

Democracy: An Anthology of Topical Problems

¹Varvara Igorevna Blishchenko, ²Vladimir Georgiyevich Egorov, ³Dmitry Nikolaevich Ermakov,
⁴Sergey Yakovlevich Lavrenov, ⁵Vladimir Vladimirovich Shtol and ⁶Olga Alexandrovna Zozulya

¹Department of Jurisprudence, MGIMO University,
Moscow, Russian Federation

²Department of Historical Sciences, Institute of the
CIS Countries (Institute of Diaspora and Integration), Moscow, Russian Federation

³Department of Political Sciences, Financial University under the
Government of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia

⁴Department of Political Sciences, Kutafin Moscow State Law University,
Moscow, Russian Federation

⁵Department of Political Sciences, Russian Presidential Academy of
National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA), Moscow, Russian Federation

⁶Department of Historical Sciences, Moscow State Regional University,
Moscow, Russian Federation

Abstract: At the present stage of social development in the framework of globalization and large-scale transformation of the social relations the society is undergoing the process of complication: new identities, groups, institutions are being generated which somehow become part of political events and impact on the social and political relations. The growing individualization of the subjects of the social process as well as the complexity of the social structure, complicates the process of self-identification of people as a source of power and achievement of consensus in the definition of the common good. These circumstances actualize the problem of the study of the theory of democracy and the subsequent development of a model that would be adequate to modern conditions and allow closing the gap, on the one hand, between theory and practice and on the other-between the nominal representation and direct implementation of people power. In addition, at the moment humanitarian knowledge does not have an unequivocal determination of the content of the democracy concept which is caused by the need for academic reflection and study of the phenomenon of this social appearance. This study deals with a theoretical analysis of the idea of “democracy”, different approaches and concepts, especially the classical theory of democracy which was influenced by the ideas of liberalism and developed in the work of Alexis de Tocqueville, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, Joseph Schumpeter, Max Weber. Particular attention is paid to the analysis of the possibility of people power, relations between elites and people masses in the works of the founders of study of elites, the role of the party system in the functioning of representative democracy, model of reduction democracy of R. Dahl, known as pluralist democracy or polyarchy, the concept of associative democracy, post-democracy. The authors also explore the “hybrid” associated with the direct political process, projects of consolidation of public interest and its implementation in the framework of modern democratic practice. In the perspective of actualization of the conceptual content of the article the theme of democratic transition in Russia and the former soviet states is touched upon. The author concludes that implementation of the objectives of democratic reforms in the former Soviet Union should be carried out by means of the conservative modernization.

Key words: Democracy, people power, pluralist democracy, democratic transition, polyarchy, plebiscite, monitoring democracy, post-democracy, procedural democracy

INTRODUCTION

Democracy as a category of political science and social practice which realizes humanity’s aspirations for freedom and justice has always been at the center of scientific learning. Despite the fact that the problems of

democracy have occupied the minds of intellectuals, starting with Aristotle, science is still far from a clear definition of the content, quality criteria and especially the development prospects of this social phenomenon. The difficulty of mastering the phenomenon of democracy is not only connected with the natural for the social

sciences subjectivity, ideological and political conditionality of the cognitive process but also with the actual complexity of the object of reflection. And that is not only the case that in each specific historical period and in terms of a particular cultural tradition democratic principles are implemented specifically. Collision of advancement in this area of knowledge, in our opinion is more concerned with the non-static mode of most democracies, actualized in correlation with the structure of society. For example, the potential of the implementation of people power by means of the representative democracy directly depends on the degree of society's homogeneity and on the other hand, the inevitable increase of the "complexity" of its quality by Zolo (1992) causes the transformation of the pattern of democracy in the public consciousness and practice. Imbalance between the mechanism of the democratic regime and the needs of people power implementation through the preservation of obsolete or politically engaged construct which ensures political involvement, inevitably leads to pathology in the organization of society (the dominance of elite preferences, absenteeism, deprivation of legitimate power, public apathy, etc).

Since, the absolute embodiment of people power due to objective circumstances can be considered in practical way only as a goal-setting, most philosophers are prone to the reduction of the concept and practice in each case up to some "major" procedures or institutions of the democratic process.

Besides democracy, like any other social phenomenon has its specific historical and temporal dimension. Attempts of universalization of the mechanism and instruments of the democratic regime do not have any success either in terms of its conceptualization, or in terms of practical implementation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In our view, democracy is a recognized by the society necessity to attract people to the solution of fundamental problems of the country, formalized in political and social institutions operating in specific national and chronologically particular environment due to social, economic, ideological, mental factors, transformed with the growth of the society "complexity". Despite the fact that some manifestations of people power were present in the ancient times (Greek Polis), in the communal and local self-government of the middle ages and modern age, the revolutionary and social movements in the pre-industrial era, democracy is a phenomenon of modernity that was preceded by the industrial revolution, the development of the rule of law and the principles of direct control (Tily, 2007). The classical theory of democracy has been shaped by the ideas of liberalism and based on the priority of political equality and freedom of self-determination of an

individual, the identification of citizens as a subject of power. However, political participation through the available mechanism of representation already since the proclamation of democracy as the most important social value has not ensured "Government of the people, by the people, for the people". Imperfection of representative democracy was marked in the end of the 18th century by Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Alternative to an unattainable ideal of people power by means of parliamentary system the great Frenchman saw in the democracy of small communities. Despite the fact that Rousseau later questioned the principle of human society organization through the differentiation into autonomous cells, even nowadays there are followers of the implementation of a genuine democracy based on self-government, formalized both in production collectives (cooperatives) and on the territory, including alternative communities consciously developing on the principles alternative both to capitalism and the usual village.

In his "model" of democracy Rousseau proceeded from the need to overcome class differences in society, preventing the consolidation of public interests and the formation of one-class society of working proprietors. Democracy by Thomas Jefferson also involves the construction of one-class society in which everyone is economically independent (Macpherson, 2011).

