

Postdemocratic development of modern political system: global an socio-cultural trends

Pavel P. Baranov^{1,*}, Valentin Y. Lyubashits², Alexey Y. Mamychev³, Alexey I. Ovchinnikov¹

¹*Doctor of Juridical Sciences, professor, Honoured Science Worker of Russian Federation, Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA), Moscow, Russian Federation*

²*Doctor of Juridical Sciences, professor, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation*

³*Doctor of Political Science, candidate of legal sciences, Chairman of Russian and foreign law theory and history department, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russian Federation*

Abstract: The article analyzes the processes of democratic transformation of the political system in the post-Soviet space, as well as the impact on recent global and socio-cultural trends. It is proved that the main thrust of modern style democratic political thinking is not the internal content of human life and society, and the formal structure and the dominance of abstract ideological political and legal systems. The authors argue that such a transformation vector leads to the formation of risk-taking and unstable development of political systems in the post-Soviet space. Critically analyze public policy focus on the search for universal formal regulatory and institutional and administrative (bureaucratic) to ensure the stability of the models in a changing world. The article proves that the political and legal development should be based on typological originality and spiritual and cultural characteristics, primarily social phenomena such as the state and the right created and organically developing within the framework of the well-known society, its socio-cultural and political structure.

Key words: State; Democracy; Political system; Legal system; Human rights; Transformation

1. Introduction

In the modern political process of undergoing significant transformation, related to the change of democratic principles, practices of democratic will and public interaction and the deformation of the most ideological and conceptual foundations of democracy. Contemporary forms of democracy and the principles of a democratic political system undergo substantial transformation. The general nature of these changes is to ensure that publicly-imperious space gradually rose from the mass influence and participation, and the sphere of state management significantly “becomes elite”, i.e. the main levers, mechanisms of redistribution of social benefits, the ability to influence the adoption of socially significant management decisions gradually concentrated around a certain group of political and economic elite (Lyubashits et al., 2015).

At the same time, as K. Crouch says, “post-democratic society and will continue to keep all the features of democracy: free elections, competitive games, free public debate, human rights, a certain transparency in the activities of the state. “However”, energy and vitality policy back to where it was in the era preceding the democracy - a small elite and wealthy groups, concentrated around the centers of power and seeking to get their privileges” (Crouch, 2010).

K. Crouch believes that the current public policy has to deal with “confuse the public”, and the existing forms of interaction between society and the government form a passive population to develop their own political agenda that, in his opinion, to some extent leads to the exit for “the scope of the idea of democracy” and the formation of corporate and elitist politicians with a predominance of the interests of power-economic elite. Therefore, “the more the state takes on the maintenance of life of ordinary people, creating their apathetic attitude towards politics, the easier it is corporate interests more or less discreetly use it as their cash cow. Failure to recognize this is a reflection of the profound naiveté neoliberal thought” (Crouch, 2010).

In this aspect, the author calls for a revision of the ideological and conceptual bases of the organization of the democratic political process and governance to the formation of a relatively new and more effective forms and methods of interaction between society and the state, which would take into account both socio-cultural environment the implementation of democratic principles and procedures, and global trends development.

We think in this regard would be appropriate to raise the question of what democracy is and how this concept (ideological and conceptual principle) affect the organization of the modern political process in Russia. The answer to it is equivalent to the realization that there are real political-legal and

* Corresponding Author.

socio-cultural processes, modernity, which we experience as a whole.

2. Theoretical and methodological research tools

In theoretical-methodological and practical terms, this study is based on the provisions of the new institutionalism, developed in the works of such authors as: P.J. DiMaggio, J. March, J. Norton, J. Olson, R. Taylor, J. Wallace, A. Tabor, P. Hull, F. Duvernet Aymar et al. In which the political institutions are interpreted widely, on the one hand, as formal rules, regulatory models, procedures and standards; and on the other - as symbolic systems, cognitive scripts, socio-cultural, spiritual and moral models, organizes and manages the mental activity of people (Agamirov et al., 2015). This approach is most justified to adequately describe the public power organizations, and in particular the public authorities, both the institutional and regulatory and socio-cultural phenomenon (Baranov et al., 2015).

A study of state power is also based on the work of authors such as V. Averyanov, A.S. Akhiezer, A.I. Bardakov, I.I. Glebova, M.R. Demetradze A.G. Dugin, N.I. Lapin, S. Lurie, A.Y. Mordovtsev, Y.S. Brewers. Proving the fundamental relationship of the political process and the socio-cultural dynamics (Ovchinnikov et al., 2015).

