
SOCIOLOGY OF POLITICS AND MASS-MEDIA

© VLADIMIR V. MELNIK

v_v_melnik@mail.ru

UDC 316:17.025.14:321.7

DEMOCRACY VS “LE CONTRAT SOCIAL”

SUMMARY. The study of methodological and methodical level of problems of development and correlation between democracy, social contract and social capital gives a possibility to determine their role in the evolution of Russia, to determine the starting conditions of further nonlinear development of mezo, macro and micro social systems on the basis of their proper genotypic qualities and to sum up the sociological approach of social contract theory.

KEY WORDS. Democracy, social contract, civil society, social rights, socio-cultural genotype, self-organization, compensatory problem, negotiations power, social rule systems, levels of poverty.

A series of color revolutions, the character of the development of the EU, the latest events in Russia show the exhaustion of the paradigm of traditional democracy — majority democracy. The democracy of political correctness, multiculturalism and sovereignty does not correspond to the conditions and results of the development of social systems, which are becoming more and more complex. Western democracy takes various forms. The most important of them is anancastia democracy, formed on the basis of international or clan market capital, as an instrument of realization of political and economic interests of governing minorities. In modern Russia there is a quite different myth of free market democracy, characterized by the well-known principal of Robert Merton's "self-fulfilled prediction". As we used to study only K. Marx's theory, 300% income is considered to be a norm for Russian capitalists. The myth is supported by our liberal assurance that market economy is the premise and the economical basis of democracy. It is not so. In the 1930s the apologist of democracy and the free market Friedrich Hayek in his book "The Road to Slavery" stated that democracy is not a fetish. He wrote: "Democracy in its essence is a means of defense and support of the social world and personal independence. It is neither impeccable nor absolutely reliable. It is necessary to remember that quite often the autocratic rule gives much more cultural and spiritual freedom than several kinds of democracy — and it is theoretically possible that under the rule of a homogeneous and doctrinarian majority

democracy may be as tyrannical as the worst of dictatorships. As far as democracy is no more the warranty of personal freedom, it can exist in any form in totalitarian regimes" [1]. F. Hayek was strictly against the consideration of democracy as the highest political aim, as it is only a means of its achievement, and considered the viewpoint that the will of the majority is not able to create tyranny to be wrong, as the government is limited by restrictions, but not by the source of power.

In modern Russia, especially with the very short period of market democracy, this question becomes extremely important. Let us return to the roots. Historically the notion of democracy was preceded by the notion of "social agreement", originally "le contrat social", which first appeared in works of such philosophers as Thomas Hobbes and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. After Rousseau's "Social Contract" (1762) this notion became popular in European politics and social science, especially after the period of the French Revolution with its new social paradigmatic matrix "freedom, equality, property".

It is clear that since that time the parameters of the "contrat social" were violated several times, but the main principle remained the same — society gives part of its intrinsic right to the government, which guarantees freedom, equality, property, legitimacy. In return it is liable for the citizens' defense. It is important for us that the major paradigm of the social agreement remains relevant for the achievement of social balance (not stability), order, which will satisfy all society, but not its majority (even 65%) in such a complex social system as Russia. New qualities in both the state and civil society are necessary now. But what are these qualities?

The basis of a new social agreement was also a constant process of negotiation between these two subjects, taking into consideration changing societal realities, of the aims of the movement towards new structures, which would move us to a new level of development. But this process is mediated, according to F. Fukuyama, by two interconnected factors: social cash capital and civil society. According to N. Amosov, social capital in our country ceased energetically by the 1980s (the enthusiasm of the creators of the new society). In the 1990s, during the conversion to the market economy, it burnt out, and now the only acceptable basic condition of further movement is the formation of a civil society, as only it can produce the negotiating force for discourse with the state and for restrictions of the abuse of authority. What is the essence of this force? In our opinion, on the new level the civil society, even in its early stage, is the main productive force, and, apart from goods and services, it produces one more specific product. According to V. Tambovtsev, it is a negotiating force [2; 17]. But in conditions of weak social capital, this negotiating force is small, though Russian human capital is high. How can this process be accelerated? The key points are social agreement and civil society. From the point of view of formal logic these notions are interchangeable, and social capital is determined (apart from general factors: upbringing, education, training) by character and forms of connections, mediating the relationship between the individual and the state or economy.