Proceeding from the fact that social equality is inaccessible, Jeremy Bentham admitted that wealth, due to the disproportionate division of property is a source of power that is manipulating the actions of others to achieve comfortable living conditions. According to his words the relationship between wealth and power is the most intimate and deep, it is so profound that the separation of one from another, even in imagination is very difficult. They are both relative to each other as instruments of production. And furthermore, human beings are the most powerful instruments of production and therefore, each is concerned to use the service of their brethren for the sake of increasing their own convenience. Hence, burning and common thirst for power and the same common hatred of subjection (Macpherson, 2011). Thus, the inequality in the property, according to J. Bentham, eliminates the material and political egalitarianism. And overcoming inequality in the possession of the property is impossible due to the fact that the guarantee of its inviolability is an essential stimulus of production. Advocate of market, liberal economics J. Bentham proceeded from the recognition of objective law in the differentiation of society under the capitalist mode of production. In this regard, according to J. Bentham, the paternalistic model of democracy has as its distinctive purpose and result the protection of its members from harassment and extortion by the officials which it employs to protect themselves and has been the only way by means of a majority votes, to prevent the

robbery by the government of other people and to provide partial turnover of rulers (Macpherson, 2011). According to a Canadian researcher Macpherson such a model of democracy has no idea that it could be morally transformative force; it is nothing more than a logical requirement of control by naturally selfish and conflicting individuals (Macpherson, 2011).

Also, John Stuart Mill, recognizing the impossibility of avoiding the social and material inequality, in the first place, tied representative democracy with a hope to improve the morale and the organization of society. And, secondly, by offering the system of multiple voting he “adapted” the mechanism of representation to the social heterogeneity.

A democratic political system, according to Mill (2006) can make optimal use of existing moral, intellectual and active forces in order to give them the most influence in public affairs. In connection with the approval of the messianic role of democracy, the model of J.S. Mill was included in the anthology of the world political thought as a “moral” or “model of development”.

However, an appeal of the intellectual to the moral side of things did not exclude the fact of recognition of the effects of the unequal distribution of social differentiation, so he proposed a non-trivial approach to the elimination of obstacles to the promotion of democracy. In his research “Principles of political economy” he confesses that he is not fascinated by the ideals of life of those who think that the normal state of human beings is the struggle for prosperity and is not sure that the need to crush, to destroy, to wedge off, beat all others the key feature of modern social life represents the best life that humanity might wish for itself but just some sort of unpleasant manifestations of one of the stages of the production progress. He accepts the possibility that this is a necessary stage in the development of civilization, however, this is not the kind of social perfection which will cause a burning desire to assist in its implementation for the philanthropists of the future... Meanwhile, people who do not consider the modern early stage of human perfection as the last stage of this process, can be justified in their relative indifference to the type of economic progress that inspires the traditional politicians as for example, the simple expansion of production and increase in accumulation (Mill, 2007).

Mill (2007) having left aside hopes of some of his predecessors for one-class society and rationalism considering selfish motives of individuals of the others, proposed to “slightly adopt” the mechanism of representation to the social heterogeneity. In order that the numerically dominant classes could not “impose”

class legislation, according to his opinion, the possibility to vote several times for some categories of citizens was admitted while for the others (for example, welfare recipients, bankrupts, tax evaders) to be deprived of the right to vote at all. Such a system of representation was to give more votes to those whose opinion was entitled to a greater consideration (Mill, 2006).

“Moral” model of democracy which reflects the perspective of social development to the greatest extent, significantly augmented with descriptive potential, dominates in contemporary academic discourse and social practice. It is not modernization of the architecture of representation, but the social practice itself that has led to the aggregation of political participation of elites whose opinion is entitled to a greater attention and the prospect of the society improving in accordance with the ideals of the Enlightenment is still associated with the consistent implementation of the liberal democracy principles.

Distribution of electoral rights to the highest possible majority of population, about which J.S. Mill was talking in “Considerations on representative government” has not abolished the imperfections of representative democracy. The uniqueness of the democratic experience of the United States, mentioned by Alexis de Tocqueville which consists of equality of people among themselves on their material status and the level of intellectual development, a phenomenon in any country of the world and never through the centuries, the memory of which stores the history of mankind, has never existed, nevertheless has not excluded the reduction of the people power to the “control of the majority” which consisted mainly out of law-abiding citizens who either by nature or because of interests sincerely wish good for the country (Tocqueville, 1992).

The founders of elitology and especially Pareto (2011) believed that the rapid growth of wealth, savings, capital invested in the production, a way of wealth distribution which involves maintaining inequalities irrevocably differentiated the societies into the governing elite and the governed and the modern parliaments are becoming an effective tool of demagogic plutocracy.

Disunity in the society of the rulers and the ruled Jose Ortega y Gasset explained by the readiness of the elites to take responsibility for compliance with the democratic standards of the hostel. According to his opinion, in a well-organized society the mass does not act on its own because this is its role. It exists to be led, instructed and represented until it ceases to be a mass, or at least shows this trend. But by itself it is not able to perform this. It needs to follow something higher, originating from the selected minorities Ortega y Gasset.

Fully apparent in the first half of the 20th century, the crisis of “mass democracy” subsequently, by integrating new connotations has been acquiring the character of aporia, placing in question the democratic perspective. Mass culture which replaced moral and religious foundations of traditional society, firstly has broken the boundaries of individual autonomy, integrated human into existential mainstream, allowing, through universalization of preferences, to guide his political participation and secondly has replaced tradition of Protestant asceticism by the hedonistic senses and thereby significantly increase the “immunity” to the social activity.

However, these important but not the main consequences of modernization of societies, of the ancestors of liberal democracy have not had a comprehensive set of factors which initiated its evolutionary trend. The growing dynamics of the socio-economic and cultural development finally breached the homogeneity of the patriarchal society. The structure of advanced societies lost forever the “virgin” homogeneity which certainly increased the gap between the concepts and practices of representation and power of people.