In addition, a number of studies in recent years devoted to the evolution of government, the various forms of its organization, the individual government institutions and practices within a specific socio-cultural environment, but these fundamental developments, theoretical and methodological innovations formulated development trends of public power relations rarely apply to analysis of the current state of the power system, its separate institutions and agencies, prospects for the development and optimization (Ovchinnikov et al., 2015). Currently popular are comprehensive studies of state power in the political process, taking into account socio-cultural factors and the directions of its transformation (Lyubashits et al., 2015).

3. The main part

3.1. Post-democratic transformation of the present political system.

At the moment we cannot speak of democracy as a particular concept, because today it has become very blurred and conceptually varying political phenomenon whose content varies according to the political-ideological and narrow corporate interests. At the same time as the political practice of "democracy" today is characterized by "floating" the scope and requirements, which is especially manifested in the comparative legal analysis of the various state-legal spaces of modernity, in the development of the contemporary international order. So, it is the word "democracy", surpassing the level of a unique model of civilization state, it

became part of the new quasi-religious dogma, which claims world dominance.

In fairness it must be admitted that the claim to world dominance this new "messianic" doctrine is quite justified, because the current system of democratic tenets, symbols and values is positioning itself as a universal, smoothing religious, socio-cultural and institutional and legal differences and democratic paradigm thinking "puts himself" over the traditional forms and mechanisms of social cohesion and organization, introducing a new level, the context of the existence of state-legal spaces. However, an alternative doctrine, socio-cultural, institutional, material and other resource base, to date, no! In the modern scientific and everyday consciousness is no alternative to the democratic way of thinking. "Democracy" is currently serves as the matrix of knowledge and interpretation of the existing social, political, legal and other events and processes is the only true (at least not seriously challenged) normative value system.

Thus, we are all passionate about the prospects for democracy and the rule of law, not understanding clearly (or understanding in their own way), what it is. Most likely, it is important not the content of these extremely relevant "concepts", and the belief in them. However, the fact that democracy is based on a rational belief in it is not a new idea. The fact that democratic forms cannot reach undertaken by the "obligations" (the direct rule of the people, the account of public interests and needs of parliamentarism, providing the most complete freedom and social justice, etc.), that democracy is a rationalized faith in unattainable ideals of individual freedom, for which she forgives (A. de Tocqueville), or that it is the great lie of our time (K.P. Pobedonostsev), or mass political illusion (J. Ellul), or a new form of despotism (J. de Maistre, E. Burke), or a faceless and anonymous form of discipline and drill social and individual body and soul (Foucault, 2005), written quite a lot. Today, however, this tradition of critical analysis of the democratic forms of political organization, considering their advantages and disadvantages, design and simulation of modern mixed types and forms of the state is gradually disappearing from the pages of scientific publications, public lectures, political lexicon, and so on.

And the world's democratic transition resumes, albeit in new forms and formulas, medieval rhetoric: knowledge of the truth ("democratic truth" becomes a new form of political despotism - all that is beyond democratic model Western-style is declared unreasonable, irrational); the righteousness of state-building (institutional and normative design of "paradise" in the world); sacredness of certain characters, images, treated as the original, universal; a constant established order legal system, "rank" sources of law; of the sanctity of humanitarian intervention, and so on. By the way, it was the medieval Western European pathos of messianism and universalism has spawned a number of contemporary phenomena and phenomena. For

example, the concept of “holy war”, “Jihad”, the form of military and humanitarian interventions, which justify the logic of succession reproduced in today's global democratization. According to the just concluded V.D. Nightingale, “in fact, we are witnessing a classic example of a regression to forms of social domination, which appeared historically by lingering” (Nevazhzhay, 2000).

The modern doctrine of democracy and the concept of human rights were sent to the repository history and traditional forms of tolerance and cultural pluralism. Thus, tolerance and ethnic and cultural differences in the national development were not only not demanded in the global democratic discourse, but in general are replaced by “institutional intolerance” (to other, non-democratic - the traditional forms of nation-building) and cultural hostility to the civilization spaces, which “do not go on the high road of our time”.

The principle of pluralism of cultural forms and identities, as well as processes of “nationalization” of public-legal institutions obviously contradict modern fundamental features of democracy (equality of rights, the priority of the sovereignty of the individual, freedom, etc.), as national, ethnic, and local group becomes a priority in relation to the individual, blocking the formation of similar individuals (or “homogeneous subjectivities” - Michel Foucault), inhibit the formation of a global civil society.

