

# Contemporary Discourse On Democracy

**Dzhamal Mutagirov**

\* Dzhamal Z. Mutagirov, Doctor of philosophical sciences, Professor of the Saint Petersburg State University, Director of the Centre for Study of Human and People's Rights. E-mail: dezamy@mail.ru

Accepted :16 Jan,2014

## **Abstract.**

**In the article, taking into account many thousand-year experience of humankind, a wider understanding of democracy is substantiated. The traditional sights at democracy as a form of the State order, the author completes with his own. He understands it as spirit and a condition of all public relations, as well as the power of the free, equal in rights, socially, economically and politically active people, differently manifesting in various spheres of life.**

**Fundamental basics of democracy are revealed: a society's priority before all established by it institutions, including the State; freedom and equality of all members of a society and citizens of the State; the rule of law, which is an expression of will of the people; the decision of all public problems in accordance with the 'majority's rule'; electivity of all officials taking into account their qualification, and also their unconditional removability. In the article an inconsistency of attempts of authoritative leaders and their environment to substitute democracy for certain surrogates is shown, and the basic criteria of true democracy, absence at least one of which does it incomplete and relative, are formulated.**

**Key words: society, the State, democracy, people, majority's rule, will of the people, liberty, human rights, electivity, the rule of law.**

## **INTRODUCTION.**

Democracy in all times was understood as the power of the people. The American democrats had significantly expanded and specified its content as "rule of the people, by the people and for the people". It is not difficult to see, the emphasis in both cases is done on whom the power belongs to, who is its executor and for which goals it exists.

Throughout millennia democracy functioned in different forms and levels. The rulers and beneficiaries of power traditionally consisted of the richest and most influential people with high knowledge and special merits and honors. And very rarely they consisted of the representatives of all sections of the society. Accordingly, the power of these layers and groups of people were called monarchy, aristocracy, oligarchy, meritocracy, plutocracy, democracy, and ochlocracy and so on. The researchers of the political systems of all times tried to establish the basis and criteria of these forms of government and succeeded in it with great difficulty, so far as in any system of social order there are simultaneous manifestations of them all. They have praised some of them and criticized others depending on their own political stands. In the article, we

give our own understanding of democracy, worked out on the basis of comparison and matching the real state of democracy in different groups of countries of the world, conventionally consist of countries with relatively developed democracy, the countries in transition to democracy and countries with authoritarian and tyrannical regimes. Both historical and logical, and comparative research methods of investigations, having in mind the variety of the systems, allow us to see as a main line of socio-political development of the mankind, and the deviations of different societies and States from this line, as well as to establish some general criteria for real democracy.

## **Democracy as a universal phenomenon**

Democracy was and remains the best, most desirable for the vast majority of society and, at the same time, the most mysterious and not exactly determined yet social order. This uncertainty is the reason why some people praised it, attributing to democracy all imaginable and unimaginable dignity, and the others no less persuasively

criticized, blamed, and ridiculed it as if linked with all imaginable and unimaginable evils.

At the same time, many researchers of democracy as a phenomenon cannot definitely say what it is and in what its main criteria consist. Some of them often limit them to describing of the symptoms of political power and power relations, or attributing democracy to the institutions, which by definition could not be democratic. In reality, democracy might be considered is a power of free, equal, economically and socio-politically active people, serving to the people, considering by the society and State as the main value. It is polyhedral and is manifested differently in the socio-economic, political, national, and spiritual spheres of public life.

For nearly two and a half millennia after the first estimations of democracy there were numerous definitions of the power and the people. But, regrettably, many of them are incomplete, often subjective and too far from solving of the problem, because were made with consideration mainly the political dimension of the problem – power as ability to coercion. Of course, compulsion is an essential and integral element of any authority. But coercion to what, why and how? Coercion is possible only in certain cases and when there are some opportunities: credibility, strength, result of the authority's actions, etc. However, attentively going deep into the essence of human life, it turns out that that a power can be manifested and is often carried out without any coercion, because of its vital necessity and usefulness. Power of circumstances, power of nature, power of the beauty, friendship, and solidarity, as well as power of strength or an example play a huge role in human life. They can motivate and encourage people to commit certain acts voluntarily, without any compulsion and on their own incentive. That is, a power is an institute of any commonality and in every area of its life it becomes apparent differently, and it will exist until there will be any commonality of living beings.