The historical process of the 20th century (especially the first half) is filled with precedents of regeneration of social homogeneity by political and sometimes violent methods. And as a rule, these political acts justified democratic goal setting. Eloquent and “not cliched” example of promoting liberal democratic values is represented in the policy of Kemal Ataturk in Turkey which was aimed at the separation of the social organism with the purpose of removing the elements that do not fit in the Western context. Supported by the West in his desire to democratize a traditional Islamic state, K. Ataturk was overcoming ethnic heterogeneity through the genocide of the Armenians, the otherness of the Islam “people” by means of the imprisonment of the dervishes, etc. Nevertheless, the building of the Turkish Parliament was crowned with the declaration: “All state authority emanates from the people” (Muller, 2014).

Domestic experience to achieve the “democratic” unity of the people consolidated by the communist ideology, including the facts of mass repression and forced resettlement of peoples is well known. Trying to overcome the contradiction between the deepening “complexity” of the societies and the current system of representation by replacing the principle of election from territorial constituencies with the delegation of representatives of trade unions or political preferences exposure through the organization of electoral procedures on party lists was bearing palliative character. The first

“project” was rejected because of not obtaining broad support due the difficulty in implementation Ortega y Gasset. The party system, upon which the same high expectations in terms of the promotion of democratic values were laid, since the second half of the 20th century has been evolving by the downtrend. Mentioned in the modern literature allegations of multi-party system as a mandatory component of democracy appear to be, at least, non actual.

However, it would be wrong to underestimate the role of party system in acquiring a representative democracy, at least in a certain historical period, a certain resilience and scientific relevance that caused the appearance of the mentioned metaphor of the immanence of party pluralism of democracy. In fact, the parties incorporated into the electoral mechanism have lost their inherent “natural” qualities of the mass organizations, consolidating the class and group preferences and acquired significantly more narrow social functions. Becoming a tool “debugged” for electoral competition, the parties lost the clear class and ideological boundaries and oriented themselves to attract the votes of all segments of the population. Thus, by offsetting political “otherness” they have overcome social heterogeneity by means of gathering supporters to their ranks, who are not differentiated by class or ideological grounds.

Because of the party system between the government and “complex” society appeared a shock-absorbing platform resulted in deprivation including of class conflicts provided by “establishing a special kind of balance.” Evaluating the new social role of parties Macpherson (2011) writes that the main function which takes the party system in the Western democracies since the introduction of the democratic right to vote is to weaken the anticipated or potential class conflict or soften and smooth the conflict of class interests with the aim of preserving the existing institutions of property and market-based system of effective attacks Macpherson.

The second feature which the party “tried on”, has become a function of de-personification of the responsibility of the ruling elite in front of the voters who are forced to give voice not for specific representatives, but for a list of party members. The result of this function implementation is not much different from the effects of the first function realization. With every extension of electoral rights party system if necessary has been becoming less accountable to voters (Macpherson, 2011).

Ultimately, the modern parties completed the arsenal of modern weapons of manipulation of public opinion which the power elite dispose to advance their own power ambitions. In contrast to J. Ortega y Gasset who assumed a legitimate transfer of management functions to the

hands of a few, who have social responsibility, considers the emergence of “two classes” is the result of non perfect distribution and a new generation of elite which has become international and has usurped the social and political power, a “traitor of democracy”. According to him, aristocracy of talent a visually attractive ideal which would have to distinguish democracy from societies based on hereditary privilege turns into a contradiction in terms. The gifted ones retain many of the vices of the aristocracy, not having its virtues. In his snobbery they do not acknowledge mutual responsibilities between the chosen few and the mass.

Recognizing that the masses themselves are not able to develop a clear and definite views, furthermore not able to formulate or turn them in consistent attitudes and actions, Schumpeter substantiated the concept of procedural democracy in which political participation of citizens is reduced to the act of either providing or not providing the support for the group claiming to leadership (Schumpeter, 1995). In this reading, the content of democracy, its semantic range is reduced to the “method”, a certain type of institutional arrangement to achieve legislative and administrative policy decisions (Schumpeter, 1995).

In fairness it should be noted that the idea of reducing democracy to participation in the elections much earlier than J. Schumpeter stated M. Weber. In a letter to Robert Michels dated April 4, 1908, he wrote that the concept like the will of the people, the true will of the people, etc. have ceased to exist for him long ago., that those are fictions.

The reduction of democracy to the electoral procedure in the concept of J. Schumpeter is caused not only and not so much by the imperfection of the procedure of delegation of the people’s will to a limited number of representatives dependent on the voters only during election campaigns, but the main problem is the impossibility to determine the common good, “the greatest happiness” which substantiate the will expression. Exclusion of the utilitarianism from the democratic discourse composes the positive of the concepts by J. Schumpeter as in terms of today’s transformation of societies associated with increasing intellectualization and individualization of subjects of the social process, reaching a consensus in the definition of the common good becomes even more problematic than at the time of its creation. Because in the view of J. Schumpeter will of the people is not identical to the achievement of a good so in order that the result would be worthy from the ethical side, it is necessary to rely on unconditional faith in democratic forms of government as such-the belief that in principle should not depend on the desirability of the results (Schumpeter, 1995). The reason

for the reduction of democracy, according to J. Schumpeter is also that the majority of citizens lack of competence and wish to evaluate the major political issues that in the mind of ordinary, typical citizen rank along with the ways of spending free time and even not yet reached the rank of hobbies (Schumpeter, 1995).

In addition, if the will of the people is expressed quite definitely, making decisions by a simple majority is the will of the majority and not the will of the people (Schumpeter, 1995). On the contrary, democracy, in a system of arguments by Schumpeter (1995) thus is interpreted as a method by which the reins of power are to be transmitted to those who are supported more than the other competing individuals or groups.

