

This article was published in the Scientific and Practical Electronic Journal "Alley of Science" №10(26), Volume 6, in 2018 on Russian.

This article has been translated into English by its author Schemelinin K. S.

The original article on Russian can be read at:

[http://www.schemelinin.com/K\\_Schemelinin-changes-democracy-2018.pdf](http://www.schemelinin.com/K_Schemelinin-changes-democracy-2018.pdf)

<https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=36767709>

---

**Schemelinin Konstantin Sergeevich**

**ORCID:0000-0002-3636-1583**

## **THE DOCTRINE OF CHANGES AND DEMOCRACY**

**Annotation.** The law on the connection of unfulfilled changes in society and subsequent mass losses of the population, as well as the law on the economic advantage of democracy over authoritarianism during the scientific and technological revolution, are formulated. Additional principles for democracy are given, which must be observed in a democratic state during the scientific and technological revolution, so that the intensity of scientific and technical progress is maximally possible.

**Keywords:** democracy, authoritarianism, elections, constitution, electoral legislation, scientific and technical progress, legislative power, executive power, judicial power.

### ***Table of contents***

Part 1. Law on changes and mass loss of population

Part 2. The economic advantage of democracy over authoritarianism during the scientific and technological revolution

Part 3. Additional principles for democracy during the scientific and technological revolution

*§1. The need to introduce additional principles for democracy during the scientific and technological revolution*

*§2. The first group of principles. Voting*

*Principle № 1. Only completely personally free people are voting*

*Principle № 2. Those who left to live in another country do not vote*

*Principle № 3. To vote from coming of age to retirement*

*Principle № 4. Working minors and retirees are voted*

*Principle № 5. The age limit for being in a democratic system of government should be set*

*Principle № 6. Those who are far from scientific and technological progress or can interfere with it, not standing for election*

*§3. The second group of principles. Power*

*Principle № 7. Three-Stage Sequence for Moving Up for the Power Levels*

*Principle № 8. One election - one position for one long term*

*Principle № 9. The head of state is not a military man*

*Principle № 10. Working minors can standing for election*

*Principle № 11. A working qualification is required*

*Principle № 12. Avoid duplication*

*§4. The third group of principles. A responsibility*

*Principle № 13. Minimal success*

*Principle № 14. Maximum is two attempts*

*§5. Fifth group of principles. Separation of powers*

*Principle № 15. Three separate elections across three branches of government*

*Principle № 16. First - resignation, then – elections*

*§6. Fourth group of principles. Protection*

*Principle № 17. There is political power - there must be elections*

*Principle № 18. Only a financial barrier*

*Principle № 19. Protection for the Constitution*

*Principle № 20. Renunciation from power is not difficult*

*Principle № 21. Minister versus deputy and vice versa*

*Principle № 22. All against one*

*Principle № 23. No levels crossing*

*Principle № 23. The levels don't intersect*

*Principle № 24. Broad understanding of one post*

*Principle № 25. Free high moral judge*

*Principle № 26. Only independent expertise*

*§7. Analogies*

*§8. Advantages and disadvantages*

*Application. Analogies between biology and social structure of society*

### ***Part 1. Law on changes and mass loss of population***

The world is full of changes: the seasons of the year follow each other, birth is followed by youth, growing up and death, and so on, because "in the world there is nothing permanent but impermanence" (Jonathan Swift). Public life is also constantly changing as new technologies emerge that change the daily life of people.

The democratic system is well adapted to change, but democracy is formed by people, and people tend to overestimate their strength and their importance: "He who thinks that he can do without others is very mistaken. But those who think that others cannot do without him are even more mistaken" (Francois de La Rochefoucauld), therefore even the best, democratically elected leaders, from time to time, must give up their place to other bosses. This demand for democracy takes on special significance in an era of active scientific and technological changes, since it is known that "the older a person becomes, the more he resists changes, especially changes for the better" (John Steinbeck), and any leader with each passing year becomes only older.

The discrepancy in the speed and quality of changes regularly leads countries to disasters, which usually happen like this: those countries that change more slowly than others begin to lag behind in development - at first insignificantly, and later (in accordance with the law on the transition from quantity to quality) - critically; changes that need to be implemented are postponed and / or not implemented actively enough, as a result of which the volume of necessary, but not implemented changes accumulates and, over time, leads to the fact that too much changes must be made in a very short period of time.

