**Democracy: concept, history of development**

The term "democracy" consists of two Greek words: demos-people and kratem-rule, hence it is "the power of the people". A more detailed definition of "democracy" was formulated by American President A. Lincoln — government of the people, by the people, for the people . Here, all three English prepositions Express various aspects and essential features of democracy, namely: democracy comes "from" the people themselves ("of"), it is carried out by the people ("by") and in the interests of the people ("for").

As one of the well-known researchers in the field of democracy theory R. Dahl admits, "during the twenty-five centuries during which democracy was discussed, disputed, supported, attacked, ignored, approved, implemented, destroyed and then sometimes restored again, there seems to have been no agreement on some fundamental issues related to the essence of the concept of democracy."

In the theoretical and empirical literature on democracy, there is such a conceptual difference of opinion on the definition of "democracy" that American researchers D. Collier and St. Levitsky were able to find more than 550 "subspecies" of democracy. At the same time, some of these conditional "subspecies" simply indicate special features or types of full democracy, but many indicate "reduced" forms of democracy, which in their content are partially intertwined with each other in a variety of ways. As noted by L. Diamond, "today (as opposed, for example, to the 1960s and 70s), most researchers see democracy as a system of political power and do not attribute it to any social or economic characteristics. What they still disagree on fundamentally is the range and scope of the political attributes of democracy."

In fact, research experience shows that the concept of democracy is one of those that are very difficult to interpret unambiguously. At the time of John. Orwell observed: "when we talk about such a concept as democracy, we find not only the absence of a generally accepted definition of it; any attempt to give such a definition is met with resistance from all sides... Supporters of any political regime proclaim it a democracy and are afraid to lose the ability to use this word if it is assigned a single meaning".

The ambiguity of the phenomenon of democracy is determined not only by differences in the understanding of its nature, but also by the long evolution of its historical forms.

The very first historical form of democracy, according to anthropologists and ethnographers, was generic. According to their observations, all adult men and women had the right to vote within the framework of the ancestral primitive community system, including in the Council of the family, which chose the leaders of the family, made decisions about declaring war and accepting outsiders into the family. At the same time, within the framework of a tribe composed of separate clans, all decisions were made by a Council of elders and military leaders, i.e., there was an aristocratic rule.

Thus, the main features of generic democracy were the following:

1) It existed in closed tribal collectives and did not extend to the tribal level;

2) there was No division of managerial and Executive work, there was no specialized management and enforcement apparatus;

3) the Power of leaders and elders was based not on institutions of coercion, but on tradition and moral authority.

It is obvious that this form of democracy was imperfect and could only exist in an undeveloped society. With the development of production and the social division of labor, with the emergence of private property and social inequality, primitive democracy naturally gave way to authoritarian forms of government (monarchy, aristocracy, oligarchy, or tyranny).

The next historical form of democracy was the so-called slaveholding Athenian one. It began with the famous reforms of the Archon (Supreme ruler) Solon, which he carried out in the VI century BC, redistributing land holdings from the aristocracy in favor of the broad strata of free citizens and securing their property rights by law.

Among the features of Athenian democracy are the following:

1) the Highest power in the Polis of Athens belonged to the people's Assembly (ecclesia), which controls the activities of the Executive power of the Polis (i.e., the Council of Kings);

2) Legal equality of free citizens (slaves and non-Athenian migrants (meteks) did not apply);

3) Maximum reduction of property restrictions for participants in the national Assembly and encouragement of the poor to exercise their civil rights;

4) Could exist only in conditions of slavery and slave labor, freeing free citizens to participate in politics;

5) Could only operate on the scale of a single city (policy), because the activity of the national Assembly on the scale of an average or large state is impossible;

6) With the loss of the authoritative leaders, with the growth of social inequality and the increasing influence of the mobile Athenian democracy turned into a tyranny of the majority, and the national Assembly in the place of settling accounts: violence has been poor over the rich, the persecution of dissidents (remember the massacre of the great philosopher Socrates), the execution of generals for the military defeats.