There are many definitions of a society [Campbell, (1981); Ferguson, (1966); Sociology, (2004)]. Here we will be guided by the understanding of society as a voluntary association of the human beings for joint solution of life's problems, which cannot be solved by them individually. This is the first fundamental human institution. Vital problems of all societies are solved by them through extensive system of institutions, each of which is designed to a particular range of problems of their life. According to the logic of life, the institutions of economic, social and spiritual life were formed first. At a certain stage of development of society other institutions for specific community's tasks (defense of the habitat from any threats from outside, protection of the lives and security of its members, etc.) appear. Common activity to achieve the objectives of any institution requires some accords, high responsibility and discipline of all members of the society; their commitment to solve social problems together.

Protection of life and safety requires maximum concentration of the forces, subordination of all members of the society to the same rules, which purpose is to ensure a state of constant vigilance and readiness to stand against any threat to the society. Hence the names of the institution: Polis, the State, Commonwealth, Republic, etc. A power to establish and settle relations, necessary for the protection of the society, as well as for regulation of the relations, emerging in the course of these processes, is called a political one. Nature and, consequently, actors of the power, are determined mainly by its goals. The political power always belongs to certain sectors of a society that nominate their representatives, who, as they believe, can better use it to provide their security.

Peculiarity of the objectives of society implies that the State must be very flexible, dynamic, and fluid and be able to amplify and shrink, depending on circumstances. Anyway, the society would like to see the State precisely such.

Political power provides its functionaries with not only authority to decide, but also the right to compel members of the society to execute certain functions, to dispose with a share of the public funds, to choose ways and identify methods for solving of the emerging in society, region and area problems. It is assumed that people with authority will act in the most beneficial to a society mode. Democracy is a precondition for guaranteeing such a course of actions. However, the authority to command and control gives to its holder some opportunities to use it also for personal gain and enrichment. The possibility to rise over the others, and rapid enrichment turns the power into an arena of competitive struggle.

Because of these and a number of other circumstances, the State, willingly amplifying, does not wish to shrink even after disappearance of any threats to society. A striking example of rightness of that was shown by the Russian Federation. So, for 18 years after the collapse of the Soviet Union (1992 - 2010), after declared ending of the cold war and disappearance of military threat to the country, privatization of public property, before organized and managed by the State, and after significantly reducing of its social obligations before the citizens, administration of Russia, instead of expected substantial reduction of, increased on 70% [Primakov, (2011)].

Possible danger to society and to life of its members is the main factor determining the existence of the State. If there is no real threat, it would try to create artificial ones, inventing of the non-existing enemies and continuing its amplification and strengthen. The State, formed by society for the protection of human rights, first of all, the rights to life, liberty and security, might be turned into the main source of threat to the society and its members. Similar metamorphoses are often seeing in the life of disordered and badly governed societies. In well-organized and best governed societies, every individual and every group of people are engaged in business, which they can do most efficiently. Each worker receives

for his labor revenue, corresponding to his real contribution into social production and its protection. There, where not the common good but the personal gain of the people in power becomes the purpose of the State, some of their functions are substituted. The policemen, in the pursuit of personal profit, can enter into deals with criminals and as a result they transform from the law defenders into the principal and most dangerous offenders, for struggle with which new structures are established in police bodies. Employees of the State's service for struggle against illegal trade in narcotics confiscated according to the law drugs distribute under the guise of their status among addicted people, converting them into source of own revenues.

The societies, functioning in accordance with natural laws, always resist and will resist against unnatural claims and will return its institutions to their rightful place. Democracy is the optimum norm of functioning of all institutions of the society and the best way of harmonizing of all social processes with retaining of permanent effective control of the people over all established by them institutions.