Arguments on reduction of will of the people by Schumpeter (1995) quite adequately reflect the level of the real problems of democratic values realization. Foreseeable perspective does not give grounds to suppose the unification of citizen’s preferences or overcoming the limitations of representative of the majority to be possible. Attempt of the outstanding Austrian to replace the actual will expression by a simple procedure of citizen’s participation in the elections, competing individuals or groups, who have as demonstrates the social practice, indirect relation to the will of the voters, raises doubts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Semantic aberration of democratic discourse in the representation of Joseph Schumpeter has not gone unnoticed. Describing his views in his article “Models of democracy: competitive elitism” D. Held writes that if democracy is an institutional framework for the formation of the legitimation of leadership, it is only distantly related to the classical understanding of democracy as a rule by the people Held. Irrelevancy in the proposed concept by Schumpeter (1995) to the democratic perspective is quite evident, for example, in the assessment of international non-governmental organization “Freedom House”. In drawing up the rating of political rights of citizens, conducted by this organization, 7 out of 10 indicators characterize elections transparency. As of 2015, out of 95 countries around the world where “Freedom House” conducts study 89 (46%) are recognized as free and democratic 0.55 (28%) partly democratic and 51 (26%) not democratic. The level of development of democratic institutions is recognized as the highest in Western Europe and North America.

However, the discrepancy between the will of the people such as the results of the elections in the Western European parliaments is indicated by the fact that as a

Table 1: Presents data on the turnout in the parliamentary elections in Ukraine, showing a similar trend

Years	Overall turnout during the parliamentary elections (total number of voters %)
1998	75.0
2002	65.0
2007	62.0
2012	58.0
2014	52.4

result of the election campaigns of 2001-2006 candidates who received an average of 35.8% of the votes of the citizens having the right to vote, won. The reluctance to formalize the relationship of people with the election of the representatives was the reason for the absence in the legislation in the United Kingdom, Canada, USA of the minimum threshold of voter turnout (Morozova, 2014).

Fighting absenteeism forces the legislators of “democratic” countries to introduce legal provisions that ensure the participation of citizens in the voting process. Among the measures enshrined in law which are aimed to overcome the electoral passivity there is a wide range of coercive actions, ranging from public censure, fines to imprisonment. Even the hypothetical possibility of the will expression under the pressure of public institutions looks at least incorrect.

Even more graphically appears a significant difference between democracy and the realization of transparent elective procedures in the practice of “democratic transition”. Fall of electoral activity in Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine is directly proportional to the level of positive assessments by Western public institutions, open elections in these countries. For example, in Georgia, the turnout of citizens during the parliamentary elections campaigns from 1992-2013 was halved, from 93-45%. The following (Table 1) presents data on the turnout in the parliamentary elections in Ukraine, showing a similar trend:

The vision of a democratic prospects was offered by Robert Dahl. The constructive potential of its concept is to shift the descriptive tools of democracy from the election procedures to the social function of political participation of citizens. Taking into account that none of the major political systems in reality is completely democratic, R. Dahl inclines to characterize them as “polyarchy”, “relative” democracies or regimes, largely affected by the processes of expansion of people participation and liberalization, i.e., providing a high degree of involvement of public contestation (Dahl, 1971). “Polyarchy” as a special quality of a society is being developed over a long period. The Western world, before reaching this state has gone through the “three transformations”. First one during the 18th century has led to a transition from the hegemony to competitive

oligarchy. The second transformation which has lasted from the end of 18th century and ended after the World War I has generated a full polyarchy which acquired the required degree of maturity after the Great Depression. The result of the three transformations was an increase of volume of the powers of citizens to participate effectively and challenge the policy and at the same time the number of individuals, groups, interests which preferences must affect the policy-making process (Dahl, 1971). According to Robert Dahl, achievement of polyarchy requires six institutions: elective officials; fair, free and equal elections; freedom of expression; the presence of alternative sources of information; the independence of NGOs; broad involvement of the population in the political process. Thus, in the mode of “polyarchy,” according to Robert Dahl, thanks to the existing system of social institutions the citizens got the opportunity of political participation, including the competition with the power structures and the functioning of the legal opposition, the presence of which is a significant factor in the political process.

Looks of R. Dahl included in an anthology of political thought as the concept of “pluralist democracy” which have overcome procedural formalism of Schumpeter, however, did not submit the relevant mechanism of democracy. Freedom of expression of political views and even the presence of organized opposition, in reality, does not guarantee the account of the public interest in making government decisions. Moreover, experience shows that, in parallel with the increase of absenteeism and social apathy in the developed “democracies”, citizens prefer more not hierarchical directions of consolidation which are particularly susceptible to the influence of political technologies, than formal organization.

In his book about modern “developed democracies” Crouch (2010) evaluated skeptically the prospects and the political potential of public institutions of civil representation and named public political competition as an orchestrated imitation which allows to aggregate real power resource in the hands of elites, mainly represented by the business community. According to his words, the consent with the modest expectations of liberal democracy leads to the satisfaction with what he calls the post-democracy. With this model, despite the holding of elections and the possibility of changes of government, public pre-election debates is a carefully orchestrated spectacle with rival teams of professionals who own techniques of persuasion and a small limited range of issues selected by these teams. The mass of citizens plays a passive, silent, even apathetic role, responding only to signals sent to them. Behind this spectacle of the electoral

game is deployed a non-public real policy which relies on the interaction between the elected governments and elites, mainly represented by the business sector (Crouch, 2004).

Ranking the ideas of democracy as the constitutional, procedural, essential and “process-oriented”, Charles Tilly related the concept of R. Dahl’s “pluralist democracy” to the latter category, referring to the dynamism of his scheme and the mobility of its institutional framework. Charles Tilly’s own concept unfolds in the form of “essential” approach that allowed the author to develop his own method of quantifying the processes of democratization.

The essential approach of Tilly (2007) succession to the prior experience of the procedural one (Schumpeter, 1995) and process-oriented (Dahl, 1971) definition of the phenomenon of democracy projects promotion of research and practical discourse in the plane of the creation of a regime of sustainable dialogue between the authorities and citizens about political decision-making. According to C. Tilly regime can be considered democratic if the political relationship between citizens and the state is expressed by broad, equitable, secure and mutually binding procedures for discussion. Democratization is the general movement towards more inclusive, more equitable in fact, more secure and more than a binding coordination regarding appointments to political posts and public decision-making.