If we talk about democracy not as a practice of political life, but as a doctrine, then in the early historical periods (from Ancient Greece to the French revolution)," democracy " was reduced to the doctrine of the forms of the state. For Herodotus (he has this concept for the first time), as well as for Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Seneca, and other classical authors, democracy did not mean a certain type of society, but a special form of organization of state power-it is not possessed by one person (as in monarchy and its variations, say, tyranny) or a group of people (for example, in the aristocracy and its varieties, such as oligarchy or plutocracy), but by all. Aristotle was the first in his typology of state forms, along with the quantitative criterion of division ("who rules?"), also points to quality criteria ("what are the ways of domination?"), and his attitude to" democracy "("ochlocracy") is rather ungracious, as one of the forms of degeneration of state life.

The re-evaluation of the concept of democracy, as well as the semantic expansion noted above, takes place during the French revolution. Democracy becomes a concept that first reflects a certain direction of thought, and later-designates the direction and content of a certain social movement, its political and social goals. From this time on, democracy means not only a certain social structure that opposes the monarchy and the aristocracy, but it also becomes a philosophical and historical cipher in the sociology of power, a code for a number of liberal-bourgeois demands for autonomy and participation in decision-making, as well as for ideas and aspirations for social equality.

The modern constitutional state began with the curbing and disarming of confessional parties participating in civil wars of the XVI – XVII centuries, with the establishment of a sovereign state by monopolizing the means of "legalized physical violence" (M. Weber) and concentrating them in the hands of the state. At this first stage-the establishment of internal peace and the formulation of the problem of sovereignty-the state is built as a state. This, however, does not say anything about the quality of the power organization itself. The state becomes constitutional only in the second stage, when this" Leviathan " (Hobbes) creates conditions for peace and survival, implements the separation of powers and guarantees the inalienable rights of fundamental rights and human rights; and only in the third stage of development, with the implementation of the principle of the sovereignty of the people and the conquest of universal suffrage, it becomes a democratic constitutional state, which is later (the fourth stage) supplemented by some components of the social state, the welfare state.

Liberal theory of democracy

The traditional liberal theory of democracy, when describing representative democracy, proceeds from a Central thesis related to Anglo-Saxon history: democracy is designated as a responsible government (beighot), i.e. as a responsible government, a government that can make decisions and is responsible for them.

The main thing here is not to erase the differences between rulers and subjects, but to create a real basis for making responsible decisions. Representative democracy aims primarily to create conditions and opportunities for clear implementation of the principle of responsibility with less attention to the principle of complicity, although it is usually the procedures of complicity that are used when the government fulfills its obligations (related to the principle of responsibility). In this perspective, democratization means not only "maximizing the chances of participation", but also "maximizing political responsibility". Constitutionality and restriction of political domination are the main elements of understanding representative democracy. The will of the people is not expressed in full and directly, but through the institution of intermediaries — it is delegated to representatives who themselves begin to form the will of the people, and when making political decisions Express and anticipate this will independently and under their own responsibility. Certain relations are established between people's representatives and those they represent, based on authority and trust. In such a case, both sides are equally constitutive. Thus, there are, on the one hand, independence, as well as political and legal competence of a Deputy that does not go beyond the borders established by the Constitution, and, on the other hand, powers that are only transferred to him by the voters and the people. Proponents of so-called identitarian democracy reject this very principle: in their view, representation, powers, and the formation of intermediate power structures are elements that are alien to true democracy.

This is why Rousseau claimed that " the English people were only free for one day, the day when they elected their Parliament. After that, the people live in slavery again, they are nothing." Therefore, the people, if they want to be free, should not voluntarily fall under the yoke of decision-making procedures based on the separation of powers. "Any law that the people themselves" personally" did not approve is nothing, an empty place, it is not a law, " Rousseau said. This rigidity of judgment rests, in fact, on the empirically unfounded fiction of the existence of some homogeneous will of the people. It is only when we all believe in the existence of a universal good that is permissible, but not provable, and does not exist, that it is possible to identify the managers and the governed, and to ignore the distinction between rulers and subjects, as Rousseau and the roussoists demand.