Moreover, in a number of studies have shown that the Universalist values formed during the Enlightenment, are now the only way to ensure sustainable development of society and civilization; In this self-evident and not subject to criticism it is believed that understanding of the nature, content and social importance of these values has the same interpretation in all legal-political continuum. These “research fictions” is justified that only data values can ensure the unity of the social development, international order stability, replacing the conflict-and, at its core, irrational social normative value buckles, such as traditions, customs, religion, ethnicity, nation, etc. n., that do not provide cohesion and social trust in the modern world.

Hence, for example, and the desire to link the phenomenon of legal nihilism, with non-Western forms of political and legal thinking that is justified, as correctly notes latent social and cultural disparity between the requirements of relevant legal culture and archetypal at its core concepts of right and law. From this confrontation follows a general negative attitude towards the alien and the alien model of legal rights culture.

From the point of view of Michel Foucault, whom John; Cohen and A. Arato called the great critic of democracy and civil society after Marx (Cohen and Arato, 2003), the practice of government, formed in democratic societies, initially focused not just on the to ensure that certain pre-admit a priori data of freedom, but that freedom to consume and therefore its produce, and organize.

And this is such a political organization at which one can be free, but this freedom “means that il mondo va da se emerges game of interests that mobilized the security strategy, designed to reflect the internal hazards associated with the production of freedom. Hence - the consolidation of those or other forms of coercion, control, oversight mechanisms, which are produced in disciplinary techniques, totally investing behavior of individuals” (Foucault, 2005).

3.2. Modern political discourses of democratic development.

Becoming a democratic setup of political thought begins with the Enlightenment. In various political and legal doctrines and teachings under the influence of secularization and natural-philosophical ideas about the development of social organization formed by the liberal type of political rationality postulates universalism of political and legal principles and axioms, such as developing of different types, models, forms of political organization and ideology, attitude to power, its interpretation, policy, polity and so on. - Natural law, positivist, formational, in a variety of logical and methodological schemes and continues to support this universalism.

Since then, the political form (liberal democracy), regulatory procedure, public/government relations encoding (for example, election procedures), basic economic mechanisms (market economy), that were once pure Western European phenomena begin to be interpreted as universal, are interpreted as the original axiom of human development. The main program of political doctrines becomes an explanation and justification of universal human laws related to the progress of the rule of law and civil society. The same can be safely attributed to the development of socialist and anarchist doctrines of the XIX century, representing the universal program of social organization. This Enlightenment pushed the spiritual and moral problems of social organization and social cohesion of the law-making process and state-building. Public structuring and regulation ceased to be harmonious and holistic, as reformat solely on the formal framework and abstract norms extremely politicized and social interaction.

For the dominant style of democratic political thought mainly it becomes the inner content of human life and society, and its formal structure and dominance ideocratic factors (formal equality of the ideas of freedom, justice and so on. Here, the “form of government and a parliamentary device are much more interesting than the public, religious or moral condition of a society “where” is alien to any organic view of the political nature of things, without feeling their genesis and qualitative identity, he said (liberal-democratic way of thinking - auth.) in the interchangeability and the rational design of many political institutions and structures. In his view, they do not “grow” (historically - auth.), but are (formally

artificially - auth.)" - said on this occasion I.A. Isaev (Isaev, 2008).

On the other hand, education forms the setting on the quasi-religious belief in the absolute of the human mind, its capacity and the possibility of rational design of harmonious unity, happiness, eternal order, etc. Thus, in the traditional ideological system of a person perceived as "antinomic entity", which combines the sinful nature and the pursuit of truth and good (in this case the main problems was limited to the free choice of individual wills between good and evil). Therefore, it was seen as perfection in the spiritual plane, and external - the formal-normative. Within the framework of the democratic dichotomy manifests another series of demarcation - the rational and the irrational, and the inner, spiritual and moral content "pushed back" outside the social organization and social interaction.

Neoliberalism and Neosocialism, developing a democratic way of thinking today, sources of "social evil" is transferred from the inner world to the outside organization (the form of government, political system, some political and cultural institutions). In summary, many neoliberal and neo socialistic publication, we can say with confidence that in fact the last "profess" one style of political thinking, the only difference in the projects of the future structuring of society and the world order (Hardt and Negri, 2006).

