

## Democracy and its real state in the modern world

Dzhamal Z Mutagirov\*

Department of Political Sciences, Professor of International Political Process, St. Petersburg State University, Russia.

**\*Corresponding Author** Dzhamal Z Mutagirov\*, Department of Political Sciences, Professor of International Political Process, St. Petersburg State University, Russia, Tel: +7 812-328-94-55; Email: [dezamy@mail.ru](mailto:dezamy@mail.ru)**Received date : March 29,2018; Accepted date : April 03,2018; Published date: April 10, 2018.****Citations:** Dzhamal Z Mutagirov. Democracy and its real state in the modern world. J.Journalism and Intellectual Property,DOI: <http://doi.org/04.2018/1.10001>.**Copyright :** © 2018 Dzhamal Z Mutagirov et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

### Abstract

Hardly one can find today people, with the exception of the dictators and their followers, who do not consider themselves be champions of democracy. Almost all of them agree with that democracy is the best form of organization of social life. But most of them associate democracy mainly with the State, with distribution and division of the State powers, thereby linking together the phenomenon and one of the main threats to it. What democracy actually is, and what to do to make it a reality for all peoples, societies and humankind as a whole? Traditionally responses to this question are trying to find in the forms of government and in methods of their improvement. The role of society (people), which is the bearer of sovereignty and the only source of power, remains without due attention. This article seeks the objective role of a society and the State in a social life.

### Key words

people, society, humankind, life, institutions, the State, service, social order, democracy, the will of the people.

## 1. Introduction

As it is known, human life passes and is organized in a family, society and in the universe as a whole. What is primary, initial, fundamental for human beings, and what is secondary and derivative? Social order largely depends on the understanding of this ratio. Educators of humankind, reflecting on the answers to these questions since ancient times, approached to the truth only in modern times. "Some writers have so confounded society with government, as to leave little or no distinction between them; whereas they are not only different, but have different origins", Thomas Paine wrote. "Society is produced by our wants, and government by our wickedness; the former promotes our happiness positively by uniting our affections, the latter negatively by restraining our vices. The one encourages intercourse, the other creates distinctions. The first is a patron, the last a punisher.

Society in every state is a blessing, but Government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil; in its worst state an intolerable one: for when we suffer, or are exposed to the same miseries by a Government, which we might expect in a country without Government, our calamity is heightened by reflecting that we furnish the means by which we suffer. Government, like dress, is the badge of lost innocence; the palaces of kings are built upon the ruins of the bowers of paradise" [1].

However, a State centrist view on public processes, legitimizing the authoritarianism and tyranny, deeply entrenched in the era of absolutism, like a hoop keeps people from awareness of the true correlation of human institutions and guidance by scientific conscience. Objective assessment of the role of the States in societies' life [2 - 7] how would drown in a loud chorus of apologists. Replacement of the State centrist view to the society centrist approach to understanding these processes is able to rid people and societies from centuries-old habits of worshiping an authoritarian government and to turn democracy into a unique for all peoples and humankind norm of coexistence.

## 2. Method

The study is conducted, applying the methods of content analysis of the written evidences about the forms of the organization of social life in different epochs, and comparison them with each other, as well as the rate of progress in different countries with various public systems, and guidance by a logic of the progress in general. Consistent adherence to them will help to apprehend the natural way to optimal organization of human life, and understand democracy as a natural norm of relationship between individuals and peoples in their daily life and stick to it.



## 2.1. Correlation of society and its institutions

Life of the people as rational beings passes in a family, society and in the State. But traditionally human life somehow is binding mainly to the State, which is considering as the main subject of power and power relations. In reality, the public relations are regulated by different forms of power: economic, social, political, spiritual, etc.

Society is the first human institute [8] formed to solve collectively the life problems, impossible to solve individually [9]. To meet these objectives, it establishes a variety of services and invests them with respective competencies. The State is only one of these institutions.

Distribution and formal separation of powers are an objective necessity for any societies functioning, and not always it says of democracy in a society. Some elements and manifestations of democracy in various combinations, notably self-government as the main pivot of the entire system of democracy [10] have been existed always, and the most effective ones, had proved their vitality, became standards of living for many nations.