Unnatural state of relations between society and its state was determined not by societies and their members, but by the states and their institutions. For thousands of years almost everything was estimated through the prism of the States or rather of the ruling in them circles' interests, through their vision. Even democracy often was understood only as a form of government. Social power, economic power, and cultural power somehow disappeared, even the researchers of power and power relations have refused to see any significant differences between them. Pushing off from this unnatural reality, someone began to consider that no social order determines the character of the institutions of a society, but the form of government determines the forms of the power in all areas of public life. To some extent it is possible to agree with such judgments, but only to some extent, for political power, being a phenomenon of later origin, appears as if a concentrated expression of power at all. It influences on the social, economic and spiritual power, but does not determine and must not specify them. On the contrary, the social and economic power as the primary institutions determined as specific so destination of the political power.

Democracy has started as equal for all members of society standards of relations in economic, social and spiritual life, equal attitude to the natural resources, which is the main source of existence of all animal life on the Earth, only one of which a human being is. Because of the different physical characteristics of people, economic inequality gradually formed, resulting also social inequality. Political is a fixation of the economic and social, though is able to effect on them backward. Genuine economic and social democracy always entails genuine political democracy also. Moreover, it narrows the field of political and the last not necessarily and not immediately

ensures social democracy. History knows relevant democratic forms of the governments under slavery and capitalism, socio-economic framework which could not be regarded as democratic.

We consider democracy as a multidimensional and multifaceted phenomenon, which pervades all aspects of life of the human communities. Everywhere the power exists there are also its participants and implementers, as well as the ways of its implementation. Democracy everywhere means a free and equal participation of all actors, or at least the majority of them, in the definition of the forms and objectives of the power, and in exercising and determining the mechanism and methods of its implementation. It existed and exists in all societies but in different forms, manifestations and scopes: as some germs, certain moments or elements of the solution of common problems, links and even entire systems of institutions. But full democracy does not exist anywhere yet.

Direct or immediate democracy, when only heads of families and clans, as well as free human beings with certain size of property meant the people, has been an initial form all social problems' solving. Then it gave way to the power of elite or people, dominating in these groups, share of which always was small. Some call it "elitist democracies", though in fact there was no democracy here at all.

With formation of large republics different variations of representative democracy, many of which fraught with the risk of a return to the so-called 'elitist democracies', arise. The optimum might be considered rational combination of direct democracy and representative democracy: direct democracy in solving of all local problems, and representative – of the societies and States ones. This requires an active participation of civil society in control over all processes. In particular, when there is no certainty that the peoples' representatives made the best decision under the given circumstances, it can and should be referred to all citizens in the form of a referendum.

Political scientist E. Heywood distinguishes also such form of democracy as totalitarian, characterized by an absolute dictatorship of a chieftain or leader under the guise of democracy. This mode is based on the assumption that only the leader has the political wisdom and is able to express the true interests of the people [Heywood, (2004): p. 86 – 87]. Actually neither authoritarianism nor totalitarianism has anything of common with democracy.

Democracy, as well as freedom and justice, is an ideal, to which humankind had aspire tirelessly throughout history. As befits any ideal, it does not exist and likely would not exist in perfect form. This applies to democracy as well; it has not been in perfect shape anywhere else in the world, and is unlikely to be ever. We can only discuss about different degrees of democracy in societies where elements of democracy are present only at the level of family, clans and local communities. Accordingly, the democracy of public life, as well as cleanness of water and air, measure of a beauty of man or nature, etc. is the notion of relative.

Degrees of democracy and purity (beauty, brightness) are numerous and differ from each other. Probably the water and air were absolutely clean before the outbreak of animal and human being, especially the latter, who through his activities affected and continues to affect their quality to such extent that the problem of the threat to all life on the Earth, including of the man himself, arose. Then people started to take some restrictive measures, which would be able to return some cleanness to them. So is democracy. It was a natural state of the primary societies' function at their very outset, and gradually 'grow turbid' because of the socio-economic inequities and inequalities, differentiation of society into layers and classes. And nowadays there is more democracy in public life, in the family and labor relations between people as members of society, as well as in solving of the social and spiritual problems of common interest. It is more in the societies without the State or with the weak State. It is no accident, therefore, Thomas Jefferson, comparing the social order of the Indian tribes in the North America and Europe, found that life of indigenous communities was more democratic.