Fundamental processes that determine the movement of society towards democracy, in the view of Charles are an increasing integration of trust networks into public politics, increasing insulation of categorical inequality from public politics and reduction of independence from the major centers of power of public policy (Tilly, 2007).

After having actualized in the democratic agenda the aspect related to the participation of citizens in decision making, C. Tilly took a step in overcoming the emphasized gap between representation and democracy. However, apart from the limitation of the representative format in the filling of a democratic discourse with the “pristine” sense, a natural consequence of manifesting social “complexity” prevents its modern design.

Representatives of the concept of so-called “associative democracy” believed that the “complexity” of the social system which prevents the improvement of existing democratic institutions, might be overcome by consolidating the preferences of individuals in the community (or according to John Dewey in associations). Dewey (2002) considers that social complexity is characterized not by the atomization of the individual sets, but by the structuring of the society in the unions. On

this occasion he writes that in the industrial age side effects have become so comprehensive, multiple, deep and complex, thus, having stipulated the emergence of such vast and consolidated operating unions, operating not as communities, but as some faceless units and that is why a society made up of such unions cannot achieve self-identification. And latter is definitely an indispensable condition for the effectiveness of its organization. That is our understanding of the essence of the crisis affecting the public interest and the very idea of society. Society has too many faces, its interests are too diverse for us to comprehend it by means of options which are at our disposal. The problem of democratically organized society is essentially an intellectual problem and from this point of view in the political life of the past centuries we do not find anything like it (Dewey, 2002).

In the view of John Dewey self-identification of simple unions in the community, actualizing as subjects of the democratic process is initiated by the method of cooperatively organized mind (Dewey, 2002) the content of which is to solve the problem of emancipation and improvement of research processes and the dissemination of findings, obtained in result of these studies (among representatives of these unions Ed.), improvement of the methods and conditions of debate conduction, discussion of questions and persuasion of citizens (Dewey, 2002) which in turn should contribute to a sustainable community within the group habits of behavior and a certain kind of unification of personal competences.

Arend Lijphart proposed the use social potential of generating multi-compound communities in the improvement of democracy through the formation of a coalition of leaders who have the right of mutual veto and strict compliance with the principle of proportional representation, necessarily autonomous in their policy unions.

“Newtonian binomial” in the search for a democratic perspective in the context of growing social “complexity” was described by Zolo (1992). A statement of the fact that democracy in today’s post-industrial societies is experiencing unprecedented evolutionary stress led Zolo (1992) to the conclusion about the need to build post-representative theory of the political system (Zolo, 2010).

Based on the analysis of social transformations, generating new stratum, identities, institutions and related subsystems that accelerate the processes of functional specialization, the researcher talks about further increase of the social complexity. In turn, a new quality of social complexity according to D. Zolo calls into question the fundamental premises of democratic theory in both its classical and its revisionist recensions. Apparently, the

entire Democratic Encyclopedia is doomed to obsolescence and with it the most basic of its paradigms are doomed to the same fate participation, representation, competitive pluralism (Zolo, 1992). The presentation of will of numerous of group and corporate preferences of “complex” social organism in a narrow format of representation becomes apparently insolvent and increasingly as a wave, that arose as a result of unpredictable flooding, gush the dam reservoir (in this case limits of the institutions of the political system), passes into the elements of informal space saturated by non-hierarchical communications. Furthermore, in terms of the revolutionary development of the latter, there is a risk of loss of political freedom and rights as a result of violations of the “cognitive autonomy” and in its absence an independent public opinion opposing processes of self-legalization of political elites in power cannot be formed (Zolo, 1992).

Formation of an information society, in an environment where the representation does not provide a consensus of public interest and self-contained power, does not amortize, but instead exposes the inadequacy of the political system to the needs of democracy development, information technology, complemented by the development of communications, on the one hand, becomes a mean to overcome by the majority the official format of the political space and therefore a destabilizing potential, on the other hand, the mechanism to ensure the viability of illegitimate elite structures.

Thus, the acquisition by planetary civilization of new quality obsolesces the social and academic debate on the general and the particular, the universality and specificity which have been formed in the West for a long historical period of the model of liberal democracy. Modern social and political practices and cognitive process dictate the search directions of the social democratic paradigm perspective. Sensing this need, a prominent political theorist Carl Schmitt in search of a hypothetical design of strengthening the state found the mechanisms that are able in the political reality to help in the acquisition of a strategy of the updated architecture of democracy design.

In the interpretation of Schmitt (2010) democracy is a state form corresponding to the principle of identity (namely, identity of specific present people with itself as a political unity). The people are a bearer of the legislature and give itself a constitution. In addition, democracy, according to Schmitt is a “method” in which the government is organized in accordance with democratic principles at the maximum possible participation of the citizens of the state (Schmitt, 2010).

The identity in reading of the intellectual meant the entirety of people power and the lack of backlash between

the constitutionally declared and the actual will of the people, realized primarily through the participation of citizens in making fundamental management decisions. Democratic connotations of equality and freedom were interpreted by Schmitt (2010) ambiguously. If equality is, in his opinion is the principle of adequate democracy, then freedom in the sense of an individual one, by nature entitled to each individual freedom is the liberal principle appropriate only for representative democracy of liberalism as subspecies of democracy in general (Schmitt, 2010). Freedom in the concept of Schmitt has equal opportunities for political participation, but not freedom of representation of infinitely diverse individual or group preferences. Equality of all, that has a human face, he writes is able to substantiate neither states, nor state forms or forms of government. Out of this it is impossible to get any specific distinctions and delimitations, only abolishment of distinctions and boundaries; on this basis it is impossible to constitute any kind of special institutions. On the contrary, if the equality common to all people should be the only determining and decisive, then it would be impossible to carry out any specific distinctions. The idea of human equality does not contain any legal, political or economic criteria (Schmitt, 2010).