In this context, it becomes evident the fact that the modern democratic way of thinking is based on risk- taking and unstable social environment, which is stabilized not harmonious interaction of the spiritual and moral, ideocratic and other value-regulatory systems and formal and organized, abstract beginning in the power-law interaction . In this aspect is obvious and logical actualization of risk problems and instability in the development of modern democratic systems, the search of adequate formal regulatory and institutional and administrative (bureaucratic) "vaccination" in an ever changing world. It is understandable modern "futuristic tenets of thinking", developed in the sociological and political science studies in the context of which argues that social systems and political regimes should "learn to live" with no stable landmarks, cultural landmarks and values, national identities, long-lived factors order, the universally recognized authority, and so on.

The new reality is a constant real and virtual crisis, the current system of actual or latent risks. It is a kind of "global discourse of humanitarian thinking", an exciting all areas of knowledge, determining the direction of their development. Instability is a new dominant social organization and risk- taking - a new direction in the modernization policy management technologies, improvement of the state apparatus, political and legal order, etc.

In today's volatile and risk- taking the social environment, which plays a democratic style of political thinking, concepts such as "democracy", "civil society", the "welfare state", according to Michel Foucault, are not applicable to the

characterization of contemporary reality and are presently ideological cliché, public (façade), models diverge from the actual practice of power-law relations in society. Foucault considers these public models as a product of modern technology the authorities that support the structure of the modern dominance within a particular state, and in the international arena (delegitimization of a regime by the international community by reference to the violation of the principles of democracy, and the suppression of civil society and so on).

French thinker, comes to the conclusion that it is the idea of democracy and the public good, replaced the religious and spiritual foundation of political organization, it is an absolute the new force, limiting and managing the freedom of the individual, subject to its political program and imperious demands. Thus, he concludes that democracy and the public good "is there when all subjects will certainly obey the laws, well perform their duties diligently engaged in crafts, which they have devoted themselves, and comply with the established order at least to the extent that it conformed to the laws in other words, the public good is, in fact, obeying the law in any case, if the purpose of sovereignty is a public good, the general welfare is not more than the absolute subordination. This means that the goal of sovereignty is closed on itself: it refers to the very exercise of the sovereignty; blessing is obedience to the law, therefore, the benefit sought by the sovereignty is subordinate to the sovereignty of the people" (Foucault, 2004).

Socio-cultural dimension of democratic transition is well known that stereotypes, symbols, images and installation (mainly organize our thinking and understanding of what is happening) play an important and sometimes decisive role in the evolution of political practice, scientific discourse development, political ideology, and so on. Accidental and therefore lack of modern research, critically analyzing existing "authority" and the installation images, categories and concepts of the theory of state power are obvious. Today, under the guise and political studies mostly out articles and monographs devoted to the problems of the rule of law, its construction, implementation, etc. It is unlikely that the state power theory is solely to the interpretation, commenting and interpretation of the unique (to the civilization point of view) of the draft political organization.

Moreover, the more comes out of scientific publications on the subject, the more vague it becomes a question of the essential difference between such categories as "democracy", "state", "state of law", "government", "human rights" and so on. At the definitive analysis of the categories of data content displayed virtually one from the other, the unknown reader is determined by the unknown, the state is determined through a system of democratic government, rights and freedoms, rule of law in general (another model of the state, apparently, does not exist), or vice versa, etc.

Recently, the concept of “public authority” are more or less successfully investing system attributes of a democratic political regime, i.e. bringing the first one of the forms of its realization. In this brilliantly proved that totalitarian and authoritarian power as such does not exist (because the government is based on the legal forms and freedom), and operates coercion and violence, which have no common “to the merits of the government, democratically instituted and implemented in public- legal forms”.

There is a certain restraint, and often fear research in socio-cultural, mental, anthropological and ethno-political analysis of public phenomena renovation trends and patterns of civilization development of political, legal, economic, religious institutions and structures. For positivist (legalist interpretation of political processes) or metaphysical (natural law, communication, and other postmodern interpretation of political reality) arguments ignore hidden, conscious abstraction from existing national and cultural factors and dominant.