The degree of democracy is determined by the procedures and standards according to which the societies form and reform their official institutions, keep up their activity and by speed of elimination of the inevitable in these processes miscalculations and mistakes. That is, democracy is not only a form of government, but also an optimal rule of relationship among peoples in their daily life, passing in the family, workplace, society and in the entire universe.

The above-mentioned State centrist view absolutizes life only in the State and represents the latter as the principal source of power and determinant of all power relations. As a consequence of such miscalculations a dangerous substitution of the phenomena occurs: the servant elevates up to a master, the real master lowers down to the status of a ward, and the head of the administration elevates up to the supreme sovereign. This is especially dangerous when the head of the administration falsely perceives his true role in public life. When the Russian politician Vladimir Putin, elected president in 2000, was asked at a press conference, 'What is your attitude to the heads portraits placing in the offices?' he without any hesitation answered: 'It's OK, because the president is the State's symbol'. The young President, a university-educated lawyer, ought to know that symbols of the State are its flag, anthem and coat of arms, and the President is only the temporary elected by the people head the State's administration. The question of this kind: 'How do you understand a civil society?' was asked and Putin's successor D. Medvedev. 'Civil society is an essential element of any State', he replied self-confidently, turning all upside down - not the State is one of the many thousands institutions of a society, but the society itself is one of the many attributes of the State! It ought to be clear that the fate of any society and country, led by people with such understanding of the things, may not be enviable.

Democracy presupposes not only rational institutionalization of public life, when each institution fulfills responsibly all delegated to it by society functions of, but the strict observance of the correlation of economic, social, political and spiritual powers. The theorists and practitioners of democracy required this, formulating the concepts of non-interference of the State in economic, social, and spiritual life of society, of the 'weak' or 'limited' State, the 'State-manager', etc.

However, the State, in contrast to economic, social and spiritual institutions of society, engaged in the solution of specific problems, tries to establish its powers' monopoly not only in political sphere, but also in any other, as well as to manage all aspects of public life. Some scholars try even to justify such behavior, presenting it almost as an objective pattern: It possesses the fullness of the competence to deal with all aspects of social life [11]. In reality, the State has it no by virtue of objective necessity and no for the benefit of society, but only because, having a monopoly on force, it compels society to reckon with it, as with a reality. Society, its majority must understand the fallacy and harmfulness of such attitude and practice based on them. Many prominent thinkers disagree with the monopoly of the State to force. The Eastern States were 'too strong', and we must do everything in our power to avoid such situation, famous American Scientists J. Buchanan and H. Tullock consider. The State should have enough power to 'keep the peace', but not enough to satisfy the ambitious people's temptation. To the State should never give sufficient force to prevent a truly popular uprising against it [3-6].

It is important to remember and assume again and again that the State is only one of many thousands institutions of civil society, each of which is designed to solve specific problems of this society. Such problems for the State are defense the society against external threats, protection of human rights and freedoms, and relations with other countries.

Political power is necessary for elaboration of and observance the rules of the national law. Each branch of this power has how would double level structure: constant power of society (people) and provisional credentials of the generated political institutions (legislative, executive and control). Unfortunately, in a real life, many societies and States ignore this division and all power credit only to political institutions, against which well-known intellectuals of modern times consistently opposed [6-12].

Since the State is a temporary institution and democracy is seeing as a form of the State, some people raise the question: does democracy have any future? [12]. We think that the issue is caused by incorrect judgments about democracy as the form of a statehood only. Democracy, like many other phenomena of social life, is objective and permanent. Because of the conflicting nature of the people themselves, some difficulties raise on its way occasionally. It is possible to slow the processes of its establishment and extension, but suspend them forever is impossible. They will be renewed again and again, each time with new content and at a higher level of purity. Economic and social progress, fed by education and enlightenment, are the natural engine of democracy. The higher their degree, the higher will be the degree people's freedom, the progress of society as a whole and the greater democracy.