It is possible to suppose that humankind, lived for hundreds of thousands years in a primitive communal system, has started its path to progress with greater democracy (family, clan, community, military, etc.). Social power was, as if dissolved in whole society and was personified with it. All questions of public life were decided by the councils of elders or heads of families and clans. Gradually the power becomes personified. Societies have formed the States and delegated to these new institutions as much authority as, according to general understanding, was necessary for its normal functioning. Thus, democracy is narrowed cone-shaped as the transition to politics and power relations. The bigger and stronger the State becomes, the weaker the societies become.

### **The bases of democracy**

An absolute or a 'pure' democracy as a real form of power or rule of all people has never been existed and will not exist because of its improbability. "If we take the term in the strict sense, there never has been a real democracy, and there never will be. It is against the natural order for the many to govern and the few to be governed. It is unimaginable that the people should remain continually assembled to devote their time to public affairs, and it is clear that they cannot set up commissions for that purpose without the form of administration being changed" [Rousseau, (2010): p. 80], Rousseau wrote. For a while democracy in its best form is the power of a relative majority.

One of the most important synthetic indices of democracy is how much each member of the society and the citizen of the State individually and all they together are free in their actions, and practically solve their vital problems individually and freely participate in socio-political life.

This is a direct consequence of the available degree of freedom in the society.

A problem of correlation of human freedom and democracy, what of them is the primary, fundamental, and what are secondary, derivative and dependent, and what is of the primary value to the human being has always interested people. Hardly anyone can deny that human freedom is primary, basic value and underlies all social relations. Freedom of actions in accordance with the laws of nature is natural condition for the human being. As it was already mentioned, at a certain stage the societies' development, social and economic differentiation began and the State has formed. Economic, social, and political powers have been concentrated in the hands of a few people. All this has accompanied by restriction of freedom of the person up to complete denial of it for some groups and classes, and expulsion them from governance processes, including solving of their own lives' issues. Political power fixed this inequality and kept it. However, the part of people, finding them in unequal situation, fought for freedom and equality. At this stage, the struggle for freedom and democracy become mutually connected with each other: The freedom leads to democracy, and democracy leads to increasing of freedom. More active factor in this dual process is democracy; the degree of freedom society's member depends on it and therefore the struggle for freedom is equivalent to the struggle for democracy.

Democracy is a soul of all social relations, emerging in the process of real participation of every member of society, or at least most part of them, in common solution of the challenges that cannot be tackled in isolation. Each person can decide the problems within individuals freely and at his own discretion, in accordance with the norms of public morality.

Relativity of democracy has some objective basis. What they are? First of all, each person is unique. Therefore, every society and every nation are differentiated into thousands and millions groups of people with their objectives, interests, vision of societal problems and ways to solve them, and with determined by all this behavior. Taking part in public life, they pursue different purposes. The full unity of society is impossible and incomprehensible; it has always been, is and would be relative. But how to define a 'public good' that, according to all theorists of democracy, should be an aim of all democratic institutions of the society and how to determine a strategy for social development, as well as ways and means of its implementation? Which of the many possible directions and options of development should be regarded as a priority, and answering to the best interests of the society? Answers of the political theorists to these questions are different, and often mutually excluding each other.

Modern democracy is based on the «majority's rule», about which Aristotle wrote yet [Aristotle, 1291b 20], and Thomas Jefferson theoretically substantiated. But here, naturally, a number of quite legitimate questions beg: why

not unanimity or consensus, but majority, why minority of citizens must obey the law, to which they did not give their consent? Most of whom and what, and how to determine this majority – by strength, wealth, influence in society, knowledge and abilities, or somehow else?

Certainly, unanimity is the best option for solving of any social problems, and the most complete embodiment of democracy, but, unfortunately, it is unattainable. What is perceived by ones as natural, to the others may seem as illogical and unnatural. There are problems that equally effect on all people, but have many solutions'. It is not surprisingly that Adam Smith wrote about chessboard of human society, options of moves on which are multiple [Smith A. (2002): p. 25]. In selecting the best variants of their solution people will inevitably diverge. Whose choice should have priority?

In case of some aspects of personal life, performed by each individually, for example, how much and when to eat, sleep, marry, and how long to work etc., the decision of every individual should be decisive. If the problem is universal and any decision effect on interest a lot of people (defense of the society, use of natural resources, environmental impact, etc.), the right to determine the optimal ways of its solution belongs to a society as a whole, but, again, for the aforementioned reasons, to absolute majority of its members. It might be supposed that full democracy can exist only when there is a consensus in the society.