In the views represented by Schmitt it is pointed out a constructive indication of the unsuitability of the liberal values of “individual freedom” as a construct relevant to “project” requirements of the developing mode of democracy. Doubtfulness of identification of democratic standards with consistently implemented in the West course set at realization of the interests of all kinds of non-traditional minorities does not require evidence. And it not only case that their preferences often conflict with the moral, ethical and religious norms prevailing in society, but that the representation of these exclusive interests cannot be integrated in the “national unity” which will substantiate the democratic order. Democracy, according to Schmitt is the democratic equality, in fact, the homogeneity of the people, that does not mean rejection of diversity or insuperable “complexity” of societies, but recognized as a subject of democratic art “united people”. Otherwise, acknowledging certain individuals, groups, corporations as the subject of the democratic process should legalize the factual inequality of rights of “black” and “white” population of North America, non-citizens and citizens in Latvia, Russian and Ukrainians in Ukraine, etc.

In connection with the argument about the unity of the people Schmitt (2010) came to an equally important problem of the relationship of the central government and democracy. In modern political science and socio-political

discourse the regimes, based on the strong power of the political leader are considered solely as antagonists of democracy. That is why the post-Soviet political regimes with strong presidential power, despite the high level of credibility on the part of the population are estimated to be anti-democratic. For example, the political system of Kazakhstan where the trust rating of the President has recently achieved 90% and more in the presentation of Freedom House is neither free, nor democratic. Russia is no exception to the "rules" of this organization. The index of democracy in our country, following the Kazakh's is one step above the lower limit, despite the fact that the incumbent president has 80% support of Russians.

Schmitt (2010) beliefs impartially reflecting the problem, to put it mildly, do not coincide with the methodology of determining the democratic regimes by the modern Western political class. Compared with other forms of state the difference between government and subordination even might, in fact, enormously strengthen and increase, if only those persons, who rule and order, stay in substantial homogeneity of the people. If they get the approval and trust of the people, to which they relate, than their dominance could be more strict and rigid, their rule more decisive than the rule of a patriarchal monarch or cautious oligarchy.

In the works relating to the Weimar period of the scientist (in order to avoid a reproach in the unhistorical reference to his heritage, this is emphasized) C. Schmitt definitely pointed in the direction of improving the democratic continuum through the use and expansion of the functional space of direct democracy. The absence of communication resources, in the period when he was writing the works, incompatible with modern ones, caused a certain inadequacy of specific forms of its realization, proposed by the author, for today reality. However, the strategy of democratic evolution, based on the vast involvement of the people to solve the fundamental political problems was determined by C. Schmitt correctly. The relevance of the assumptions, expressed by him, about the democratic assumptions confirmed by the widespread introduction of mechanisms of direct democracy into the social and political practice of the United States of America, the Benelux countries, Denmark, Switzerland, Sweden, Finland, etc. Annually at the state level in the USA around 12-15 thousand referendums are carried out. In Western Europe (excluding Switzerland) during the consolidation of the constitutional procedures 240 referendums were conducted while in Switzerland >100 (Butler and Ranney, 1978)

If the acts of the direct democracy in the political process of the industrial era were a palliative measure (popular initiatives, the imperative mandate, referendums,

etc) exceptions to the general rules as for example, a plebiscite democracy in the French Fifth Republic, than in terms of the information society the direct democracy should be the immanent substance of the transforming social systems.

Establishment of direct democracy is not a single act, but an evolutionary process determined by the social practice. The introduction of democracy by means of revolutionary changes contradicts the very essence of the socio-political reality. In addition, the introduction of an "ideal model" which is an abstraction that simplifies the reality, inevitably harms democracy and would lead the vector of its existence in a dead-end. So the idea, that the existing and future developments in the field of computer technology and telecommunications allow to establish direct democracy at the level of millions of participants which is attractive not only for the technologists but also for the social theorists and political philosophers, cannot provide us with direct democracy (Macpherson, 2011).

Canadian political scientist Macpherson (2011) fairly observes that the functioning of democracy will require a stronger sense of community than it is today. Talking about the impossibility of an immediate transition to the direct democracy with the achievement of an appropriate level of technological communications, Macpherson (2011) puts into question certainly not the adequacy of information technology which ensures the political participation of citizens but above all he means the immaturity of modern society: the lack of change in the consciousness of people which allows the transition from treating themselves and acting primarily as consumers to understanding themselves as those who implement and develop their abilities, to acting in accordance with such an understanding and going through this positive experience; the highest level of social and economic inequality.

According to Macpherson (2011) the main problem of participatory democracy is not how to implement it, but how to achieve it (highlighted by the author).

Overcoming the property stratification occurs, according to C.B. Macpherson without any intervention, due to the natural qualities of capitalism, the effectiveness of which depends on the capacity of the consumer market. Based on this logic, the business community has to take actions (salary increase, prices decrease) to maintain people's living standards at an adequate level enough to ensure the purchasing power.

There is no need to turn the arguments in favor of the proposition that at the stage of modern financial capitalism the source of social division of society becomes the monetary sphere which is far from the real needs of the population.

Another disadvantage of the Macpherson (2011)'s concept remains the unresolved problems of social complexity and formation of the agenda of political participation. But in this case the irrevocable requirement regarding the decision making process is out of sight: someone has to formulate questions.

Formation of the agenda submitted to public review, Dewey (2002) proposed to transfer to a class of expert. However, even if the competent experts provide for the community' solution the important issues of functioning of the society, they will be so broad and intricate, the technical issues connected with them will require so special knowledge, details of the projects will be so numerous and changeable, that the society, being put in front of them, will not be able to decide and achieve self-identification. And it's not that, like society as such does not exist, like there is no such a large number of people who are equally interested in determining the outcome of a given set of social relationships. The fact is that society is too numerous, too scattered and disunited, too confusing. Moreover, in a society there are too many groups, so that any joint activity characterized by serious and long-term side effects, turns out to be enormously varied; activities intersect, creating new groups with their narrow interests; and you never knows what can link all parts of the society into a united one (Dewey, 2002).