Elite theory of democracy

The creators of the elitist theory of democracy are opposed to the exaggerations and projectionism that, in their view, underlie the old liberal ideals of democracy. However, from the gap between the ideal ideas of democracy in the nineteenth century and reality, they do not draw a conclusion about the" falsity " of reality itself. The method of proving them is precisely counter-directed — not reality should be corrected in accordance with the ideal, but on the contrary, the ideal itself should be pragmatically verified by it. What a democracy can and should do is determined by what it does practically, and what can be recorded objectively.

Proponents of the elite theory of democracy proceed from the position derived from political empiricism, according to which, even under the rule of the democratic majority, political decisions are still made mainly by the minority. In contrast to the critical theory of democracy, firmly adhering to the tenets of popular sovereignty, equality and political self-determination through participation in decision-making, proponents of elite theory does not consider the lack of dominance and the power of the democratic elite; at the same time, they consider their point of view only as a consistent conclusion from the fact that there is no well-developed and full-fledged scientific, politically binding concept of the common good, nor any rational behavior of citizens when voting in elections or when making decisions on certain specific problems. In the elite model developed by Schumpeter, the requirements of democracy are reduced to the method of power formation: "the Democratic method is the order of creating an institution for achieving political decisions, in which individual (social forces) get the right to make decisions through competition for the votes of the people." According to this model, (socially) differentiated communities (as subjects) do not have a permanent voice in all matters, but exercise this right through a kind of "political division of labor". In this situation, the ruling elite, elected for a certain period, assumes the functions of political representation of the majority of the population, deprived for the same period of the opportunity to act in words and actions. Thus, the advantage of democracy over forms of minority rule is almost entirely in the way that majority power is created. This power, by its very nature, must at least create conditions for publicity, political alternation, and at least limited control.

Economic theory of democracy

The extremely influential and widespread "economic theory" of democracy, created by downs on the basis of the traditional model of political economic concepts, is based on the statement formulated by Him that each person is able to achieve the maximum benefit for himself (personal) with the help of rational activity. This idea is the basis of the image of Homo economicus-an economic person, fully informed, able to make decisions on rational grounds. However, it is highly doubtful that decisions concerning political choice can be compared with decisions that a person makes in the sphere of market relations. This comparison leaves out of sight what distinguishes political decisions from all other types of decisions, namely: the rationality of collective actions is observed in politics, because the choice here involves a certain level of information processing. And this is only the case in public, interactive processes, in joint action.

The excessive individualization of rational behavior allowed Buchanan and Tallock, who developed the mentioned downs principle, to justify democracy on the basis of old concepts of social contract. For these researchers, democracy and the majority vote are the rules of decision-making that force rational individuals to come to an understanding in one way or another.

Critical theory of democracy

Adherents of the critical theory of democracy oppose the fatal conclusions that can be drawn from the analysis of the empirically descriptive principles of this theory, against the "theory of the domination of the democratic elite" and against the theory of pluralism. From the point of view of such authors, the mentioned theories lose the critical distance, the critical approach to the political and social reality of each time period. The critical theory of democracy analyzes reality, armed with strictly normative postulates, in the center of which is the ideal of individual self-determination. This focus on the autonomy of the individual leads to two different and even opposite conclusions: on the one hand, to the demand for full political participation and democratization throughout society, on the other hand, to the demand for free conditions of existence for domination and power. Both types of critical theory of democracy, i.e. "participatory" (the right to participate in everything) and "anarchic", have to be strictly "divorced" in practice, since their representatives use similar arguments in their value judgments. Not to mention that their starting point is the same-individual self-determination.

The concept of participation (participation) considers self-determination of the individual as the right to participate in decision-making through the right to vote; in all spheres of life, such participation is necessary. There are no private or public "spaces" that are outside of politics. The goal here is a comprehensive democratization of all spheres of life (Wilmar). An analogue of this concept of democracy is an expansionist, i.e., an expansive understanding of politics as encompassing both private and public spheres of life.