It is known that death accelerates change: natural death weakly accelerates change, but violent death often brings more changes than was desired and expected.

It is precisely because of the unsatisfied desire of people for big changes that the population of countries that have not implemented the changes required by the time becomes more and more radical, and forceful solutions to issues are on the agenda: this is how civil wars are generated [21, p. 914 and p. 916], coups d'états, riots and uprisings [21, p. 894], causing refugee flows, increasing emigration and mortality rates, and occasionally bringing with them massive terror and large-scale famine.

Thus, what a given power could carry out gradually, accurately, balanced and without violence, is carried out by another power quickly, harshly, with mistakes, excesses and violence. And in those cases when the government did not hear or understand its own people, it is the government that is responsible for the subsequent disasters.

But in the absence of the necessary changes, there is another danger - the country that has critically lagged behind in implementing the necessary changes becomes weak, that is, vulnerable to external conquest.

Gotta pay for what should be done, but was not done [19, p. 7].

On the whole, as you can see, changes and massive population losses are linked by a certain pattern.

#### Law on Change and Mass Loss of People

**A country that is too slow to implement the necessary changes or does not make them at all is itself approaching the time when, due to unimplemented changes, the population of this state will begin to decline at a high rate.**

#### *Clarification of the Law of Change and Mass Death*

1. Changes in this law should be understood as broadly as possible - these can be changes in the field of social structure, changes in military affairs, changes in the field of economics and money circulation, as well as changes in the field of foreign and (or) domestic policy.

2. Losses of the population of the country in this law should be understood as broadly as possible - this is the death of people from hostilities, hunger, cold, terror or

genocide; this is an increase in the level of natural mortality from diseases, a decrease in the birth rate, an increase in the level of emigration (refugees and voluntary emigrants), and so on.

3. It is not at all necessary that a state that implements the changes required by time will avoid participation in a bloody conflict (there is always the possibility of an attack by a neighboring state); however, it is likely that a society that is changing in accordance with the requirements of the times the society that does not make the necessary changes will win the war.

In simple terms, ***understanding the essence of the law of change and mass loss of life will allow the population to avoid future difficult problems that they are creating for themselves right now.***

*Examples operation of the law of change and mass death*

The scale and speed of technical, scientific and social changes gained great importance in the 20th century (especially in connection with the beginning of the scientific and technological revolution from the second half of the 20th century), therefore, almost all the examples below will be taken from this period of history.

Example № 1. Italy and Ethiopia.

The first time, at the end of the 19th century, these countries fought on equal terms, but then Italy moved forward in industrial development, as it was in the right rhythm of change, and Ethiopia did not change enough, so in their second war at the beginning of the 20th century, Italy conquered Ethiopia [6].

Example № 2. Germany and France.

In World War I, Germany and France fought, in general, on an equal footing [2]. After this conflict, Germany began to develop faster, so in the Second World War Germany quickly and effortlessly conquered France [11].

Example № 3. China and the USSR.

In the second half of the 20th century, China [15] and the Soviet Union [16] were, on the whole, similar states with a communist ideology and planned economy. The PRC was able to smoothly change and become a country with a market economy, while the USSR could not [12], therefore China still exists now, at the beginning of the 21st century, and the Soviet Union ceased to exist at the end of the 20th century. The lack of necessary changes, which the USSR should have made, but did not, led not only the country itself to disintegration, but also spawned several wars, led to an increase in the level of emigration and launched a demographic crisis in Russia, Ukraine and some other countries of the former Soviet Union [22].

Example № 4. Brain drain.

When highly qualified specialists leave their country for another state to live and work there, this means that their home country has not done what has already

been done in other countries, which means that the homeland of these emigrants has lagged behind in making the necessary changes.

Example № 5. Depopulation.

If in a society the total fertility rate is less than 2.1 children per woman, then the number of this community of people decreases, which means that this group of people (subethnos, ethnic group or state) does not do what will allow them to stabilize or raise their numbers [ 20], that is, it does not carry out the necessary changes for themselves.