The English historian of law J. Austin considered democracy as the government's form, consisting of a relatively large fraction of the nation. "It means, in fact, form of government, that is, any government in which the ruling body consists of a relatively large fraction of the whole nation", he wrote. But what does a 'broad' faction mean? Broad compared with to the monarchy, 'three-or-duumvirate', or we are talking about most part of the nation? The Sociologist M. Sumner paid an attention to the vagueness of the terms 'fraction', 'few' and 'many'. In his opinion, only monarchy, i.e. the power of one person, who decides individually, and all obey him, is concrete. He himself understood the republic as 'overturned monarchy' [25].



Since society consists of many strata, each of which has its own name, the dominance of any of them determines a particular type or mode of social order. Political power may temporarily be controlled also by regional groups of different levels, bearing in mind the practice of appointing of the friends and countrymen of the first persons to important public office.

Democracy was and remains the best, most desirable for the vast majority of society and at the same time, the most mysterious and less certain on its contours phenomena. This uncertainty is the cause that some people praise and glorify it, attributing to it all imaginable and unimaginable dignity, and others persuasively scold, criticize, ridicule, equally persuasively associating with it all imaginable and unimaginable evils. The nature and criteria of democracy are often silenced, limiting to a description of the external manifestations of political power and power relations, or attributing democracy to institutions, which by definition are not and cannot be democratic. So, the author of the well-known in his time work 'Democracy and Liberty', Lecky seriously wrote on two institutions of democracy in the Middle ages: on the Church and the guilds, whose members were considered equal among themselves [15].

Indeed, it is permissible to speak of faith as an institution, supposing an equal treatment of all believers to whom they consider their "Creator", although there is no place for democracy. It is, repeating the words of T. Jefferson, relationship between man and his creator, if one accepts the existence of such. Only at the dawn the religions formation, their adherents, sincerely believing and calling each other "brothers and sisters", elected their pastors. After the recognition of a religion by the State the Church had converted into a purely authoritarian and dogmatic institution. Not coincidentally, one of the "founding fathers" of the United States and the second President John Adams named the Church one of the bulwarks of tyranny [16]. The practice of some countries confirms that assessment. So, the Russian Orthodox Church, supported by the State authorities, resolutely condemns the human rights and freedoms, democracy and the rule of law, ignorantly declaring them sources of immorality and permissiveness.

Democracy is a social order established by free people, which expresses the true interests of their absolute majority; This is the power of free, equal, socio-politically and economically active people, serving the people, considering as the main value, and implemented by them. Democracy is many-sided and is realized differently in various spheres of public life and can exist simultaneously both socio-economic, political, national, spiritual, and even international or universal [17].

## 2. 2. What is a power, and who are the people?

Almost two and a half millennia after the first estimates of democracy there were thousands of definitions of both the power and the people. Unfortunately, many of them not yet solve the issues, because a focus is done predominantly on the political dimension of the problem - power as an ability to coercion.

Undoubtedly, coercion is an important moment of any power. But coercion to what for, how and why? Thoughtful reflections on life persuade that the power may also manifest itself without any visible coercion - by necessity and appropriateness of what life offers or dictates. The power of nature, the power of circumstances, of a glamour, beauty, love, friendship, solidarity, enmities, examples, etc. play in human life a huge role.

They can encourage and motivate people to commit those or other actions on their own initiative, voluntarily, without any coercion. Thus, the power is the ability not so much to coercion, but to motivation. The society's goals specificity suggests that the power institutions should be very flexible, dynamic, changeable and to be able to both expand and shrink, depending on the circumstances and tasks. Anyway, such is how the society wants to see established by it institute. But the State authorities, like the biblical Leviathan, know no limits of permissible and reasonable. Its greed and cruelty have no boundaries.

Power gives its officials not only renowned authority, but also the right to compel members of society to execute of those or other functions, to dispose of one or another share of public wealth, choose the ways and determine the solutions' methods of the arising in the society, region, and area problems. It is supposed that this is done in the name of the common good and that people with power, will do all the best for the society. Democracy is a form of power, guaranteeing this way of actions. However, the power to command and control, to coercion others to commit those or other acts may be used for personal gain as well. Connected with the authority possibilities to tower over others, command them, as well as to get rich quickly turns it into an arena of severe competition.

