



International Conference on Research Paradigms Transformation in Social Sciences 2014

Institutions of civil society in space of democratic politics

Zhuravleva I.V. *

National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, 30, Lenin Ave., Tomsk, 634050, Russia

Abstract

The article presents an analysis of a civil society organization depending on the democratization of the political system from three points of view: Liberal Democratic, Social Democratic and that generalizing the first and the second ones. Democracy is considered as a subordinate use; requirements for compliance of democracy in relation to civil society are identified and their relationship is defined.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of Tomsk Polytechnic University.

Keywords: Civil society, civil institutions, democratic politics, pluralistic theory, negative-libertarian position

1. Introduction

Consideration of the role of civil society in democratization of the political system depends on how the institutional structure of civil society is developed. There is a deep relationship between functional and structural aspects, namely, between democracy and civil society (Kean J., 2001; Ferguson A., 2000; Baranov N.A., 2006; Dahrendorf R.G., 2002).

The purpose of the work is a study on the role of civil society in democratization of the political system. To achieve this goal in this paper the following problems are solved sequentially. The civil society is considered from three positions: liberal-democratic, social democratic and generalizing the first and the second ones; a relationship existing between them is determined; particular requirements for compliance of democracy are identified.

In the early 19th A.de Tocqueville travelling to the New World, summarized his observations in the "Democracy in America" which is still called "the best book on democracy and the best book about America". Reflecting on these aspects of the relationship, he systematized the results of his observations (Tocqueville A.de, 2008).

2. Terms and theoretical framework

* Zhuravleva I.V. Tel.: +7-38451-644-32

E-mail address: I.V.Zhuravlyova@yandex.ru

A.de Tocqueville confirmed that to ensure stability of the democratic system, it was important that civil institutions, that provided stability, had always been undemocratic and hierarchically organized. For example, the Catholic Church and the patriarchal family considering their internal undemocratic character, he referred to functional democratic institutions.

Although in his views, de Tocqueville was a conservative, a danger of splicing of an undemocratic society with a totalitarian state was evident for him. He noted that members of a democratic society hardly left personal affairs, being confined to their private interests and had the only view - to shift the responsibility to the State which was the only obvious and permanent expression of collective interests. To minimize this danger democracy could through institutionalization of the civil society.

This problem was very excited for the founders of the American Constitution. If we turn to the Constitution of 1787, we see that each state within its territory possessed full legislative, executive and judiciary power, managing their elected representatives. Religious tolerance and non-interference of the government into religious affairs became one of the main conditions for the institutionalization of civil society. Given the abundance of faiths, such a policy had helped to unite the inhabitants of the North American States in primary cells of the civil society. In those cells relationship was based on religious and moral basis, forming a relationship of mutual tolerance. To date, the important characteristics of social components of the civil society are the priority of moral regulators in relation to legal and political ones and mutual tolerance of all social groups. These are sustainability indicators of the existing social order (Levin I.B., 1996).

3. Results and discussion

A civil society is necessary for creating and sustaining democratic politics. Western analysts I.Shapiro, J.Joy, G.Marison, A.Hamilton worked on this problem. This problem is reflected in the work by L.Hartz "Liberal Tradition in America". The author asked why U.S. policy had not evolved in the direction of socialism or democratic socialism. L. Hartz answered that America did not oppose the feudal past; America did not have any basic elements of class differences, of which the socialist policy could develop (Hartz L., 1993). In his work L.Hartz used the concept of American policy that had existed since the time of debates on the feudal constitution in the late XVIII.

Political experts had made systematization in the 1920s. Its uniqueness (American civil society) expressed itself through a plurality of intersecting "interest groups" or factions, each of which had its structure, interests and the range of issues. In European societies, in contrast, there was a main border line between the propertied classes and all others. American society had many border lines but there was no base or permanent line of separation on socio-economic grounds. A diversity of religious, professional, family and local associations increased, as pointed out by Hartz, and it reduced the likelihood of the socialist tradition, that could unite the poor classes under capitalism. And this was the answer to the question of the author: "Why Socialism is unknown to America?"

Proponents of the "Theory of Groups" that prevailed in the early XX century, sought to interpret theoretically plurality of dividing lines, which determined the overall American political situation. The most famous was A.F. Bentley, whose theoretical motto was: "Each group corresponds to the interest; each interest corresponds to the group". In 50-60th theoreticians of pluralism emerged. The most famous of them, Robert Dahl, drew on the Theory of Groups. Based on a series of experimental and practical studies of American cities, he demonstrated an extensive dispersal of authorities in terms of making decisions in the public sphere, control of the various organized groups on various issues. His work "Who Governs?" (1961) is considered to be a classic one (Dahl R., 2011).

A leader among all rejected theories was the theory of Marxism, and, namely, that under capitalism the state "is no more than "the executive committee of the bourgeoisie". And they did not accept the theory of G. Mosca, R. Michels, C.Wright Mills, who claimed that under any political system one or other elite would govern through

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/1111969>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/1111969>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)