## **Part 2. The economic advantage of democracy over authoritarianism during the scientific and technological revolution**

The types of authoritarian systems are different - autocracy, monarchy, theocracy, despotism, dictatorship, as well as the directory, junta and triumvirate [7].

The ultimate type of authoritarianism is totalitarian dictatorship or totalitarianism [14].

Authoritarianism, by its very nature, is hostile to free competition; therefore, in economics, authoritarian systems usually operate using violence that destroys free market competition. Such a line of conduct allows for sharp economic jerks by mobilizing all forces in a given direction (this often happens in the military-technical field, because authoritarianism loves strength), but does not allow rapid development in all sectors at the same time: in authoritarian systems there is always an element of significant lag in development of some or most sectors of the country's economy.

Scientific and technical development in the conditions of democracy and authoritarianism occurs in different ways, but always an invention must be created from the beginning or a scientific discovery must occur. Such events sooner or later occur in any social formations, but to invent or discover is not enough, this innovation still needs to be introduced into the final product, and the basis of the implementation process (innovation process) is market competition [3].

Scientific discovery or invention for a competitive environment that thrives in a democracy is the most important factor for survival and profit, therefore, private capital is constantly looking for all kinds of innovations, and when it finds it, it immediately introduces it into the production of the final product.

In authoritarian regimes, the final product is not the main thing, because under authoritarianism, the main thing is power, so if a given discovery or invention strengthens the current power, it is promoted and implemented in every possible way; if a given discovery or invention is indifferent to the current government, then the government does not interfere in the innovation process, and economic incentives for implementation are not enough due to weak market competition, because authoritarian systems are prone to excessively broad state regulation of the economy. As a result, under the conditions of authoritarianism, an innovation indifferent to the

authorities is nevertheless introduced, but usually this happens too late, that is, when in a democratic system a similar introduction has already taken place long ago! The worst thing for innovation is if, from the point of view of authoritarianism, it undermines the stability of the authoritarian power itself - then, (basically, such an attitude was experienced by scientific works), a discovery or a whole system of discoveries generally disappears from the scientific sphere in the country, blocking the development of entire industries science: for example, this happened with genetics, demography and sociology in the 1930-1950s in the USSR.

***The formula for innovation: there is authoritarianism – there is no innovation, there is democracy – there is innovation.***

This formula for the innovation process is simplified, but, nevertheless, it allows us to understand the fundamental difference between democracy and authoritarianism - a democratic system promotes the implementation of the results of scientific and technological progress [1], but authoritarianism does not. This difference is the reason that the economic competitiveness of democratic states is higher than that of authoritarian countries, which clearly manifests itself precisely during the scientific and technological revolution, during which science became a productive force [10].

Law on the economic advantage of democracy over authoritarianism during the scientific and technological revolution

**During the scientific and technological revolution, democratic systems of power have an economic advantage over all types of authoritarian power systems.**

Economy is the basis of political relations, which means that the one who wins in international economic competition, then wins in the interstate struggle. In general, ***the democratic system during the era of the scientific and technological revolution can be viewed as a form of weapon in the interstate competitive struggle.***

***Corollary 1. On the victory of democracy over authoritarianism during the scientific and technological revolution.***

**During the scientific and technological revolution, democracy carries the conditions for the victory over authoritarianism.**

Democracy allows people to more fully use their creative possibilities, reaching heights not only in art, but most importantly in science and technology, which is the basis for the economic success of the country as a whole, and, consequently, for a higher standard of living of the population of the state. Everyone wants to have more money, and democracy gives people more opportunities to live

richer than authoritarianism, so authoritarian regimes, as if by themselves, in a natural historical way, either disappear or turn into democracies - this was the case in the twentieth century: in particular, as a result of the confrontation (the so-called "cold war" [5]) with the democratic USA, the Bolshevik totalitarian regime in the Soviet Union [4] collapsed, and the USSR itself collapsed; in Spain the fascist totalitarian regime turned into a parliamentary monarchy [9], and in Chile the military junta was transformed into a presidential republic [17].

(Additional information. For an unambiguous understanding of the essence of the USSR, it is necessary to cite the following quotation from the article "Dictatorship" published in the Great Russian Encyclopedia: "The most typical political systems of a dictatorial type in the 20th century were totalitarian regimes: the fascist regime in Italy, national socialist in Germany - on the right political flank and the Bolshevik in the USSR - on the left flank") [4].