If the participatory interpretation of democracy implies a tendency to "total politicization", the anarchist version, on the contrary, tends to "total privatization". The goal and function of democracy, from this second point of view, is the abolition of any form of domination.

Proponents of the ideal of non-domination rely on a discourse free from hegemony and from any coercion , in which, based on common efforts, a minimum of problems and solutions is formed that is not disputed by anyone; and at the same time — without any concealment, deception — the interests of all parties involved are openly demonstrated. This model of discourse, formulated by Habermas, proceeds from the position that "practical questions contain truth", and comes to the requirement of consensual, i.e. conciliatory methods of unity. Where no one is left in the minority as a result of voting, no one can feel subordinate or think that their fate is determined by others.

This is the point at which the participatory and anarchist versions of the critical theory of democracy converge. In demanding participation, the sovereignty of the people is regarded as an absolute; it is considered, as in Rousseau's concept, that the people are something unified, a subject endowed with a single will. The requirement of the absence of any power (actually, anarchy) makes the autonomy of the individual and his self-disclosure absolute, and any collective actions are possible only in cases where all are United by one single will.

Max Weber's plebiscite theory of democracy

Weber was one of the first to draw attention to the possibility of a conflict between bureaucracy and democracy. He noted the paradox of democratization: involving the masses in social and political life creates large organizations, institutionalizes them, and then these organizations become destructive for democratic political functioning. Large bureaucratic institutions enter into competitive relations in society, the result of which is a compromise and a monopoly on making all the most important decisions. As theorists of modern corporatism in the West point out, the bureaucratic centralization of business, the state, and trade unions has created a modern corporate state, with the elites of these three corporations independently making decisions that are of vital importance to millions of people. Thus, this trend in the development of the political system of Western countries comes in clear contradiction with the principle of democracy. It should be noted that bureaucratization and corporatism, the removal of the process of making important decisions from the control of public policy to some extent correspond to the theories of democratic elitism. However, both the theory of democratic elitism and pluralistic theories can explain the functioning of the political system only in a stable state of economic and social life, when elites make decisions, the masses do not interfere in the political process or passively support the corresponding elites. The crisis of these theories is inevitable when society enters a period of long-term crisis development, when the bureaucratic method of decision-making is impossible and mass movements of protest against the existing system begin.

The active involvement of mass protest movements in political life, the promotion of charismatic leaders to the forefront of political life in the West, the strengthening of authoritarian tendencies, even the threat of fascism, as some left-wing political scientists write, make it necessary to search for theoretical concepts that explain the relationship between political leaders and the masses, the masses and political institutions.

In the concept of M. Weber, democracy is a way and a means, not an end in itself. This is a way of electing leaders, a means both to give their rule legitimacy and to attract a significant mass of the population to the political Affairs of the nation. However, democracy, according to M. Weber, is not a suitable tool for solving ordinary political issues. in such cases, compromises through negotiations rather than voting are necessary. Therefore, he considered utopian theories of "popular sovereignty", such concepts as" the will of the people"," the wisdom of the people", etc., whose purpose is to exclude the domination of one person over another. According to Weber, this cannot be achieved in modern conditions, since direct democracy and the government of non-professional politicians are fundamentally impossible outside of small States-cities limited by their size and population. According to Weber, any rationalization or formalization of relationships between people in modern large societies and States inevitably leads to authoritarianism. It is not by chance that the analysis of English parliamentary democracy, which was considered by the overwhelming majority of researchers as a model of the most successful democracy, gave Weber reason to doubt the democratic nature of the functioning of this institution of power.

Weber's conclusions are based on his analysis of the principles of organization and activity of bureaucrats and the "iron law of oligarchy" that operates within any organization.

In contrast to the Anglo-Saxon political tradition, Weber offers a theory of plebiscite democracy, with which, in his opinion, the tyranny of bureaucrats could be avoided. In this theory, people and individuals are assigned the role of passive participants in the political process. The only form of political participation for the masses is participation in elections and the exercise of the right to vote.

