of society “to reject or accept the conditions of a corrupt existence, a measure of forced adaptation” to the rules established in society (p. 65).

Corruption can be differentiated into different types: it is possible to distinguish “socially dangerous corruption”, “socially harmful”, “publicly condemned”, as well as “upper”, middle and lower (Okutina, 2022).

Corruption is also a legal category that affects all spheres of activity, and for the full development of society and the state, it should be eradicated first of all in the legal consciousness of in-

dividuals, since any of its forms cannot only go beyond the norms of morality and ethics, but also cause serious, and sometimes irreparable damage.

An analysis of international legal documents in the field of corruption shows that they lack common approaches to the definition of the concept of “corruption”, which makes it possible for different countries to independently fix it at the legislative level. Given the diversity of approaches to this concept, it is rather difficult to choose a common policy for all countries to develop a single concept and common approaches to combat corruption. Since it affects the sphere of state power and the authorities of local governments, the main burden of responsibility falls on the state itself in terms of increasing the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures. As N. N. Okutina (2022) notes, the main condition for the existence of corruption is the monopoly of the state on most of the types of activities, and the exclusivity of powers, lobbying and personal gain become accompanying components of the corrupt activities of persons vested with state and municipal powers. In this regard, the key can be called the eradication of the causes of the emergence of corruption (for example, a low level of legal awareness, imperfection of the legislative framework and management system, and much more), which is also a rather difficult task.

One of the key causes of corruption is the abuse of the position by officials, the low level of law enforcement practice, etc., which can be eliminated by tightening penalties for corrupt behavior, minimizing corruption risks not only in the system of state bodies, but also in the education system, the introduction in educational institutions of measures to explain corruption risks, measures to combat corruption.

The famous scientists V. V. Sevalnev and E. V. Cherepanova (2022) mention that in the modern world, an effective anti-corruption policy of states depends on the achievements of scientific and in particular technological progress, digitalization. The legal basis for this activity was the adoption of a number of legal acts on the digitalization of the economy and public life. In many countries, a total transition to the use of digital technologies is qualified as one of the effective measures to combat corruption, but it is difficult to take it unambiguously positively. And if in one case, the use of digital technologies increases

the efficiency of the activities of state and some other structures in the relationship between the state and entrepreneurs, then in other cases digital technologies can also be used for corrupt purposes (Sevalnev & Cherepanova, 2022).

The existing anti-corruption measures are not sufficient and require increased vigilance against corruption manifestations, as well as the introduction of more effective anti-corruption measures in such a way as to ensure maximum compensation for the harm caused. This is especially important in the modern world, when both at the national and international levels, work is underway to bring together, first of all, civil law means of counteraction.

At present, an international legal system of measures to combat corruption has been created, which is characterized not only by criminal law anti-corruption means of combating this social evil, but also by civil law methods of anti-corruption struggle, enshrined in the 1999 Civil Law Convention on Corruption (ETS N 174), which entered into force on November 1, 2003, but Russia does not participate in it. In accordance with the approach set forth in this convention, it is preferable for persons affected by acts of corruption to protect their interests precisely within the framework of civil law (Snegireva et al., 2020).

It should be noted that the current legislation lacks civil law mechanisms to combat corruption, which, in our opinion, is a serious gap. And although some authors talk about the need to consolidate certain legal norms on certain categories (for example, on the invalidity of corrupt transactions (Snegireva et al., 2020), we consider it more appropriate fixing the consequences of any manifestation of corrupt behavior in relation to subjects of civil, business and corporate law.

In Art. 10 of the Federal Law of December 25, 2008 N 273-FZ “On Combating Corruption” (2008) establishes the concept of “conflict of interest”, which means the direct and indirect personal interest of a person that can and does affect the proper, objective and impartial performance of official duties (exercise of powers), we believe that this is a clear illustration of corrupt behavior.

A conflict of interest is also a situation where a contradiction arises between the personal interest of an employee (representative of an organization) and the legitimate interests of an organization, which can lead to harm to the rights,

property and (or) business reputation of the organization (Semenova, 2020).