Because of these and a number of other circumstances, the State ceases to serve the community, willfully extending even after diminution of the possible threats and risk for the society's life. The Russian Federation demonstrates striking example this judgment's faithfulness. So, for 18 years after the collapse of the USSR (1992 - 2010), elimination of public property, organized and administered by the State, and multiple cutting its social obligations to the citizens, the apparatus of the State power and administration, instead of the expected shrinking, increased by 70% [19]. The trend is continuing up to now, reaching even the spheres of education and science.

Possible threats to society, and to the lives of its members is the main factor determining the existence of the State. If there are no real threats, the State must shrink, but it is not happening because it continually invents some artificial threats, non-existent enemies to expand and grow. The State alienated from its society is able to turn from a public institution for the protection of human rights into the main source of threat to its creator. Such metamorphoses are quite often observed in life of the disordered and badly managing societies. In the well-organized societies, every individual and every group of people are engaged in the affairs, which they can effectively accomplish: the absolute majority of their members are involved in the production of material and spiritual values and delivering them to the consumers, about one to two per cent of the working age members – in administrative processes, providing constitutional order and protecting society from possible threats.

When no common good but personal gain becomes the purpose of power, some functions, particularly of the employees of non-industrial areas, substitute. Heads of executive power of the States deal with public funds as their own. Police officers in pursuit of personal benefit can conduct deals with criminals, turning them from law enforcers into the most dangerous offenders, to identify of which new units are required to establish in structures of those bodies (at the expense of all society). Servicemen to combat the drug trade turn the legally confiscated drugs of some criminals into their own revenues source, distributing them under the guise of their status, among others.



Researchers of socio-political relations often had compared members of societies and citizens of the States with angels and devils. Surely, a certain amount of exaggeration happens here. Man as a member of society, having obtained the status of the citizen, logically should overtop, become more optimistic, confident in his security and, consequently, more perfect social and moral being. It would be more exact to compare a society and its State with the creator and one of his creations, or speaking by the language of the Bible, with God and rebelled against him Satan. Society, functioning mainly according to the laws of nature, always resists against such unnatural claims one of its services and will return it to its fitting place. Democracy is an optimal condition for the harmonious functioning of all institutions of society and the best way to manage all social processes with permanent control of the established institutions, and to prevent any possible risks for society and its members.

Unnatural state of the relations between society and the State is determined primarily by the fact that for millennia the nature and direction of social development were defined not by societies and their members, but by the States and their institutions. Almost everything in society had been assessed, and often until now is assessed only from the State and ruling circles' positions. On the State and its functionaries used to say almost with aspirated voice and raising eyes to heaven. Even democracy is often understood only as a form of the State power. Social, economic and spiritual power as would be disappearing, even researchers of power relations ceased to see any significant differences between them. In fact, democracy is multidimensional and multifaceted phenomena, penetrating all aspects of life of the human communities. Everywhere, where there is some power, there are its participants and implementers, as well as the modalities for its implementation. Democracy everywhere means free and equal participation of all members of society, or at least their majority in determination of the objectives, as well as in searching the ways for their achieving. It has been existed and exists in all societies but in different forms, manifestations and scopes: as germs or certain moments or elements of processes addressing the common problems, as links and even entire institutions. It is gradually widening, but full democracy exists nowhere in the modern world [18].

Presumably, direct democracy was the initial form the social problems' solving. Then it gave way to elite or dominant groups in society, the share of which has always been limited. This is the so-called elitist democracy [20]. There is also false democracy: Board of a narrow clique or single person makes decisions formally 'approved' by episodic national plebiscite, however, without direct participation of the people in decision-making processes. They are permitted to say 'Yes' or 'No' to the decisions of the ruling clique, while only forged 'Yes' is accepted [18].