Up to the present moment (from 2003) "de facto" the condition of social agreement, according to A. Auzan, whose viewpoint we find absolutely correct, is characterized by parameters of two types. The first is the problem of compensations for the place gained in the economic system, which was solved in favor of vertical contracts, when "compensations are regulated by the government, but not the law of agreement

between parties"; the second is "the advantage of redistributing groups" with the dominant of rent-oriented behavior, but not the will to create income [3; 17]. In such space, stability increases, but not development. The increase in income is connected only with the increase of GDP from the sales of oil per capita. As all internal economic reforms are stagnating, the process of GDP increase gives little movement for Russia. It proves our conclusions about the linear character of the development of our economic system [4; 39], in which current basic and external conditions completely determine its quantity characteristics, the properties of which are determined by the past, but not the future. It is obvious that a system with such parameters has the worst conditions for development. All these form the political order of stability. Here we should point at the sociological research (2006-2009) carried out by sociologists of TSU, including the author of the present article, in the program "The Social and Cultural Evolution of Russia and Its Regions". It was conducted under the guidance of N. Lapin. The topic of the discussion was related to the interconnection of variables of material position and the dynamics of development of life self-concept in time (one year) in the Tyumen Region. It turned out that the stated linearity is in full correlation with the dictated politics of stability, which is reflected on the empirical level. We have 2 comparable sections [5; 56]. According to national research in 2006, the proportion of the three poorest layers ("very poor", "poor", "unsecured") is 51 % in the whole country. They state their status as stable, as it was a year before. In the Tyumen Region this figure is 37%. Approximately the same correlation was found in research in 2009. Obviously, the fear of losing their "stable" position on the poverty ladder (on the other hand, there were 12-15% whose position lowered, but they hoped to improve it) is the main factor, which guarantees the acquisition of power in the country in this elective cycle.

Development, unlike growth, is a complex of institutional changes and economical increase. In a compound social structure the increase of GDP is only the first level of solving the problems: to add, to divide, to consume. But it is followed by the second, third and fourth levels. Finally there is an exit to the level of maximal investments, which was reached in China, but which is far from us. One of the ways to reach it is to change the country's path of movement.

The modern theory of the social contract has found a reflection in different branches of science: sociology, economics, law, philosophy, political science, etc. In recent years in social sciences there has been a tendency to use rule combination analysis, which determines the social connections studied. Of a special interest for our article is the social rule system, which is being developed by Swedish scientists T. Berne and E. Flem, based on the Swedish model of democracy, Swedish socialism. They state that the individual's activities are organized and governed mostly by socially determined rules and systems of rules. The theory of Swedish researchers focuses on two fundamental principles: formation and reformation of social rule systems; installation of social rules, resource mobilization for distribution of the rules. By social rules they mean norms and laws, moral principles, rules of the game, the procedure of administrative regulation, customs and traditions, requirements of economical and political institutions and corresponding sanctions. The rules govern, but do not completely determine personal behavior, there is still freedom of choice. Any social organization is a completely or partially divided system of rules. This paradigm is extremely popular in Western sociology, the humanities.

We suppose that the paradigmatic shift here happened at the beginning of the 1990s, when the economists Kiefer and Shierley under the guidance of the World Bank conducted research in 84 countries in order to find out the factors which determine the country's development, and, finally, these factors turned out not to be economical. The factors of rules, valid in the country are more important: power of law, risk of expropriation, risk of default, government's violation of rules of social contract, level of corruption, quality of bureaucracy. These factors as well as factors of evaluative order, are called above-constitutional, and refer to the nation's behavior.

In the works of other foreign scientists (K. Beanmor, I. Sened, E. Lagerspetz, S. Voyte etc.), there are approaches, describing from the position of the theory of games the conditions, necessary and sufficient, for the formation of cooperation in a society. These approaches allow to formalize the main points of theory of the social contract and can be taken into consideration in the description of the theory's basis. S. Voyte formulated the neoinstitutional approach. He pays much attention to "inner" institutions (moral norms, ideology), because these institutions, as it is written above, form the social contract. Depending on the presence or lack of different inner institutions, various societies are able to achieve an effective social contract to a variable degree. The so-called "max-min' principle" is actively used in practical research on the social contract. It means that one should consider any available policy from the viewpoint of the worst scenario and events which can take place. This method is applied to practical problems of management (calculation of investments, income, taxation, decision taking).

A separate subject in this sphere is multiple works devoted to the foundation of the EU, in terms of the formation of a new social contract on the basis of existing national models ("Latin", "Scandinavian", "German" etc.). The key parameters of comparison are the following: taxation level, employment level, social orientation of economics.

The main social and cultural problem here is the level and the character of influence on the present of cultural differences and past tendencies (the path dependence problem, as stated by the well-known Russian economist A. Auzan). Its core — different opinions, cultural preferences, the history of relationships, social opinion, formed in the course of time — is now considered to be the main problem of formation of a united European state.