It is precisely under these “other consequences” that anti-corruption mechanisms can be indicated. Moreover, if any corruption scheme or behavior is detected when performing any action (and even inaction), the legislator should refuse to apply the statute of limitations, which, in our opinion, will increase the vigilance of participants in civil circulation, by amending Art. 208 of the Civil Code of the RF, including in the list of claims that are not subject to limitation of actions, claims for the protection of property and personal non-property rights as a result of corrupt actions and corrupt behavior. It is also necessary to clearly regulate the system of measures applied to participants in civil circulation.

The first part of Art. 13 of the Federal Law of December 25, 2008 N 273-FZ “On Combating Corruption” (2008) states that “Citizens of the Russian Federation, foreign citizens and stateless persons for committing corruption offenses bear criminal, administrative, civil and disciplinary liability in accordance with the legislation of the Russian Federation”. This rule entails compensation for losses and payment of a penalty (fine, penalty) in full. The value of civil liability lies in the fact that it is of a property nature and can be applied regardless of bringing the guilty person to other types of liability.

However, despite the specified normative consolidation, the basis of civil liability for corruption offenses in Russian legislation is primarily substantive norms of a general nature (Rezyuk, 2022).

As M. N. Ilyushina notes, this is a norm of a kind of innovation, orienting law enforcement agencies to the need to use not only criminal procedure, but also other branches of law in the fight against corruption. Accordingly, as an independent legal form of civil liability for a corruption offense, the civil law institution of obligations as a result of causing harm. This institution is suitable for forcing corrupt officials to fully or partially compensate for property damage caused to the state or municipality as a result of government decisions (illegal administrative acts) taken by them under the influence of selfish interests of officials that are obviously unfavorable for the state or local government (illegal administrative acts) (Ilyushina, 2009).

Moreover, liability measures in the civil law

sphere should be applicable not only to officials, but also to citizens occupying certain positions in the business and corporate sphere of activity. As support for this hypothesis, the provision of subpart. According to the Civil Code of the RF it is allowed to forcibly seize property from the owner by a court decision, property is transferred to the income of the Russian Federation, in respect of which, in accordance with the legislation of the Russian Federation on combating corruption, evidence of its acquisition with legal income is not presented.

And as noted by N. Snegireva, O. Novruzova and P. Snegireva (2020), maintaining a balance between private and public law, which accompanies the effective functioning of the anti-corruption mechanism, and civil law norms just contribute to this.

Thus, the use of such civil law mechanisms as the invalidation of not only corrupt transactions, but also the application of the consequences of such invalidity, the legislator’s refusal to apply limitation periods, will allow civil law methods to fight corruption, more effectively solve problems in the field of countering corruption.

## The Socio-Philosophical Analysis of the Problem of Corruption

The socio-philosophical analysis of the problem of corruption is justified by the fact that this problem is multi-branch and multi-content, so the search for ways to prevent corruption is not only within the framework of legal acts, it is necessary to distinguish the objective and subordinate reasons that make the manifestation of corruption obvious. In the professional literature, modern researchers distinguish the destructive consequences of corruption, considering it as the main obstacle preventing the formation and development of a democratic society. Modern civilizational developments prove that corruption in modern society is considered as a social phenomenon that destabilizes public relations and hinders the strengthening of democracy (Aleksiev, 2007).

In particular, speaking about the origin and causes of corruption, the famous researcher A. V. Makarov (2012) notes that corruption schemes operate even in countries guided by long established democratic traditions. It should be stated

that corruption is a public evil threatening the state reaching a cosmic scale, which is a real obstacle in the matter of state building. At the same time, the researchers found that “a quarter of our compatriots believe that corruption and the weakness of state power have already become the main obstacle to effective economic reforms in the country.” Thus, corruption causes real material damage to the country, therefore it can and should be considered as a political, legal, and economic phenomenon. Combining political, legal and economic components, corruption pre-determines the nature of social relations. For example, E. Lazarev (2011) sees corruption as a “self-sustaining political institution” (p. 8). D. Kazimbetova (2004) considers it as political crime where “public danger has increased” (p. 145).

According to the researchers, the presence of anti-corruption commissions will allow solving a number of serious social problems. This stimulates research interest in the search for reasonable means of combating corruption. Modern researcher Y. Okhotsky (2019) once mentioned “Overcoming corruption is equal to the establishment of proper order in the country, the real protection of the population from the further deterioration of the social, and first of all, financial situation” (p. 221).