Rational combination of direct and representative democracy when direct democracy governs on local levels and representative – on regional and national ones should be considered the best. This requires very active participation of civil society the in monitoring all socio-political processes. And when society is not convinced that its representatives adopted the right decision, the matter shall be submitted to a national referendum - higher form of direct democracy.

Some political scientists differ also such form of 'democracy' as totalitarian, characterized by an absolute dictatorship of the leader under the guise of democracy.

This model is based on the assumption that only the leader has political wisdom and is able to express the true interests of all people. Actually neither authoritarianism nor totalitarianism, embedded with the personality of the individual, have nothing common with democracy.

Democracy, as well as freedom and justice is an ideal to which humankind tirelessly aspires throughout history. As befits any ideal, it does not exist and, most likely, never will exist in perfect form. We can only talk about different degrees of democracy, as well as of societies where elements of democracy exist only at the families and local communities' levels. Consequently, democracy, as well as a cleanness of the air and water, a degree of the beauty of nature or human being, brightness of the light or collars, etc. are relative. Degrees of democracy, as of purity (beauty, brightness) are numerous and differ from each other. Probably the water and air were absolutely clean before origin of the animal world.

So is democracy. It was a natural state of the primary societies functioning at the dawn of their origin and gradually became 'turbid' with increasing people's socio-economic disparities and inequality, differentiation of society into layers and classes, restrictions, and then with suppress the individual 's freedom. And now there is more democracy in public life, family and labour relations among people as members of society, as well as in addressing social and spiritual issues of common interest.

Understanding of democracy and an attitude to it often depend on specific situations and actions perpetrated under its flag. So, in the first democratic country of the New times - United States, - its Constitution affirms and defends the republican form of government, different from both the monarchy and, according to some members of the Constitutional Convent, democracy. Under the influence of insurrections and rebellions of the masses in the young republic, democracy had been initially personified mostly with the power of the masses (the crowd) [22]. Only by the end of the fifth decade of the United States, democracy had understood here as an ideal to which they had to strive.

Fully concurring with the view of theorists of democracy that "not only that government is tyrannical, which manages tyrannically, but all governments, not having in their constitutions sufficient protection against arbitrary power of their Princes, are tyrannical"[23], Americans have provided various guarantees for probable abuse of authority. They have determined not only the authorities of each branch of their government, but also what it is forbidden them to do. It is a pity, this was not done in the constitutions of many emerged later republics, which installed only authorities without any restrictions and prohibitions.

One of the most important synthetic benchmarks of democracy is the extent to which each member of society and the citizen of the State individually and all together are free in their actions, can practically solve their life problems at the individual level and to participate freely in administration of the affairs of their society. This is a direct result of the degree of freedom of the society and its members.

### **2. 3. Majorities' rule as the soul of democracy.**

We are talking about relativity of democracy and that this has its own objective causes. What are they? First of all, every individual is unique. For this cause, every society and nation are differentiating to thousands or millions of groups of people with their interests, goals, visions of social problems and ways to their solutions,



as well as with a resulting from all their behavior. Taking part in public life, they will pursue different, sometimes opposing each other goals, stick to different views and opinions, have different social and political orientations. Therefore, full unity of such society is impossible and incomprehensible; it has always been, is and will be very relative. But what 'public good', which, according to all theorists of democracy, should be the main goal of all democratic institutions of society, means? How to determine a strategy for social development, as well as the ways and means for its implementation? Which of many possible directions and options of development can be considered having a priority and most responding to the interests of society? The theorists of different eras had given different and often conflicting answers to these questions.

Modern democracy is based on the 'law of the majority'. Aristotle was the first who had written about [24], and T. Jefferson had theoretically substantiated it. But here, naturally, a number of lawful questions arises inevitably: why not consensus or unanimity, but majority and why the citizens, who found themselves in minority, must obey the 'laws', to which they did not give their consent? The majority of whom and what, and how to define it: according to power, wealth, and influence in a society, knowledge and abilities, etc.?

Undoubtedly, unanimity is the most complete embodiment of democracy and the best option for solving social problems, but unfortunately, it is unattainable in the scale of society. What is perceived by some people as legitimate and natural, to others may seem unnatural and illogical. There are problems that affect equally the interests of all people, but have many ways of their solving [25]. People will inevitably diverge in selecting the best ways. Whose choice should be given preference to?