The main figure in Weber's theory is a charismatic leader, elected by direct vote of the people to whom he is responsible. Such a leader stands above the bureaucratic administration, which in turn is formally legally elected. The degree of legitimacy of a charismatic leader is determined by the scale of his success. Since, according to Weber, the role of the masses in the political process is limited only to participation in the election of a charismatic leader, they are essentially denied the right to exercise control over the bureaucracy from below. These functions are delegated by citizens to a charismatic leader who exercises control over the activities of the bureaucracy from above. one of his main tasks is to fight the bureaucracy, which is necessary to overcome the oligarchic principle of government.

When developing the "ideal type" of bureaucracy, Weber assumed that the bureaucracy would act as an impartial technical performer in the management process divided into its constituent elements. He believed that the ideal leader manages his apparatus in a spirit of formalistic impersonality, without anger or partiality. According to Weber ,the" ideal type " of bureaucracy looks as effective in comparison with other forms of management organization as a machine does in comparison with non-mechanical types of production.

However, an analysis of the functioning of the bureaucracy led Weber to the conclusion that the system of rules and instructions and the hierarchical structure in the organization of the bureaucracy are fraught with very dangerous seeds of its rebirth. They can become a brake on the effective functioning of any bureaucratic organization. Accustomed to a certain way of applying their knowledge, to a certain routine and pattern, bureaucrats are helpless when faced with real problems of social life that can not be solved on the basis of pre-prescribed rules and standards.

In an effort to solve the problem of protecting public institutions from bureaucratic ossification, Weber in the last years of his life paid particular attention to the problem of the leader within the organization and issues related to the identification of the relationship between the leader, the bureaucracy and the masses.

Weber's plebiscite theory of bureaucracy is essentially an attempt to find some ideal model for organizing a political system with the necessary elements to ensure its dynamism.

According to Weber, a charismatic leader who stands outside of classes, statuses, and demagogic politics, having a source of legitimization of his power independent of the bureaucracy and not being strongly integrated into the bureaucratic hierarchical structure, would be able to unite the nation around him and protect the individual in the face of the onset of bureaucracy and "socialist collectivism". The main significance of the plebiscite for Weber is to create a charismatic authority as a result of the direct participation of the entire people in the vote.

Critics of Weber's theory of plebiscitary democracy is celebrated among its weaknesses, the important point is that Weber failed to distinguish clearly between charismatic leadership and charismatic domination. In a Western democracy, a leader with charismatic qualities is possible, and the transformation of this leader into a caesarist one is not inevitable. However, as Mommsen rightly points out, democracy cannot accept Weber's principle of legitimizing this charisma, which makes it possible for a tyrant to appear. Believing that a leader's power is legitimized by his personal charisma, and that democratic institutions are simply tools in his hands, Weber thereby removes any possibility of controlling a charismatic personality. This approach brings us closer to accepting the principles of fuehrerism and fascist leadership. In order to combine the principle of charismatic leadership with the preservation of democracy, and thus prevent the transformation of a charismatic leader into a caesarist-type leader, institutional barriers must be erected in its path. Caesarist authority requires full control over the organs of violence and the media. Therefore, where a charismatic leader does not have this, he cannot become a tyrant.

Socialist theory of democracy

The same is true of the socialist theory of democracy, with its dual relation to the idea of democracy itself. On the one hand, under the conditions of supposed classless communism, it is naturally assumed that there will be no forms of domination. On the other hand, it is feared that the "class content of bourgeois democracy" (Lenin) can be embellished and thus weaken the working class's readiness for revolution. According to Marxist doctrine, only class democracies exist. And when the "revisionist" Bernstein called democracy "the highest school of compromise", the influence of this very, quenching opposition, utterances and the consequent disregard of class opposites became an eyesore for all Orthodox. According to the latter, behind the facade of the majority principle and formal equality, "bourgeois democracy" hides its repressive, class character. Only "proletarian" (or "socialist") democracy resolutely overcomes the limits of a pseudo-democratic bourgeois state. Only the socialist revolution creates the conditions for the formation of a "socially unified people" as the basis of the actual power of the people. Of course, under socialism there are still different classes, but according to the Stalinist doctrine, the antithesis of interests and contradictions generated by them are no longer antagonistic, so that the (socialist) state itself can no longer function as an instrument of domination and oppression in the hands of one class. For the socialist theory, democracy is a historically transient phenomenon. The first period of development is completely exhausted by the conquest of political power and the strategy of consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lukacs used the essentially paradoxical term "democratic dictatorship"for this period. Only in the second phase of development does democracy extend its influence to the entire people. And finally, "in a Communist society, democracy, having become a mere habit, dies out" (Lenin).