Human beings with different sizes of wealth, levels of knowledge, and degrees of wisdom, physical strength and health are the actors of all social processes. The first step to democracy must be recognition of freedom and equality of all human beings as members of society. Jefferson understood the republic as governance of the citizens in the mass acting directly and personally, in accordance with the rules established by the majority of these citizens, the majority not of those only, who present and participate in the action, but of all adult members of the society and citizens of the State. In reality, everybody knows that now the content of the 'majority's rule' almost everywhere is perverted. The majority only of the voting people are taken into consideration. In some countries, even 'general elections' are considered legitimate, regardless of the percentage of the voting people. At present almost no president and no one from ruling parties have the support of an absolute majority of the citizens. In response, some researchers propose even to reconsider the meaning of the notion 'people'. In their opinion, 'the people' as a political term is used primarily in order to appeal to the rights set forth in the State, and therefore becomes moot. Therefore, they did not consider 'people' as aggregate of all citizens, because this would mean that anyone should have full political rights [Wallerstein, (2010)]. It is very dangerous for democracy supposition.

'The majority's rule' does not reject and deny the minority's views of, since democracy presupposes respect for

every human being, considering as the highest value. And it regulates not all aspects of human life, but only those, which are called problems of social and public life, affecting the interests of all members of society. In personal life, flowing in harmony with the norms of public morality, an individual himself acts as a legislator, an architect and a judge. However, the majority's opinion is considered as most preferable in social and political life. Minority of the citizens, of course, retain the right to argue their case and prioritize their opinions, to promote them and attract the citizens, to demand with the support of some part of the citizens, to put their proposals to the people's referendum. Usually a will or opinion shared by a minority nowadays becomes tomorrow an opinion of the majority and a law for the society, and the current majority can be transformed to minority. Here it is necessary to remember about the important criteria of democracy: Not people, but the law, being an expression of the will of the people, rule. The will of the people often changes in accordance with changing circumstances of life and appearing of new conditions. Concurring will of the citizens' majority serves as the law of democracy at any given moment. It takes place in a democratic society, where the majority and the minority are constantly changing with their roles, receiving corresponding statuses not due to the State administrative apparatus and to all manner of vote rigging, but freely expressed by secret ballot on truly democratic general elections will of their citizens.

No less important norms of democracy are eligibility and removability of all officials, as well as limited duration of their incumbents. Almost all institutions of power in the today's world, though not all of them can be considered as democratic, are formed by weans of elections. Because of distrust of a large part of the population to this traditionally discriminated institute, hardly one of the so-called 'representatives of the people' has the support of the majority of the electors. As a result, the 'majority's rule' does not work, substituting by the 'law of a relative majority'. Moreover, in many cases, even in the so-called democratic States the will not of the majority of people, but the will of its separate 'representatives', many of which even do not think about their responsibility before this people, becomes the basis of law.

The main democratic right of the people is the right to control the activities of all officials, Henry Sumner believed. Public opinion, which means as censorship and praise, is the motivating force in democratic societies [Sumner, (1889): p. 22], he considered. The people's right to control the activities of their representatives and the right to withdraw them in cases of fraud are equally important elements of democracy, no longer implementing. By illegitimate efforts of such representatives these rights of the citizens are often come to nothing in actual practice. This is done by substituting of elections of high officials with appointing them by the heads of the States, usurpation by a few political parties the right to nominate candidates for the role of functionaries of the State, lead

ing to de facto exclusion of the citizens from the electoral processes, falsification of 'the majority's rule', denying the citizens' right to withdrawal those deputies, who deceived the trust of the people, etc.