If we are talking about some moments of personal lives, solved by each individually, for example, how much and when to eat, sleep, etc., the discretion of the individual must be decisive. If the problem is of universal importance and any decision may affect the interests of many people (use of natural resources, environmental impact; behavior in society, etc.), the right to determine the optimal solutions belongs to the entire community, but again, for the aforementioned reasons, to its absolute majority. Full democracy can exist only when there is consensus in society. Power and consent only of the majority is incomplete democracy, and, respectively, some restriction the minority's rights. This is a limited democracy. Well-known English jurist of the 18th century William Blackstone, like many of his predecessors, called democracy a social order where sovereignty belongs to the Assembly, composed of all free citizens of the community. A system where power is vested in the Council, composed of selected members of the community, he called aristocracy. Parliament, whose members are elected by majority of the voters and made its decisions by a majority of the elected, also are aristocratic [26]. It is appropriate to notice that the functionaries in the so-called democratic republics call themselves 'elite', recognizing that these republics are really 'elitist'.

People with different amounts of knowledge, degrees of wisdom, wealth, physical strength and health participate in public processes. Recognition of the freedom and equality of all people as members of society, regardless of what and how much they own, should be the first step to democracy. It is known that T. Jefferson understood the republic as a governance of the citizens themselves in masse, acting directly and personally in accordance with the rules

established by the majority of these same citizens, as the State where the citizens themselves personally solve all tasks in which they are competent.

A content of the notion 'majority's rule' is perverted now almost everywhere. It is taken into account only voting people's majority. In some countries, even 'general elections' are considered valid regardless of the share of voters. With the democratization of societies and recognition of human rights naturally arose some doubts about the democracy of the situation where the 'relative majority' can 'impose its will on the minority', which is actually the absolute majority (those who expressed their disagreement with one or another rule of life plus the absentees from voting). What to do in this case with the lawful rights of the 'minority' and its members to express their views, to self-determination, with the right to act autonomously, defend their legitimate interests, etc.?

At present, almost no head of the State and government in the world and none of the ruling parties is supported by the constitutional majority of the citizens. In this regard, some lawyers and political scientists suggest even to revise the content of the concept 'people'. In their view, 'the people' as a political concept is used primarily in order to appeal to the rights recognized in the State, and therefore becomes moot. Therefore, they propose do not consider 'people' as all citizens of the State because it would mean that any person should have full political rights [27]. The opinion is both erroneous and very dangerous.

'Majority's rule' does not reject the minority's opinion, since democracy presupposes the respect for every human being, considering as the highest value. In addition, it regulates not all aspects of human life, but only problems of the public and State life affecting the interests of all members of society. In personal life of people flowing in harmony with the norms of public morality, each individual himself acts as it legislator, architect, manager and a judge. However, in social and public life at the moment the majorities will have priority. The head of State is elected by majority of voters, the head of the government - by a majority of parliamentarians. Preference is given to the option of solving the common to all citizens' tasks, which was approved by a majority of the parliamentarians or members of the Assembly. Only a majority of all citizens, having the right to vote or of the members of the group, whose interests the institute expresses, should be a norm of legitimacy. Minority, of course, reserves the right to prove their rightness and prioritize their opinions, to promote them and attract citizens to their side, to demand to put their proposals to the people' referendum, etc.

It is a regularity that will or an opinion shared by a minority at the moment may become tomorrow such of the majority and become a law for society, and current majority may become a minority. This happens by freely expressed will on a truly democratic election, rather than through the State administrative apparatus and all sorts of garbling. It is necessary to be aware of the important principle of democracy: not people rule, but the law being an expression of the true will of the people. And the will of the people is variable depending on the altering circumstances of life and new conditions.

The main democratic right of the people is the right to control the activities of their officials, H. M. Sumner wrote. Public opinion, which means as censorship, and praise, acts as motivating force in democratic societies.