Democracy, in the context of the Marxist doctrine of the state, is an integral part of the universal theory of the development of society in its philosophical and historical perspective and with a certain periodization. This theory provides an accurate description of the goals and functions of democracy. This relationship (between purpose and function) in the Western theory of democracy looks completely different. Democracy here is not an agreement based on a gradually established worldview and social homogeneity; it arises rather on the basis of a political agreement that needs constant updating, precisely because of ever-increasing ideological and social differences (in modern society). Western democracy does not recognize its mandatory preference for any once-for-all set state goal, but seeks a democratic unity of will, in which the goals of society in changing conditions are constantly redefined.

A specific feature of the socialist theory of democracy is that, despite differences in the views and approaches of individual theorists, all of them emphasize the existence of a" class basis " as a criterion of democracy. For this reason, for them, "basic social rights" are much more important than the political rights of freedom and participation, which are mainly valued in "bourgeois democracy". This is clearly seen in the confrontation of the "political" and "social" democracy of austromarxism Adler. However, the Marxist doctrine of the state is gradually beginning to accept such fundamental requirements as free elections, the rule of law, the separation of powers, and federalism, which have liberal constitutional roots. A state with a democratic structure has long been on the path of development to a state of social action and General welfare. "Bourgeois democracy" supplemented its original constitutional and political orientation with social dimensions. And there are signs that "socialist democracy" is also gaining a tendency to Supplement its traditional orientation on social equality, welfare, and technical and economic efficiency with significant elements of a politically legal state. An example of a real rapprochement is "Swedish socialism".

System theory of democracy

In his system version of the theory of democracy, Lumann tries to redefine the normative prerequisites of democracy. He comes from a not existing in the history of the precedent — the concept of "complexity" policy relevant horizon of reality; goals as individual and collective action, in his opinion, are not set clearly. We are in an infinitely open, extremely complex and undefined world. The policy must constantly take care of developing the basis and criteria for its decisions. In this situation, democracy is the most acceptable way and means of resolving issues, since it provides the society with a very neutral content, free from "preliminary assessment approaches", methodological basis for developing solutions or, in the language of system engineering, "high-level electoral actions". Democracy differs from other forms of statehood in that it "retains the full breadth of the complexity scale" (Lumann), despite the daily work of developing solutions. And although democracy rejects many other possible options for every decision it makes, in other words, it "reduces complexity" (i.e., reduces it, narrows it), it still looks for and leaves certain opportunities for perceiving a different choice in the future. Democracy, therefore, combines the ability to develop the necessary solutions with the preservation of complexity, i.e., structural openness to alternative actions.

Initially, all this seems very similar to the General foundations of the traditional liberal theory of democracy: freedom, diversity, pluralism, openness, participation, and competition of different opinions. Yet in the context of the system-theoretical justification of democracy, all these values and principles take on a completely different meaning: diversity is not seen as a chance for psychosocial enrichment of the subject; adaptability and the ability to change their goals are positive values, since they are the ones that, in a complex (social and natural) environment, are most likely to preserve the political regime. Democratic participation becomes important not as a tool for the realization of personal and collective autonomy, but as a guarantor of the widest possible range of political decisions. Finally, elections, as the" center " of democracy in a representative system, serve less to realize personal freedom of self-determination, but rather to cover up administrative decisions and exploit the transient moods of voters in the course of political party contests. Democracy no longer justifies itself as the "most humane" form of organizing power relations, but rather as the form of state life that in modern conditions best allows the system to be preserved.