### Modern understanding democracy's criteria

Often democratic procedures in many cases are simply simulated: Parliaments debate drafts of laws and approve budgets of the States, occasionally declare elections; citizens are urged to vote for the parties and their representatives. In fact, in some countries, the electoral campaigns are turned into a pure formality, and representative bodies became some kind of the departments of the offices of the first officials of the States. These latter, verbally postulating democracy, in fact, replace the abiding laws by their personal decrees, arbitrarily administer budget, forgetting that public money must be used strictly in accordance with the regulations of the highest representative body. The most common in the lexicon of top officials, for example of Russia, are the expression 'I am' (decided, ordered, and so on) as if they are not the elected by the people for a period of time and serving to the people officials, but absolute monarchs. Someone from them tries to depict these blatant displays as 'peculiar features of Russian democracy'. Thus, at the Forum on the 'Modern State: standards of democracy and criteria of efficiency' in the summer of 2010, the then President of the Russian Federation expressed his profound disagreement with those "who claims that there is no democracy in Russia, that the authoritarian traditions are dominated here. It is not so", he said. "Russia certainly is democracy. There is democracy in Russia. Not least fantastic was the claim that "the State model of Russia has been and continues to be democratic; it needs to be democratized. Democratization is a process of development inside any of the democratic model" [Ustoychivaya, (2010)].

Only those, who has the vague knowledge about democracy, would be able to such abstruse as "The democratic model needs democratization". Or such babble: The then speaker of the State Duma of the Russian Federation seriously, as a kind of some revelation stated: "Precisely an autocratic sovereignty of the people, or if translated from Russian into a foreign languages, sovereign democracy is historically the most common thing for Russia" [Arguments, (2011)]. This statesman has been, probably, unaware that, firstly, that democracy is not a thing, but a real form of solving of social life's problems, and, secondly, autocracy and democracy are incompatible with each other antipodes.

Only where democracy did not even spend a night, the chief executive may individually change the constitutional provisions on elections. Only there he can order to extend his mandate being on top, and the so-called legislative branch in a pose 'what can we do for you?' immediately and without any discussion and debate ("the Parliament,

according to one of its ex-speakers is not a place for discussion!") approve it. It turns out that 'autocratic democracy' in Russia is moving not forward, but backward to monarchic orders.

Democracy is a universal value with its clear criteria and manifestations. It has nothing common with so called model of democracy in Russia, determined by some arguable 'standards'. In reality, these standards, as the chains, can further restrict democracy and strangle even those items or its manifestations that exist in all countries. Thus, 'legal embodiment of humanistic values and ideals' limiting the legal framework of all those values which society holds. If they are the values of the society, many of them are ruled by economic, social and moral norms, generated by civil society. State intervention here is possible only in order to avoid threats to them, to support and cultivate the moral values of society, for example, through the system of education and upbringing.

'Technological level and the ability of the State to provide it' are not directly related to democracy as well. The first democratic societies and States in the world were formed before the technological era. At the time of their formation, the United States, the first democratic republic in the world, was an agrarian country. The same applies to science and knowledge, and the capacity of the State to protect its citizens from attacks by criminal organizations. Any State is able to solve these challenges, but does it actually do it, and how efficiently? In a period of so-called 'transition of Russia from authoritarianism to democracy', that people rightly call 'the criminal revolution', on almost all levels of power criminals ascertained them.

It is difficult to agree with the assertion that the absence of poverty is the criteria of democracy. It is, first, because 'poverty' is a relative notion. Each epoch has its own criteria of poverty. Secondly, some still poor by modern standards countries, India for example, is more democratic than some relatively rich countries.

Anyway, even by polls of sociologists, in 'democratic Russia' of the beginning of the 21st century, the proportion of people, who considered themselves free, was considerably less than in 'the undemocratic Soviet Union'. Well, thick metal doors with many great castles replaced the cardboard doors in the years of the USSR, as well as iron bars on the windows up to the third floor are not the best indicators of liberty and security of the person. Every day in the 'democratic Russia' multiple more people are killed and disappear than in the totalitarian Soviet Union. Substitution of the phenomena takes place when 'fight against terrorism considers as a manifestation of democracy'. In fact, the phenomenon of terrorism is a consequence of the weakness or of total absence of democracy. This might be reaction of some groups of citizens, whose rights, as they believe, have been grossly violated by various forces, including any illegal actions of the State's institutions. Losing all hope to seek protection from the State, they take a role of judges to themselves and determine the offenders' penalties on own mentality.