The last — sociocultural — aspect is extremely important for the processes of balanced democratic development in our country. In our theoretical concept we define the potential sum of factors as a sociocultural genotype. To get an adequate look at the process of evolution of our society, it is necessary to have a conceptual construct able to reflect the complex self-developing social structure with a unique sociocultural genotype. In the last 30 years, there has been an interdisciplinary paradigmatic "shift" in the sphere of theory of self-organization (synergetics). Man in his expansion followed linear rules, not knowing about non-linear effects of his activity, just like one of Jean-Batiste Moliere's characters, who did not know that he was talking in prose. Our complex and chaotic world presupposes that the individual must adapt to changes, the cause and nature of which is unknown and unclear to him, and, as a result, unacceptable. It is not clear for people, why together with the growth of pension their purchasing ability ceases, as well as prosperity in

general, why it is necessary to change employment being mature. The majority find an obvious reason in the dichotomy "we and they" or blame obvious circumstances, take the simplest decisions. And here the role of social agreement is especially important.

From this point of view, the leading factor, which stabilizes and sets the normal balance of the system, self-organization and functioning of the whole institutional sphere, civil society and state, is helpful for the system's adaptive result. It reflects the degree of realization of social agreement, the usage of social and cultural capital, the variety of the social and cultural genotype of the system with the specific institutional mechanism, which is responsible for the accumulation and control of social changes and, consequently, for the process of self-organization. The latter underlies the development of civil society.

A sociocultural genotype is an informative mechanism responsible for the inheritance and reproduction of both positive and negative features on all the levels of society — a complex unbalanced system: a separate person, a small social or large regional community, the ethnos of a country is general, and transforming or preserving identity. F. Hayek talked about the process of loss of national features by the British before the Second World War, which provided the development of a liberal economy and slide to national socialism.

N. Lapin distinguishes a regional level: "There are social-institutional factors; whole *spheres of activity*, which slow down the regions' development. The negative characteristics are preserved in them, and they encourage the depressed state of the whole region. Such spheres of activity can be diagnosed as turbulent-stagnant" (highlighted by the author) [6; 33]. The classical example on both individual and national levels — complete reformation of personality — is Japan, starting from the age of Meiji, ending with the period of American occupation after the Second World War, which finally led the country to economical and financial power.

The theory of self-organization reveals other ways of evolution than linear growth. It is the way of resonant excitement of what is wanted and, more importantly, realizable in the sphere, nation, country, state genotypic properties and structures. It is possible with the help of the method of directed morphogenesis — the selection and formation of necessary genotypic properties, which will give the desired level of variety and spontaneous increase of difficulty in open non-linear structures. The latter is similar to biological processes of morphogenesis and "reproduction", such as reduplication of DNA, when it is preserved in an ethnos. In the processes of non-linear increase this way is the way of multiple reduction of temporal costs and material efforts. The complete analogy between sociocultural and biological genotypes is not correct. The higher the level of prosperity and culture is, the less important are biological determiners of human behavior. But they remain and they are to be taken into consideration. There is still primitive egoism, jealousy, hate, anger, laziness. The sociocultural genotype is fixed in multiple informative forms: from the Constitution and program concepts, legal acts and administrative instructions to education programs and normative acts, unwritten traditions and rules, "patterns" of managerial and economic activity, cultural patterns. Together all this complex net forms a kind of "informative matrix", according to which is built every single system of management, the way of functioning of the system. In the market economy it reflects and fixes the interests of the groups, leading

in economy and politics, and, as a result — in the formed ideology. We suppose that this is the main aim of the civil society in the current stage of development in Russia.

REFERENCES

1. Hayek, F.A. von. Road to Slavery. Translated by M.B. Gnedovskiy, 1990. URL: [http://www.libertarium.ru / 1_lib_road](http://www.libertarium.ru/1_lib_road)
2. Tambovtsev, V.L. State and the Economy. Moscow: Magister, 1997. 48 p.
3. Auzan, A.A. Social Contract and the Civil Society // World of Russia. 2005. No. 3. P. 3-18.
4. Melnik, V.V., Telegina, G.V. Methodological Problems of Equilibrium (Stable) Development of Social Systems // Tyumen State University Herald. 2012. No. 2. P. 181-185.
5. Sociocultural Portrait of the Tyumen Region. Head of the group of authors and program G.F. Kutsev, G.S. Korepanov, N.I. Lapin. Tyumen: Tyumen Regional Duma, 2008. 192 p.
6. Lapin, N.I. New Issues of Research of Regional Communities // Sociological Research. 2010. No. 7 (315). P. 28-38.