Adopting a socio-philosophical perspective, corruption can be understood as a socially formalized but illegal conspiracy where one party seeks to improve their material status while the other gains access to previously inaccessible, hard-to-reach, and scarce social privileges. The pragmatic undertone inherent in such social relations determines the viability and perpetuation of this practice. Corruption manifests itself as a widespread objective in public relations, permeating various spheres of public life and emerging within diverse social interaction frameworks.

Understanding the far-reaching consequences of corruption is crucial for devising effective prevention strategies that go beyond legal measures. Corruption poses a significant obstacle to the formation and development of democratic societies, destabilizes public relations, and hampers the strengthening of democracy. Its pervasiveness, even in countries with long-established democratic traditions, highlights the urgency of addressing corruption as a public evil that threatens state stability and economic progress.

In addition, corruption changes the philosophy of a person’s life and the way to achieve the desired quality of life. In fact, it shows the diversification of ways to achieve the desired. In this regard, the state authorities are taking decisive steps to solve this problem.

Observing corruption from a socio-philosophical point of view, it can be concluded that it is a socially formalized (but illegal) conspiracy, where one side raises the material status, while the other gets previously inaccessible, hard-to-reach, scarce social privileges. The obvious pragmatic note that sounds in the ensemble of such social relations determines the viability of this practice. Corruption manifests itself as a widespread objective public relations. Corruption, which penetrated into various spheres of public life, began to form within the framework of various schemes of social interaction. As a result, the diversity of corruption manifestations allows researchers to identify the typology of corruption relations. Currently, it is becoming obvious that corruption has become a systemic social problem. At the core of the socio-philosophical analysis is the variety of reasons for the manifestation of corruption, separated by different determining factors.

*Governance and Institutional Factors:* Weak governance structures, ineffective law enforcement, and inadequate checks and balances can create an environment conducive to corruption. When institutions lack transparency, accountability, and independence, they are more prone to corruption. Inadequate salaries and benefits for public officials can also incentivize corruption as a means of supplementing their income.

*Socioeconomic Factors:* Socioeconomic conditions, such as poverty, inequality, and unemployment, can contribute to corruption. In societies where basic needs are unmet and opportunities for social mobility are limited, corruption can be seen as a way to gain access to resources, services, or employment.

*Cultural and Social Factors:* Cultural norms, values, and social expectations play a significant role in shaping corruption. Societies that tolerate or even reward unethical behavior, nepotism, and favoritism may have a higher prevalence of corruption. Additionally, social networks and personal relationships can be exploited to gain unfair advantages, leading to corruption.

*Political Factors:* Political instability, lack of

realized in a certain period of time, taken in their systemic unity. At the same time, in order to establish systemic links between these cycles, the modern legal science needs additional cognitive tools. This toolkit is based on the phenomenon of the legal pattern.

Recently, among domestic and foreign scientists, the category of “legal pattern” has become popular in the study of various regularities of legal regulation. Thus, a legal pattern is understood as: a means of determining the legal form (Tretyakov, 2022, pp. 182-209); a means of convergence of the theory of law and the doctrine of communication, or Luhmann’s system theory (Ladeur, 1999); content of regulatory legal arrays (Nesterov, 2020, pp. 11-16); the external form of legal information that is formed in a person’s mind as a result of a purposeful expression of will (Ivanskiy, 2013, 2014, 2016a, 2016b); a certain element of the legal system (Lebedev, 2022a, 2022b); etc. At the same time, the content of this category as a whole remains uncertain, and its application is situational.

According to the author’s opinion, the legal pattern should be considered, on the one hand, as a phenomenon, and, on the other hand, as a process. As a phenomenon, a legal pattern is an integrative concept that allows, within the framework of a single scientific category, to present: an intuitive legal understanding; a legal norm or institution, presented both as a text of the law and a certain logical structure; an unformalized sample of lawful behavior, acting as an expression of legal consciousness. As a process, the legal pattern allows us to explore the transition from an intuitive legal understanding to a legal norm representing the form–content of positive law, from a legal norm to an informal sample of lawful behavior, from such a sample to a legal code, that is, a means of overcoming of a regulatory crisis that compensates the insufficiency of personal experience of individual subjects of law due to a behavior model presented in a formalized (legal norm, institute of law) and in an informal view.