We have to remember the judgment of an outstanding classic of modern democracy Jefferson about this. "The Moral construction of the World", he wrote, "is such that ultimately, no national crime does pass without leaving a trace ... Their current errors would affect them in future. The seeds of hatred and revenge, which they sow with a wide hand, will bring fruits in due time" [The Writings, (1905): p. 130]. Terrorist acts are those fruits. In a truly democratic society, there should be no causes and soil for terrorism, with the exception of individual acts of some mentally unstable and ill people, left by society without supervision or care, as well as diversion groups acting at the direction of and in favors of other countries and political forces.

Democracy indeed has its own specific criteria, their number is huge, and reveal them with accuracy is often enough difficult. The most obvious and uncontroversial criteria of democracy are: The will of the people is the supreme law of the land, of the society and of the State.

The rights and freedoms of citizens are the central point, on which all institutions of civil society and the State orient themselves and are implemented fully.

Common good, peace, prosperity, happiness of citizens are the supreme objectives of any society and all its institutions.

Functions of government and self-government are efficiently distributed between the institutions of civil society, only one of which the State is. Most of the issues of human life are administered by the citizens themselves, and remains their private matter.

Limits of political power are reduced to the necessary minimum, and it is divided into several branches, each of which is relatively independent from each other, but in all is dependent from the people and civil society.

Authorities in the country are distributed in such a mode to guarantee lasting democracy and alleviate the burden of population to bear the costs of the authorities. A large part of authorities, delegated by citizens to the State, are administered by the regions, and only those with regard to other countries and peoples, belong to the central or federal authorities. There are compulsory eligibility and removability of all State officials and short duration of their mandates. All State institutions are formed on the basis of the will of the citizens, by universal and direct suffrage by secret ballot with constitutional majority of the voters. Citizens have and practically implement the right to recall of the representatives, fraudulently infiltrated into the power structures, as well as those who had lost touch with their voters, and failed their trust.

The State and its officials constantly realize that the protection of the rights and freedoms of citizens and ensuring their security are their primary vocation. The State is for the people, not people for the State; damage caused to citizens by public officials and institutions shall be compensated at the expense of the perpetrators or the budget of the institutions concerned, and in no case out

of the general budget of the country. Not the people, but abiding law, uniform for all citizens, rules in society.

The rights of all citizens are equal. There are no considerable contrasts in the standard of living of the members of the society and the citizens of the State. The differences are determined only by degrees of people's activity and its efficiency; Remuneration for public officials is determined by the average wages in the organized and managed by them spheres of life. There are plurality of political forces, without any artificial obstacles to and restrictions on the part of the States, participating in the social and political life and expressing the interest of their population.

Only taken together, these criteria provide democracy. The absence of even one of them makes life less democratic. Adepts of authoritarian power try to justify authoritarianism and lack of democracy in Russia. They claim: the demos in Russia are not the same as in the other countries and the West puts pressure on us, etc. [Nikonov, (2010)]. The others complain of the weakness of the political culture and weak involvement of citizens into their own institutions. They say, "the citizens have the opportunity to participate, but do not participate" [Pavlovskiy, (2010)]. The proponents of authoritarian power forgot or did not dare to say that the Russian State and its institutions did everything to exclude people from an effective participation in political life. Let us remember though how the Russian Constitution was adopted in 1993. Can anyone from the apologists of "Russian democracy" tell who its author was?

The people of the country concerned must be an author of any legitimate Constitution. The Constitution is an expression of their will, but not in the Russian Federation. Many times in recent years under the same Constitution the electoral law has been changed towards expulsion of the citizens from the processes of the institutionalization of power and elections of their functionaries. The people executed a role of only a symbolic registrar of decision of the power-holdings by lowering ballots with pre-selected by authorities' names of parties and their representatives to the ballot boxes. In order to form a high political culture and involve the citizens more actively in political life, it is necessary to make them more convinced that their will has some meaning in their country and their voice is heard when making decisions.

Sometimes the word democracy is added with complementary definitions 'guided', 'controlled', 'limited', etc. In fact, these terms in such combinations do not have any sense and are designed to mislead the people and hide the true essence of the existing political regime.

Democracy is a full realization of human rights and freedoms, the rule of law and the legitimacy of all institutions of power and their acts, the responsibility of all offices before the society and a possibility of open competition.