*Corollary 2. On the victory of authoritarianism over democracy during the slow scientific and technological progress.*

**At a time of slow scientific and technological progress, authoritarianism carries the conditions for the victory over democracy.**

Before the era of the scientific and technological revolution, the main issue for the state was the question of power, and rigid political systems of authoritarian types are well adapted to the seizure and retention of power, and the best system for this, as history shows, is a monarchy [18], based on such principles like: "the sovereign has power from God" and "power is inherited." Democracy, which has no economic advantages over authoritarianism before the onset of the scientific and technological revolution, was an unnecessarily complicated and less stable system in comparison with the monarchy, therefore, until the middle of the 20th century, democratic systems in history were very poorly represented, and states, in general, were precisely by monarchies [8].

*Corollary 3. About the future victory of democracy around the world.*

**If the scientific and technological revolution continues long enough, then all states of the world will become democracies.**

Now, at the beginning of the XXI century, the world is in the process of realizing this consequence: democracy has not yet won in all countries of the world, but the trend towards victory is evident. How many democratic countries were there in the middle of the twentieth century when the scientific and technological revolution began? Only the USA and France. How many democratic countries are there at the beginning of the 21st century? Great amount! As can be seen from the example, during the scientific and technological revolution that began in the second

half of the twentieth century, various authoritarian states began to gradually leave the political arena of the world [9], and this trend does not stop.

### **Part 3. Additional principles for democracy during the scientific and technological revolution**

#### ***§1. The need to introduce additional principles for democracy during the scientific and technological revolution***

All forms of society are subject to operation the law of change and mass death of people, therefore, the democratic systems of government considered in this work should strive for such a speed of their own changes that scientific and technological progress requires from them.

Future changes usually incipient in the field of science and technology, then they changed the structure of the economy, after which they emphasise the accents in politics, actively changing social and interpersonal relations. Until about the middle of the 20th century, science was not an important element of production, so the intensity of scientific and technological progress was low - often changes in production technologies took place over the course of centuries. During the scientific and technological revolution, the world of people changes at a high speed, therefore, the foundations of democracy, which have successfully functioned for centuries in different societies and states, require the introduction of additional principles to adapt the democratic system to the realities of the technically rapidly changing modern world.

The foundation for the creation of these new principles should be human involvement in the changes taking place. Naturally, the principles of separation of powers, free elections, guarantees of the rights and freedoms of citizens and other principles of democracy, developed before the era of intensive technological changes, remain unchanged [8].

The main modification in the proposed principles is exposed universal suffrage.

Principles are the basis for the adoption of laws, and "good morals are more important than good laws" (Publius Cornelius Tacitus), therefore, the proposed principles, in addition to the main function, were also created with the aim of improving the moral climate in society and in the management system by introducing a system restrictions.

The principles described below enable democracy to sustainably keep and develop in the face of rapid and radical technological change.

Twenty-six such principles will be set out below - most likely, they can be formulated in a much larger number (at the same time, perhaps, some of them will not stand the test of time and will be rejected, which will cause fewer of these



principles of democracy), but the total number of principles is not important - the main thing that all these principles have contributed to technological change and have prevented technical stagnation.

Thus, from the point of view of democracy during scientific and technological progress, it can be argued: everything that helps the growth of the level and speed of technological change is good, and everything that prevents technical change and stimulates the preservation of technologies of the past is bad.

*Name.* The proposed system of principles of democracy during scientific and technological progress can be briefly called "principles of democracy in the face of technological change" or "principles of democracy of change".

## ***§2. The first group of principles. Voting***

### ***Principle № 1. Only completely personally free people are voting***

In the conditions of scientific and technological progress, freedom as a basis for active creativity is becoming the most important factor, including for the functioning of democracy. The choice that the voter makes should be free, that is, as independent as possible from any pressure.

Of course, it is impossible to completely get away from the pressure of society, the media, propaganda, stereotypes and other things, but we must strive to minimize this pressure; at the same time, the secret of voting in conditions of a lack of freedom cannot serve as an effective help for free expression of will.