Clearly understanding the essence of the outlined problems related with the structuring of the modern society, acquiring in the model of the direct democracy, the role of the subject of the decision-making process, J. Dewey pointed to a way out of, what it seems, a "vicious circle" (by C.B. Macpherson) through the definition of competences of political participation of the people. In his view democracy is to involve citizens in the formation of a political strategy while experts (by J. Dewey) should publicly demonstrate their special knowledge and skills not in the field of formation and implementation of political strategies, but in the discovery and promotion of the facts, on the knowledge of which, depends any policy. These people are technical experts, specialists – in the sense in which the term is used, referring to the special training of the representatives of science and art. There is no need for the knowledge and skills required for the implementation of the relevant studies, to be in possession of the majority of them; it is enough that this majority would have been able to judge how important the knowledge, obtained by others is for the society in general (Dewey, 2002).

The embodiment of the proposed theoretical model of Dewey, firstly, does not contradict the social practice, requiring more involvement of the majority of the population for the decision-making of the fundamental

problems. An example, confirming the validity of what has been said, might be a Greek referendum (July 2015) on the policies of creditors. Despite the apparent discrepancy between its results and the subsequent events, precisely because of the plebiscite it became possible to lead the society, although to a relative, but still a consensus on the main issue (not formulated on the ballot voting) of membership in the European Union. Secondly, the implementation of a theoretical "project" of J. Dewey would have helped to avoid the controversy associated with the incompetence of the population in specific issues, about which Macpherson (2011) says that the ordinary citizen cannot be expected to provide answers to questions that are associated with direct instructions and require specific "technical" knowledge (Macpherson, 2011). Third, following the theoretical provisions of Dewey in the development of democratic perspectives gives reason to overcome the "difference" in preferences that almost certainly will arise in a situation similar to the current society (Macpherson, 2011). Appeal to the agenda affecting the interests of the whole society, not groups, corporations, classes inevitably initiates the formation and development of civil society which is the foundation of the democratic order. For example, in the case of Russia, the beginning, generating the social cohesion, can become an ideological goal-setting, the lack of which aggravates the already unprecedented social rift.

Based on the understanding of the phenomenon duration of a new image of democracy, gradually filling with the tools of direct participation of citizens in political decision-making, many thinkers offer "hybrid projects", combining elements of the plebiscitary and representative systems. Thus, C.B. Macpherson considers that the simplest model that deserves to call it a participatory democracy is a parliamentary or parliamentary-presidential system of governance of the Soviet type, a pyramid system with direct democracy at the base and delegated democracy at each higher level. Thus, it all starts with direct democracy at the level of a certain area or factory the real face to face debate and decision-making by consensus or by the majority and then comes the election of delegates who will compose a council at the next more capacious level for instance, at the level of an urban area, a small town or other populated area. Delegates will be sufficiently instructed by and accountable to the voters, to take democratic decisions entirely on the level of council. And so it should be up to the upper level which is a national council designated to deal with issues relevant to its competences. At any level of the final decision-making which is above the bottom level, the problem will no doubt be formulated by a committee of a

Table 2: What democracy does Russia need? (%)

Year and month	Such as in the developed countries of Europe, America	Such as it was in the Soviet Union	A very special, correspondings to national traditions and specifics of Russia	Russia does not need democracy	Difficult to answer
2005 (6)	24	16	45	6	9
2006 (7)	18	13	48	10	11
2007 (8)	22	10	47	7	14
2008 (6)	20	13	45	8	15
2009 (7)	20	18	39	10	14
2009 (8)	23	14	43	7	13
2010 (6)	23	17	44	7	10
2011 (7)	23	16	45	7	10
2011 (10)	19	14	49	7	11
2012 (7)	27	20	38	3	12

relevant council. Thus, at whatever level solution to the problem did not occur, it will be carried out by a small committee of the council of this level (Macpherson, 2011). Along with the theoretical “projects” of democracy improvement a number of researchers are actively using the material extracted from the real political process to create its renewed architecture. One such construct, called by its author, the head of the London-based Center for the Study of Democracy John Keane, “the monitoring democracy” was described by Peregudov (2012) in an article published in the “Polis”. Explaining the essence of the concept of “the monitoring democracy” Keane writes about the phenomena of the citizen participation already incorporated into political reality. Among the features showing the evolution of the democratic order, the “citizen’s jury”, an independent public inquiry, citizen participation in the budget construction, advisory committee, “consensus conference”, “citizen’s assembly”, competitive procedures for identifying the public interest are pointed out. In total J. Keane mentions a hundred of species of “the monitoring of democracy” that emerged after World War II.

Analysis of the covered distance in the intellectual learning of the democratic paradigm of social development and dynamically changing content of the political process, stipulating it, proves the futility of trying to find the universal either in the retrospective evaluation of a democratic discourse or in determining its future.

If there is a common understanding of the quality of the democratic process as the optimization of the incorporation into the political process of the public interests, an idea of the variety of instruments, mechanisms, specific historical conditions to achieve this goal-setting is preserved. In this regard Dewey considers that there is every reason to believe that whatever changes occurred within the existing democratic mechanisms, all of them will be aimed at strengthening the role of the public interests as the main guidelines and criteria of the government activity, to allow the society declare its purposes more authoritatively. The main difficulty in this way is in the search for the means by

which the divided, mobile and diverse society can find itself and thus to identify and express its own interests. This finding of itself is the necessary precondition of any fundamental transformation of the mechanisms of democratic governance (Dewey, 2002).

In the logic of the J. Dewey’s stated message it is possible to identify some general trends of “democratic transition” in Russia while keeping in mind some fundamental considerations.

The most likely direction of Russia’s transformation of the political regime and of the majority of post-Soviet countries is to achieve the democracy as the totality of the general will. The majority of the Russian population does not associate the democratic choice with the Western model of social organization. Almost 40% of Russians believe that our country needs a special corresponding to the national traditions model of democracy (Table 2).