The people's right to control over activities of their representatives and the right to withdraw them in the case of fraud, are often frustrated by illegitimate efforts of these representatives. This is done by replacing the electivity by nomination, and by usurpation by several political parties the right to nominate candidates for the role of the State functionaries, which leads to full exclusion of the citizens from political processes. At the same time, 'majority's rule' cannot work in absence of the obligatory suffrage.

### 3. The criteria of democracy and rules of harmonization of the relations between society and its institutions

**Democracy has clear criteria; their number is numerous. The most obvious and indisputable ones are:**

- The will of people is the Supreme Law of the land, society and the State. The rule of law: Not individuals, but obligatory for all law rules in society and in the State.
- The rights and freedoms of citizens are the central point at which all institutions of civil society and the State focus, and are implemented in full.
- Common good, peace, prosperity, and happiness of the citizens are the highest objectives of society and all its institutions.
- The functions of government and self-government are rationally distributed among civil societies institutions. Most of the questions of human life remain with the citizens themselves.
- The limits of political power are reduced to due minimum; It is distributed horizontally and vertically into several branches, each of which is relatively independent from each other at full dependence of civil society.
- Power in the country is distributed in such a way as to guarantee genuine democracy and alleviate the burden of the population to bear the costs of the authorities. A significant part of the delegated by citizens to the State competences remains with the districts, provinces and republics, and only what relates to other countries and peoples, is delegated to the federal authorities.
- Eligibility and turnover of all public officials and the brevity of the term of their mandates are compulsory.
- All institutions are formed on the basis the citizens' will, through universal and direct elections by secret ballot involving constitutional majority of the citizens. The citizens have the right to recall of the representatives, who had lost touch with their voters, and confidence.
- Constant awareness of the State and its officials that their main vocation is protection their citizens' rights, freedoms and security. The State for people, not people for the State. Damage caused to citizens by any actions of public officials and institutions is compensated at the expense of the perpetrators or from the budget of relevant institutions, but in no case out of the general budget of the country.
- The real equality of citizens before the law, lack of sharp contrasts in their standard of living. The differences stem only from the degree people's activity and its outcome. The remuneration of public officials is determined by the average salary in the managed by them sphere of life.
- The plurality of the political forces and interest groups involved in socio-political life.

Only taking together, these criteria provide democracy as a spirit of social relations, characterized by rationality, freedom and equality of all participants, maximally favor to life,

creativity, and also to the aspirations of all members of society to happiness. In the political sphere, this is the power formed by people, responsible for all its actions before the people and serves the people, that is, 'rule of the people, for the people and by the people'. The absence of even one of these criteria makes life less democratic.

### 4. Conclusions

Fundamentals of administrative culture, we had written about [29] are determined by existing in the country social system, which can be as absolutist, authoritarian, repressive, so democratic. Any social system tries to appear both before own people and the world as a true democratic, sincerely serving its country and people. Real nature of a social system is determined not by what its epigones say and write, but what are the principles and norms of its function.

Full and comprehensive democracy exists in no country in the world, and its incompleteness, manifested in some countries, repeats also in the others. It occurs not because such is the nature of democracy, but because in all countries, there are similar groups and layers of people: oligarchs, criminals, officials of different ranks, ordinary people living by their own labour. Each of these groups, regardless of their residence, behave them identically. The oligarchs, like the piranhas in rivers, are leading a predatory lifestyle, part of the bureaucracy and the police tended to live as parasites on the body of society, sucking from it the vital energy. And ordinary people are working like bees to produce material and spiritual values, which often are alienating from them under the guise of 'laws', fabricating by so called 'people's representatives'. To democratize the life in all countries and to remove these negative phenomena, it is necessary to change the rules for their functioning such a way, that the tycoons could not prey and officialdom and their ilk – not misappropriate the fruits of labor the creative part of the people.