## Conclusion

Based on the above, we can draw the following several main conclusions.

One of the ways to present a rational picture of law is to establish systemic links that exist between different regulatory cycles.

The introduction of the category “regulatory cycle” by the authors into scientific circulation allows us to track the change in attitude to a particular threat, the prevention of which causes the need for legal regulation. The “regulatory cycle” also allows us to track the attitude of society to a particular threat from ignoring it through zero tolerance to its acceptance.

The regulatory crisis is a turning point in the regulatory cycle, when there is awareness of the threat and its acceptance. This is a very long, sometimes permanent, process within the framework of social development.

Social development involves the implementation of an indefinite set of regulatory cycles. Their specific number is directly related to the number of threats faced by a person and society. At the same time, the acceptance of one threat may give rise to new ones, which will also need their awareness.

The currently accepted ideas about the legal system through a set of legal norms combined into institutions are not sufficient to build a system of links between regulatory cycles. The modern legal science needs additional cognitive tools to establish them. According to the author’s opinion, the basis of this toolkit should be the category of “legal pattern”, considered as a phenomenon and process.

## Acknowledgement

The article was prepared with the financial support of a grant from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation (project “The was latest trends in the development of human and social sciences in the context of the digitalization process and new social problems and threats: an interdisciplinary approach”, Agreement No. 075-15-2020-798).

## References

Alekseev, S. S. (1999). *Pravo: azbuka – teorija – filosofija. Opyt kompleksnogo issledovanija* (Law: ABC – theory – philosophy)

and latent functions. For instance, the sale of academic degrees or positions can undermine the meritocratic principles of education, devaluing the qualifications of individuals. However, in certain societies with limited educational opportunities or biased admission processes, corruption may offer a pathway for marginalized individuals to access education and employment opportunities they would otherwise be denied. This latent function highlights the broader issues of inequality and systemic flaws in educational systems.

These cases exemplify the dialectic of dysfunction and latent function in the socio-philosophical perception of corruption. While corruption often leads to negative consequences and dysfunctional systems, it can also serve hidden functions that may provide short-term benefits or address specific social challenges. However, it is crucial to recognize that these latent functions perpetuate broader systemic problems and hinder the development of transparent, accountable, and just societies. Efforts to combat corruption should aim to address both the dysfunction and latent functions, seeking long-term solutions that prioritize ethical governance, social justice, and sustainable development.

### Exploring the International Dimension

Corruption has transcended national borders and become a global phenomenon with profound consequences. The international level of corruption is a critical aspect of understanding and addressing this multifaceted social problem.

*Global Consequences:* Corruption poses severe consequences not only at the national level but also on a global scale. It undermines sustainable development, erodes trust in institutions, distorts markets, hinders foreign direct investment, and exacerbates poverty and inequality. The World Bank estimates that corrupt practices drain over \$2.6 trillion annually from the global economy (World Bank, 2016). This staggering figure highlights the need for comprehensive international efforts to combat corruption.

*Cross-Border Networks:* Corruption often operates through intricate cross-border networks involving individuals, organizations, and even states. Illicit financial flows, money laundering, and bribery schemes can span multiple jurisdic-

tions, making it difficult to detect, investigate, and prosecute such crimes. Addressing corruption requires international cooperation and coordination to dismantle these networks and hold the perpetrators accountable.

*Global Anti-Corruption Initiatives:* Recognizing the international nature of corruption, several initiatives and organizations have emerged to combat this pervasive problem. The United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) is a notable example, serving as the principal global legal framework for anti-corruption efforts. It promotes international cooperation, asset recovery, and the implementation of preventive measures (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, n.d.). Additionally, organizations such as Transparency International work to raise awareness, monitor corruption trends, and advocate for stronger anti-corruption measures worldwide (Transparency International, n.d.).