Adequate to the conditions of post-Soviet political reality paradigm of the regime transformation is conservative modernization undertaken by the executive branch headed by the president. This conclusion has sufficient evidence: “picking up” to the state ownership of the country’s leading assets, supported by the introduction of the status Elbasy for the President of Kazakhstan, the increase in the presidential powers in Russia, the active struggle of supreme state power in Uzbekistan with separatism and attempt to monopolize the power in the field by clan communities. However, the trend of strengthening the vertical of executive power in the former Soviet republics as an attribute of conservative regimes modernization is the subject of the liberal criticism and the main criteria of their “remoteness” from the mainstream of human values.

Contrary to the sentiment of critics, most of the population of the newly independent states quite approves activity of personalized power of the president. Thus, the order assuming the dominant vertical of executive power, installed and operated in case of the approval of the population majority can be characterized

Table 3: The social composition of the governments of Kazakhstan and Ukraine, 2013 (%)

Variable	Total in government	Positions held in accordance with professional education	Positions held not in accordance with the professional education	Came to power from business
Kazakhstan	100	42.8	57.2	28.5
Ukraine	100	23.8	76.2	34.7

as anti-democratic but only if ignoring the opinion of the citizens. It is a paradox (in terms of formal logic) but the optimal model of the conservative regime transformation requires correct identification of strategic directions of the reformation, oriented at the adaptation of social and political system to the challenges posed by promising trends of social development, but not at goal to catch up with the West or save broken vestiges of public foundations.

The most important goal-setting of post-Soviet democratic reforms, designed for the medium term, should conclude in the fact that the direct state administration is withdrawn beyond the political space, thus replacing the mechanisms of recruitment in the power structures, based on personal loyalty to the head of state or representation of the interests of business, by the mechanisms that open the way to the power of the professionals who have their own vision of development of the driven industry. Party affiliation, political preferences, experience of administrative work, the election into the representative bodies and furthermore lobbying of interests of businesses or family relationship should not be the criteria to assess the suitability of the substitution of high public office. As part of the conservative modernization such mechanism is quite possible to build with a strong presidential institution endowed with the status of precluding competition at hand. It seems no coincidence that in this regard the composition of the Government of Kazakhstan looks more professional and less politically motivated by considerations of political loyalty and personal leadership of the country, in comparison with Ukraine (Table 3).

The trend of society's growing in the post-industrial formation besides incorporation tendencies in the power structures of experts of relevant industry has a different connotation, namely, the increasing potential of implementation of the direct democracy. Appearing technical ability to use the principles of direct democracy in the organization of a dialogue between the society and the authorities can make a drastic essential change in the working model of the political system of the post-Soviet states. In the scientific community the projects of regime transformation, generally consistent with these paradigms, initiated by the intellectualization of the civilizational space, has matured. Noteworthy is the project by V. Vorobyev and S. Kurits that would create a

single management and legal system which is dominated by professional experts, not politicians and Kurits. The state prevents the penetration of the power by collectivist ideologies, splitting the society into warring groups, suggesting the superiority of certain religious, national, political (party), material and other communities. The authors consider the Constituent Assembly, where by means of the universal suffrage the citizens plead themselves a sovereign nation and carry out the procedure for the adoption of postulation and goals of the state to be a the starting point. Thus, the only support of the function of ruling through the implementation of direct democracy are the citizens which eliminates the connection of function of ruling and management as a source of dictatorship. Defense is supposed to be carried out by the Guardians, elected from among the non-party citizens (traditional duties of the head of the state).

CONCLUSION

According to the project, providing the achievement of the state goal, acquires a legal recognition by the Constitutional Council, elected from the senior professionals in the fields and areas of knowledge. Execution unit in the proposed system performs the function of a collective manager to promote the constitutional objectives on another stage and operates on a contractual basis with the head of state.

Thus, the democracy as a phenomenon of modern times is an integral component of the socio-political process and a subject of academic reflection. Objective and subjective factors of social development, determining the system of social relations and interactions, catalyze impulse of evolution of mode and practice of democracy. Localization of democratic paradigms within a single universal which is adequate to a particular civilizational experience or historical period is irrelevant to rapidly changing realities of public order and the generated by the transformation changes social "complexity". Reflection in the scientific knowledge of a democratic outlook is not a trivial description of preconceived ideas, moreover motivated by politics and other considerations, but a clear picture of directions and mechanisms to overcome the constantly emerging mismatch between civilizational challenges and the institutions of democracy.

REFERENCES

- Butler, D. and A. Ranney, 1978. Referendums: A Comparative Study of Practice and Theory. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, USA., ISBN: 9780844733180, Pages: 250.
- Crouch, C., 2004. Post-Democracy. Polity, Cambridge, pp: 70-76.
- Crouch, C., 2010. Post-Democrac. GU VshE, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 192.
- Dahl, R.A., 1971. Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition. Yale University Press, New Haven, ISBN: 9780300015652, Pages: 267.
- Dewey, J., 2002. The Public and its Problems. Idea-Press, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 160.
- Macpherson, C.B., 2011. The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy. GU VshE, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 174.
- Mill, J.S., 2006. Considerations on Representative Government. Socium, Chelyabinsk, Pages: 384.
- Mill, J.S., 2007. Principles of Political Economy. Eksmo, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 1038.
- Morozova, O.S., 2014. Turnout in the elections as an element of the electoral system. Fundam. Res. J., 1: 185-189.
- Muller, J.W., 2014. Contesting Democracy: Political Ideas in Twentieth Century Europe. Institut Gaydara Publication, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 400.
- Pareto, V., 2011. The Transformation of Democracy. Territoriya Buduschego, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 207.
- Peregudov, S.P., 2012. Monitoring concept of democracy: A new relationship of government and society. J. Pol. Political Stud., 6: 55-67.
- Schmitt, C., 2010. Romischer Katholizismus Und Politische Form. GU VshE, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 272.
- Schumpeter, J., 1995. Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. Ekonomika, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 540.
- Tilly, C.H., 2007. Democracy. INOP, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 264.
- Tocqueville, A.D., 1992. Democratization America. Progress Publisher, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 554.
- Zolo, D., 1992. Democracy and Complexity: A Realist Approach. Penn State Press, Pennsylvania, USA., Pages: 318.