Contrary to its own claims, the system concept of justifying democracy does not redefine the normative premises of democracy, but makes its strictly normative justification unnecessary. Replacing traditional normative, structural, and procedural features of democracy with functionalist criteria related to the system's ability to preserve itself does not create a legitimate (legal) basis for democracy. For in principle, any and every organization of power that creates optimal conditions for the self-preservation of the system can be justified on this basis.

The fluctuation of relevant democratic orientations between the two poles — "utopia" and "adaptation" - has not done very well in discussions about democracy in the past two decades. Any concept of democracy that meets the modern standards of science must be sufficiently complex and flexible at the same time to be able to integrate both premises, i.e., heuristically comprehend and relate to each other specific questions and conclusions about different principles of democracy.

The theory of democracy cannot limit itself to a single one of any two goals (participation or efficiency, freedom or equality, legal or social state, protection of a minority or majority power, autonomy or authority); on the contrary, it must combine as many of the ideas about goals as possible that have crystallized in the Western philosophy of democracy, as well as in democratic practice, and have proved to be socially significant. The theory of democracy should not simply reflect, reproduce reality, or become hopelessly lost in utopias that are far from reality. It needs complex presuppositions, principles that occupy a sort of middle position between the images of democracy and reality; it needs a theory of democracy that is constantly ahead of its reality, but never loses sight of it.

Consider the characteristics of democracy:

A common rule of law that is based on confirmation by the people in the form of periodic elections and that the main role in decision-making is played by popularly elected representatives to the legislative and Executive authorities. The "sovereign" people participate in the control of power along with the bureaucracy.

Competing policies. The main thing in a democracy is fair and inclusive competition (competitive elections) and a process of representation in order to ensure that the will of the people is translated and then executed.

Political parties. They serve as the main mechanism that facilitates the process of forming the will of the people, their meaningful choice and influence on the government. Political parties play a key role in representative democracy by creating relationships between citizens and political power, balancing various interests, and taking responsibility for the structure of political power. At the same time, parties are by no means the only link linking citizens to the political decision-making process. The press, public organizations, and various communities are increasing the number of people involved in shaping public opinion.

Civil, political and social rights.

Democratic development requires compliance with certain norms and respect for civil rights. Robert Dahl named the following conditions necessary for the existence of a modern political democracy:

1. The Constitution assigns control over government decisions to elected officials.

2. These officials are periodically elected in fair elections that exclude any coercion as far as possible.

3. Almost all adults have the right to choose officials.

4. Almost all adults have the right to apply for elected office.

5. Citizens have the right to Express their opinions without fear of serious political persecution.

6. Citizens have the right to receive information from alternative sources. Alternative sources of information are protected by law.

7. Citizens have the right to form relatively independent associations and organizations, including political parties and interest groups.

For most theorists, these seven conditions exhaust the whole essence of democracy, but sometimes they add two more.

8. Elected officials should be able to exercise their constitutional powers without being opposed (even informally) by unelected officials.Democracy is in danger if the military or employees of state institutions or enterprises are able to act independently of elected leaders, and even more so if they veto the decisions of elected officials.

9. The state must be sovereign and to act independently of the political systems of a higher level.

Also, these conditions for the existence of democracy can also include such conditions as:

1. The transfer of power should be carried out without violence on the basis of the principle of succession.

2. The need for a legal framework. The right must be above the state, and any official is equally responsible before the law.

3. Formation of civil society. It is based on the freedoms and human rights guaranteed and protected by the state. It protects a person from the encroachments of the state.

4. Political freedom - freedom of choice. In this case, it is necessary to take into account not only the nomination of candidates on an alternative basis, but also the activity of voters in the elections, because only in this case can we talk about democratic power.

5. The presence of pluralism. This means that not one group of citizens does not act as the sole bearer of some values and ideas, but the society is a set of different goals and interests.

6. The level of economic development of the country. A stable democracy requires a minimum level of well-being for citizens.