*Transnational Bribery:* The issue of transnational bribery further emphasizes the international dimension of corruption. Multinational companies engaging in bribery to secure contracts or gain unfair advantages in foreign markets not only perpetuate corrupt practices but also undermine the principles of fair competition and hinder economic development in host countries. The enforcement of laws, such as the United States Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA) and the United Kingdom Bribery Act, underscores the need for international cooperation to combat transnational bribery effectively.

*International Cooperation:* Addressing corruption requires robust international cooperation, information sharing, and mutual legal assistance among countries. Extradition treaties, asset recovery mechanisms, and joint investigation teams are essential tools in combating corruption across borders. Strengthening the capacities of law enforcement agencies, judicial systems, and anti-corruption institutions globally is crucial to foster effective international collaboration.

*Global Reputation and Perception:* Corruption tarnishes the reputation of countries and affects their standing in the international community. It erodes trust among nations, deters foreign investment, and hampers diplomatic relations. Countries with high levels of corruption often face difficulties in accessing international aid and suffer from economic and political isolation. Recognizing the international repercussions of



corruption, governments have a strong incentive to prioritize anti-corruption measures to enhance their global image and foster stronger international partnerships.

The socio-philosophical and legal analysis of corruption cannot overlook its international dimension. Corruption's global consequences, cross-border networks, the existence of anti-corruption initiatives, transnational bribery, the need for international cooperation, and the impact on a country's reputation all highlight the imperative for comprehensive and collaborative efforts to combat corruption worldwide. By addressing corruption at both the national and international levels, societies can strive towards a more just, transparent, and equitable global order.

There are some factors that can low the efficiency and the level of engagement and participation of fighting against corruption:

*Lack of Awareness and Understanding:* One reason for the low level of engagement and participation is a lack of awareness and understanding among citizens regarding the detrimental effects of corruption on society. Many people may not fully comprehend how corruption undermines public trust, hampers economic development, and perpetuates social inequality. This lack of awareness can hinder citizens' motivation to actively participate in anti-corruption initiatives.

*Fear of Reprisals and Retaliation:* In societies where corruption is deeply entrenched, citizens may face significant risks when attempting to expose corrupt practices or participate in anti-corruption activities. Whistleblowers and activists who speak out against corruption often face threats, harassment, or even physical harm. The fear of reprisals and retaliation acts as a deterrent, discouraging citizens from actively engaging in the fight against corruption.

*Limited Access to Information and Resources:* Effective citizen engagement requires access to information, transparency, and accountability mechanisms. However, in many countries, access to relevant information regarding corrupt practices, government budgets, and public expenditure is limited. Additionally, citizens may lack the resources, such as legal support or platforms for collective action, to actively participate in anti-corruption efforts. These barriers impede the ability of civil society organiza-

tions and individuals to engage meaningfully in fighting corruption.

*Political and Institutional Constraints:* The level of engagement and participation of civil society and citizens is influenced by the political and institutional environment. In some cases, governments may restrict civil society organizations, impede their activities, or pass legislation that inhibits their ability to combat corruption effectively. Weak rule of law, lack of independent judiciary, and limited avenues for citizen participation further contribute to the low level of engagement.

*Mistrust and Cynicism:* Corruption erodes trust in institutions and can lead to widespread cynicism among citizens. When people perceive corruption as pervasive and deeply rooted, they may develop a belief that their efforts will have little impact in combating corruption. This sense of hopelessness and mistrust can dampen citizens' motivation to actively engage and participate in anti-corruption initiatives.

*Lack of Incentives and Recognition:* Another factor contributing to the low level of engagement is the absence of sufficient incentives and recognition for citizens who take a stand against corruption. In societies where corrupt practices are prevalent, individuals who expose corruption or engage in anti-corruption activities may not receive the support or recognition they deserve. Without adequate incentives and rewards, citizens may be less inclined to actively participate in the fight against corruption.

To address the issue of low engagement of civil society and active participation of citizens, it is essential to focus on creating an enabling environment that promotes awareness, protects individuals, and fosters a culture of transparency and accountability. Governments, civil society organizations, and international actors should work together to:

- Raise awareness about the detrimental impacts of corruption and the importance of citizen participation in combating it.
- Provide protection and support mechanisms for individuals who expose corruption or engage in anti-corruption efforts.
- Enhance access to information and resources necessary for citizens to participate effectively in anti-corruption initiatives.
- Strengthen legal frameworks and institutions

whistleblowers.