Today we can state that the appeal to the socio-cultural foundations of the political process, to understand the dynamics of the government, in particular, the justification of a scientific hypothesis, is (oddly enough) a negative reaction from the scientific community. Such studies are labeled as scientific activities, having lost the “main road” of contemporary humanitarian discourse. For example, on existing institutions of power (head of state, the government, the courts, and legislative bodies) do not write just lazy. However, the description of these institutions is limited to the formal interpretation of normativism rarely analysis of the causes of the adequacy of the functioning of the regulatory model, mounted in a fixed constitutional and legal level. Consideration of the public institutions of power as a national and cultural phenomena of transformation and continuity in their functioning, resulting dysfunctions and anomic effects at the national adaptation of abstract value-regulatory and institutional models - not popular. Not to mention the formation of the corresponding theoretical, methodological and sociological and methodological justification of such research projects.

4. Conclusions

As a conclusion for this part of the note that the dominant modern style democratic political thinking becomes the inner content of human life and society, and its formal structure and the dominance of abstract ideological “clichés” (formal equality, freedom, justice, elective, tolerance and so on). At the same time, this strategy of development of the political process generates risk-taking and unstable social environment, where political stability is linked not to the harmonious interaction of the spiritual and moral, democratic and other value-regulatory systems, and to formal and abstract organized beginning in the power-law interaction. In this regard, it should be critical of the tendency in contemporary public policy to seek universal formal

regulatory and institutional and administrative (bureaucratic) ensuring stability models in the ever-changing world, as this approach generates essentially a “new political reality” in which no stability dominates, and permanent real and virtual crisis, a system of actual or latent risks.

It also concluded that the current instability (as a significant political concept) becomes the new dominant political process and risk-taking - a new direction in the modernization of the political management technologies. However, in our opinion, the dominant modern democratic political process and governance should be integrated (integrative) and more effective forms and methods of interaction between society and the state, which would take into account both socio-cultural environment the implementation of democratic principles and procedures, and global (global) trends. Thus, the “state of law” (as doctrinal development strategy of the political process) should reflect the typological originality and spiritual and cultural characteristics, especially such social phenomena as a state and the right to set up and organically developing within the framework of the well-known society, its socio-cultural and political structure, where concrete historical institution of the state is institutionally formalized and developed on this foundation, presenting a special, although it may be typologically and similar to other civilizations continua, view the rule of law in the form and, more importantly, in content, reflecting the uniqueness of the political life of society its goals, objectives and needs.

Acknowledgement

The work was supported by the Russian President's grant number MD-6669.2016.6 "Archetypal (socio-cultural) of the base of the Russian public organization of power and its evolution in the XXI century."

References

- Agamirov, A.R., Sarychev, I.A., Mordovcev, A.Y. and Mamychev, A.Y. (2015). Legal mindset as factor in the state in the XXI century Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 6. No. 36. pp. 235-240.
- Baranov, P.P., Ovchinnikov, A.I. and Mamychev, A.Y. (2015). The legitimacy of power and relations as a multi-level political and legal phenomenon. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 6. No. 5 S3. pp. 209-216.
- Baranov, P.P., Ovchinnikov, A.I. and Mamychev, A.Y. (2015). The state authority constitutional legitimacy in modern Russia. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 6. No. 5 S3. pp. 201-208.
- Cohen, J. and Arato, E. (2003). Civil Society and Political Theory. M.

- Crouch, K. (2010). Post-democracy. M. pp. 9-35.
- Foucault, M. (2004). Truth and legal establishment. Intellectuals and power: Selected Political articles, speeches and interviews. M. Part 2. pp. 195.
- Foucault, M. (2005). Society Must Be Defended: a course of lectures at the Collège de France in 1975 - 1976 academic year. SPb. pp. 274.
- Isaev, I.A. (2008). Domination: Essays on Political Philosophy. M. pp. 183.
- Lyubashits, V.Y., Mamychev, A.Y., Mordovcev, A.Y. and Vronskay, M.V. (2015). The social-cultural paradigm of state authority. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 6. No. 36. pp. 301-306.
- Lyubashits, V.Y., Mordovcev, A.Y. and Mamychev, A.Y. (2015). State and algorithms of globalization. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 6. No. 36. pp. 277-282.
- Nevazhzhay, I.D. (2000). Types of legal culture and forms of justice. Jurisprudence. No. 2. pp. 451.
- Ovchinnikov, A., Mamychev, A. and Litvinova, S.F. (2015). Extra-legal and shadow functioning of public authorities. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 6. No. 3. pp. 387-393.
- Ovchinnikov, A., Mamychev, A. and Mamycheva, D. (2015). Sociocultural bases of state - legal development coding. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 6. No. 3 S4. pp. 67-74.