One can agree or disagree with opinions on different national models of democracy. It is possible to agree with

this because all democracies as statehoods are different; they are carried out in accordance with the relevant national values, customs and traditions. Some of them are federative, others are unitary. Democratic republic may be presidential, parliamentary and parliamentary-presidential. And the criteria of democracy, for example, eligibility, take many forms. Some of them are based on majority's rule, others on proportional or mixed electoral systems. That is democracy is constantly evolving, modified, inventing it again, getting rid from some institutions and forming others, and, as they say, changing the rules of the game during the game.

At the same time, the basic elements that define democracy and their essence are unchanging. The State, busy with fulfillment of its functions and controlled by the society, should be effective and not corrupt. Legislation guarantees equal political rights to all citizens; there must be authorities' accountability here, separation of powers, should be competition between the citizens and their political associations. If either of these elements is missing, we cannot say of full democracy [Klaus, 2010].

Well, full and many-sided democracy does not exist yet in any country of the world and its defects, manifested in some countries, are repeated also in the others. It is not because that such is the nature of democracy, but because all countries have approximately the same groups of people: the oligarchs, criminals, different market dealers, ranks, and simple people living on their own labour. Each of these groups, regardless of their residence, has close behavior, like any race or type of animals. Oligarchs like wolves on land or piranhas in rivers, behave them as plunderers, the nomenclature as bedbugs, parasitize on the body of a society, draining life energy from it. And ordinary people are working like ants and bees, producing various material and spiritual values, which are taking away from them by parasitic segments of society under cover of making by them laws. To democratize the life of all societies and eliminate of the negative phenomena, it is necessary to change the rules and regulations for their operation, so that the tycoons could not be preyed, and officialdom and their ilk – live as parasites, and the fruits of creative works of people remained in their possession.

## Conclusions

Thus, democracy is a state of social relations characterized by rationality, freedom and equality of all partici

pants most conducive to life, creativity, as well as to aspirations of all members of the society and citizens of the State to happiness. In the political sphere, it is the rule of the people, responsible before the people for all actions and serving to the people.

## References

- Arguments and Facts', ( 2011).  
 Aristotle. Politics. 1291b 20  
 Achkasov V A (2008). Ethnopolitology. SPb  
 Campbell T D (1981). Seven Theories of Human Society. Oxford: Clarendon Press  
 Ferguson A (1966). An Essay on Civil Society. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.  
 Heywood A (2004). Politology, Moscow,.  
 Klaus O (2010) Democracy may vary, but the basic principles are common // <http://www.gpf-yaroslavl.ru/viewpoint/Klaus-Offe-Demokratii-mogut-razlichat-sya-no-bazovye-principy-obschie>.  
 Lecky HW (1899). Democracy and Liberty, vol. 1,  
 Lieber F (2009). On Civil Liberty and Self-Government [1853]. Indianapolis,  
 Nikonov W (2010). For the subject of Russian modernization the democracy in Russia is vital // <http://www.gpf-yaroslavl.ru/viewpoint/Vyacheslav-Nikonov-Dlya-subekta-rossijskoj-modernizacii-nalichie-demokratii-v-Rossii-isklyuchitelno-vazhno>.  
 Pavlovskiy G (2010) Sustainable democracy- many models, but order of the day is one // <http://www.gpf-yaroslavl.ru/viewpoint/Gleb-Pavlovskij-Ustojchivaya-demokratiya-modelej-mnogo-povestka-odna>  
 Primakov Y (2011). Russian economy was doomed well before the crisis // A&F.  
 Rousseau JJ (2010). The Social Contract and Discourses (1761). Indianapolis.  
 Smith A (2002). An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations. Charlottesville, Virginia.  
 Sumner H. M. Popular Government. London, 1889.  
 Ustojchivaya-demokratiya-modelej-mnogo-povestka-odna // <http://www.gpf-yaroslavl.ru/viewpoint/>.  
 The Writings of Thomas Jefferson 1905. Vol. 15.  
 Wallerstein I (2010). Liberalism and democracy brothers or enemies? // [http://www.politstudies.ru/universum/newbook/12\\_2003/12\\_2003.htm](http://www.politstudies.ru/universum/newbook/12_2003/12_2003.htm)