- Recognize and incentivize individuals and organizations that actively contribute to the fight against corruption.

By addressing these underlying factors and creating an environment that encourages and empowers citizens, we can foster a culture of active participation and engagement in the fight against corruption. Only through collective efforts and a comprehensive approach can we effectively combat corruption and build more transparent, accountable, and just societies.

## Conclusion

The study of the methodological foundations of socio-philosophical and legal analysis of corruption reveals the multifaceted and far-reaching implications of this pervasive problem. Corruption, especially at the international level, poses a significant threat to the fundamental principles upon which societies are built.

First and foremost, corruption undermines the rule of law, which forms the cornerstone of a just and equitable society. When corruption seeps into legal systems, it erodes trust in institutions and compromises the integrity of the justice system. This erosion of trust has dire consequences for democracy, as citizens become disillusioned and disengaged from the political process.

Moreover, corruption has a detrimental impact on human rights. It perpetuates inequality and injustice by diverting resources away from those who need them the most. Corruption also has severe consequences for effective governance and economic development. When public officials abuse their power for personal gain, it hampers the efficient functioning of government institutions. Resources that should be allocated for public welfare and infrastructure development are diverted to illicit activities, hindering economic growth and impeding progress.

Furthermore, corruption distorts competition by creating an uneven playing field in both the public and private sectors. The consequences of corruption extend beyond the economic realm. It poses a serious threat to the stability of democratic institutions and the moral foundations of society. When corruption becomes endemic, public trust is eroded, and societal values are compromised. This erosion of trust can lead to social

unrest, political instability, and a breakdown of social cohesion.

In the face of these challenges, it is crucial to recognize that the fight against corruption requires a comprehensive approach. While international organizations and national bodies play a role in combating corruption, a singular approach is unlikely to be effective. Instead, a combination of top-down measures from the government and bottom-up initiatives from civil society is necessary.

Governments must demonstrate a strong commitment to combating corruption by enacting and enforcing robust legal frameworks, establishing transparent and accountable institutions, and fostering a culture of integrity within the public sector. Simultaneously, civil society organizations, media, and citizens should actively engage in holding governments accountable, advocating for transparency, and promoting ethical behavior.

Moreover, effective anti-corruption measures require collaboration and cooperation between the government and the people. This partnership can facilitate the exchange of information, enhance citizen participation, and foster a sense of collective responsibility in tackling corruption. By working together, governments and citizens can create a culture of integrity, where corruption is not tolerated, and transparency and accountability are valued.

In conclusion, addressing corruption requires a holistic approach that encompasses legal, socio-philosophical, and institutional dimensions. It is a collective responsibility that demands the commitment of governments, the engagement of civil society, and the active participation of citizens.

## References

- Alekseev, S. V. (2007). Psychology of corruption and the causes of deviation. *Humanities and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 5, 1-28.
- Ilyushina, M. N. (2009). *Nedestvitel'nost' sdelok kak grazhdansko-pravovoe posledstvie korrupcionnyh pravonarushenij* (Invalidity of transactions as a civil-legal consequence of corruption offenses, in Russian). *Zakony Rossii: opyt*,