Adherents of the authoritarian power are trying to justify their attempts to dominate over society and the lack of democracy in their countries, claiming that, 'the demos with his identity is not the proper one', and 'enemies are pressing', etc., as well as complaining about the weakness of the culture of political participation. They say, "the citizens have an opportunity to participate, but do not participate" [30]. But such defenders of the authoritarian order 'forget' or do not dare to admit that inefficiency the State itself and its institutions' activities, and often their anti-national orientation had done and are doing everything to alienate the people from political life. Modern educated and enlightened societies should reformat the structure and powers of their institutions, limiting the Leviathan's authority in favor of objectively necessary and truly humanistic ones.

### References

1. Thomas Paine (2010), The Writings of Thomas Paine, Liberty Fund, Indianapolis, Vol. I (1774-1779) [1774].
2. The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, (Memorial Edition) Lipscomb and Bergh, editors. New York, 1905;
3. Bastiat F (1995) The law. New York.
4. Buchanan J (1999) The Limits of Liberty: Between Anarchy and Leviathan. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, Inc.
5. Buchanan J. M. and Gordon T.(1958) The Calculus of Consent: Logical Foundations of Constitutional Democracy. Indianapolis, Christopher L. The Revolt of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy. London, 1995.
6. Humboldt V. von. (1854) Sphere and Duties of Government. London.



7. Madison J (2002) The Debates in the Several State Conventions of the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. In Five vol. [1827]. Liberty Fund.
8. Pufendorf. (1672) On the law of Nature and Nations. In Eight Books.
9. Hume and Rawls regarded society as a "cooperative venture for mutual advantage." (David Hume, A Treatise of Human Nature [1739-1740], III, II, ii, pp. 484-89; Rawls, A Theory of Justice, p. 4).
10. Jassey A. (1998) The State. Liberty Fund, Inc. 1998.
11. Roger Pinto Madeleine Grawitz.(1972) Methodes des sciences sociales: translated from the French. Moscow.
12. Christopher L (1995) The Revolt of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy. London.
13. Michaels R. (1916) Political Parties; a Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy. London, P. 3.
14. Sumner M. H. (1976) Popular Government. Indianapolis.
15. Lecky H. W.(1899) Democracy and Liberty, vol. 1, Longmans, Green, and GO. Paternoster Row, London, New York and Bombay, 1899.
16. The Revolutionary Writings of John Adams. Selected and with a Foreword by C. Bradley Thompson. – Indianapolis, 2000.
17. Dzhamal Z Mutagirov. (2017)The Philosophy of International Democracy: Essence and Ways of the Approval and Extensions / Journal of Socialomics. OMICS International.
18. Mutagirov D. Z.(2014) Democracy as a Universal Value. Moscow, Logos, 2014.
19. Yevgeny Primakov (2011) Russia's economy was doomed long before the crisis // *Arguments and facts*, March 9.
20. Only 3% the Great Britain's population formed the House of Commons in 1830 (220 thousand voters with a population of 14 million that is one parliamentarian to 330 voters [Lecky H. W. Democracy and Liberty, vol. 1, Longmans, Green, and GO. London, New York and Bombay, 1899, p. 85]. At the end of the 20th century it was formed by 35 million voters already, that is 56 thousand voters for one parliamentarian.
21. Not to be confused with referendums, to identify the true will of the people. They guarantee democracy.
22. Leoni B.(1991) Freedom and the Law, expanded 3rd edition, foreword by Arthur Kemp. Indianapolis.
23. McClellan J. Liberty (2000) Order and Justice: An Introduction to the Constitutional Principles of American Government. Indianapolis.
24. Aristotle.(1983) Writings in four volumes. V. 4. Moscow.
25. Not surprisingly, Adam Smith wrote on the chessboard of human society, options for the pieces moves on which are manifold (Smith A. An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations. Charlottesville, Virginia, 2002. p. 25)
26. Blackstone W.(2010) Commentaries on the Laws of England in Four Books. Indianapolis, Vol 1.
27. Wallenstein I. Liberalism and democracy: brothers and enemies?
28. Sumner M. H.(1976) Popular Government. Indianapolis.
29. Dzhamal Z. M. (2017) The Principles of Management Culture // Intellectual Property Rights.
30. Nikonov V. (2018) The existence of democracy in Russia is vital to the subject of the Russian modernization