- analiz, praktika (Laws of Russia, Experience, Analysis, Practice, in Russian)*, 12, 26-31.
- Ilyushina, M. N. (2017). *Grazhdansko-pravovyye mekhanizmy preodoleniya korrupcii i reforma grazhdanskogo zakonodatel'stva o nedejstvitel'nosti sdelok (Civil-legal mechanisms to overcome corruption and reform of civil legislation on the invalidity of transactions, in Russian)*. *Rossijskij sledovatel' (Russian Investigator, in Russian)*, 24, 22-27.
- Kazimbetova, D. K. (2004). *Korrupsiya kak politiko-pravovoy fenomen (Corruption as a political-judicial phenomenon, in Russian)*. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya (Sociological Study, in Russian)*, 8, 145-146.
- Konvenciya o grazhdansko-pravovoj otvetstvennosti za korrupciyu (ETS N 174) (Civil Law Convention on Corruption (ETS N 174), in Russian)*. (1999, November 4). Strasbourg. Retrieved March 10, 2023, <https://www.consultant.ru/cons/cgi/online.cgi?req=doc&base=INT&n=7783#KwIPEhTjtFPhvie>
- Korabanov, A. L., & Melkin S. K. (2010). *Sovremennyye problemy protivodeystviya korrupsii: monografiya (Modern problems of fighting against corruption, in Russian)*. Moscow: Wolters Kluwer.
- Lazarev, E. A. (2011). *Korrupsiya i politicheskaya stabil'nost': institutsional'naya perspektiva (Corruption and political stability: Institutional perspective, in Russian)*. *Politeia*, 1, 15.
- Levada, Yu. (2000). *Chelovek v korrupcionnom prostranstve. Razmyshleniya na materialah i na polyah issledovaniya (Human in a corruption space. Reflections on materials and fields of researches)*. *Monitoring obshchestvennogo mneniya (Monitoring of public opinion, in Russian)*, 5, 7-14.
- Makarov, A. V. (2012). *Osobennosti zakonodatel'nogo protivodeystviya korrupsii v sub'yektakh Rossiyskoy Federatsii (na primere sub'yektov RF - Zabaykalskogo kraja, Respubliki Buryatiya, Irkutskoy oblasti) (Features of legislative counteraction to corruption in the constituent entities of the Russian Federation (On the example of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation - the Trans-Baikal Territory, the Republic of Buryatia, the Irkutsk Region, in Russian)*. *Gosudarstvennaya vlast' i mestnoe samoupravlenie (State Power and Local Self-Government, in Russian)*, 10, 14-17.
- Okhotsky, E. V. (2019). *Russias participation in international anti-corruption cooperation. Public Administration Issues, Higher School of Economics*, 1, 211-228.
- Okutina, N. N. (2022). *Ponyatie i sushchnost' korrupcii v sovremennoj Rossii (The concept and essence of corruption in modern Russia, in Russian)*. *Gosudarstvennaya vlast' i mestnoe samoupravlenie (State Power and Local Self-Government, in Russian)*, 2, 52-56.
- Rezyuk, V. I. (2022). *Material'nye normy o grazhdansko-pravovoj otvetstvennosti za sovershenie pravonarushenij korrupcionnogo haraktera v zakonodatel'stve Rossii i Belarusi (Material norms on civil-legal liability for committing corruption offenses in the legislation of Russia and Belarus, in Russian)*. *Elektronnoe prilozhenie k "Rossijskomu yuridicheskomu zhurnalu" (Electronic Appendix to Russian Juridical Journal, in Russian)*, 1, 21-27.
- Semenova, E. A. (2020). *Pravoprimeritel'naya praktika yuriskonsul'ta: uchebno-prakticheskoe posobie (Law enforcement practice of a legal adviser: A training manual, in Russian)*. Moscow: Prospekt.
- Sevalnev, V. V., & Cherepanova, E. V. (2022). *Pravovyye osnovy protivodeystviya korrupcii v gosudarstvakh - uchastnikakh SNG v usloviyah cifrovizatsii (Legal framework for combating corruption in the CIS member states in the context of digitalization, in Russian)*. *Mezhdunarodnoe publichnoe i chastnoe pravo (International Public and Private Right, in Russian)*, 3, 25-28.
- Snegireva, N. I., Novruzova, O. B., & Snegireva, P. E. (2020). *Grazhdansko-pravovyye mery protivodeystviya korrupcii (Civil-Legal measures counteraction of corruption, in Russian)*. *Mirovoj sud'ya*

*(World Judge, in Russian)*, 3, 25-29.  
*Sobranie zakonodatel'stva RF* (Collection of Federal Law of RF December 25, 2008 N 273-FZ <https://www.fao.org/faolex/results/details/fr/c/LEX-FAOC2027-42/>, in Russian). (2008). № 52.  
Tverskova, I. V. (2012). *Kachestvennaya i polnaya regional'naya normativnaya baza*

- *odin iz zaslonov korruptsii (A high-quality and complete regional regulatory framework is one of the barriers to corruption, in Russian)*. *Gosudarstvennaya vlast' i mestnoe samoupravlenie (State Power and Local Self-Government, in Russian)*, 10, 17-20.