The right to vote is lost by people who are not completely personally free:

1. Prisoners in any place of deprivation of liberty, except at home.

No matter how the place of deprivation or restriction of freedom is called, the person in it cannot make a choice completely freely. Thus, those who are imprisoned in a prison, colony, camp and other places of deprivation of liberty for the duration of their imprisonment lose their electoral right; but those who have been restricted by being forced to stay at home, with their families, should not lose the right to vote, because their choice will be personally free.

2. Privates and cadets.

Soldiers, sergeants, cadets and other servicemen of rank-and-file positions are not fully personally free in their choice, since they are constantly and continuously, for a long time, in a rigid system in which they are obliged to obey the orders of officers.

### ***Principle № 2. Those who left to live in another country do not vote***

People who permanently reside (work, study, rest, serve, and so on) in other countries lose contact with the real societies that exist in their native states. Such migrants imagine not the political and economic picture that actually exists in their home state, but the image of the country that the media depict for them and limited communication (personal or virtual) with those who remained at home; therefore,

only voters who have resided in their home country for more than six months during the year preceding the elections are eligible to vote abroad.

***Principle № 3. Vote from coming of age to retirement***

It is now accepted that you can vote from the age of majority until the person's death. For an era of rapid technological change, this principle should be modified - the age of obtaining voting rights remains, but the age of deprivation of voting rights is introduced:

1. Young people should receive the right to voting from the time they reach the age of majority (in different countries this age ranges from 18 to 21 years).

2. People retiring fall out of the rhythm of change: retirees no longer work, therefore new technological changes and subsequent changes in society pass them by, therefore, older people lose understanding of the processes taking place around them - thus, the time to retire the retirement pension is the date of termination of participation in elections as a voter.

***Principle № 4. Working age of minors and retirees are voting***

Changes in technology change the production process and production relations (economic and political), so the people who work are in the rhythm of change.

Based on this understanding of work, those young people and those retirees who work should have the right to vote, despite the fact that this right is limited by the principle of "voting from majority to retirement". Work should be understood to mean full-time work with a duration of six months or more for one year, or part-time work for a year or more for two years. Thus, if a minor young person or a full-time pensioner worked six or more months last year, or worked 12 or more months part-time in the previous two years, then next year he should receive the right to vote.

As a result, it turns out that a working person has the right to vote at both 16 and 90 years old, that is, in fact, regardless of age.

The minimum age from which a working boy or girl gets the right to vote must be determined by law - it is estimated that this age can be taken equal to 14-15 years.

***Principle № 5. The age limit for being in a democratic system of government should be installed***

Argument for setting age limit № 1. History shows that politicians aged 35-50 are the best leaders, with experience and success in making the necessary changes. In the 20th century, the life expectancy of people has constantly increased, but change is loved by the young, and the young are looking for change, so an age limit should be set, upon reaching which no one should have the right to be in a democratic system of government.

Argument for setting age limit № 2. In society, those who are between 25 and 45 are most active. If the age of a leader in power is 60 years or more, then such a boss turns out to belong to the previous generation: the elderly leader understands

well the needs of his generation, which is already interested not in changes, but in a calm old age, and poorly understands the needs of active young and middle-aged people who want to build their lives and careers right now.

From arguments № 1 and № 2 it follows: if any leader has reached the age limit, then he should automatically resign.

In addition, after reaching the age limit, no person should be eligible to run for any elected office.

Based on an understanding of the essence of changes and historical examples, the most rational is the recognition of 55 years as the age limit for finding any leader in a democratic system of power. You can set another age limit, but (according to historical experience) less than 50 years is too little, and over 60-65 years is already too much.

***Principle 6. Those who are far from scientific and technological progress or can interfere with it, do not stand for election***

Such categories of people should be prohibited from participating in elections to any level of the democratic power system:

1. For those who, in their professional activities, are far from scientific and technological progress:

1.1. Media workers (journalists, observers, presenters, and so on).

1.2. Show business workers (musicians, dancers, singers, actors, models, and so on).

1.3. Professional athletes of all kinds of sports.

1.4. Writers of any genre of literature.

1.5. Workers of any genre of art (artists, architects, designers, cooks, and so on).

1.6. Teachers of all forms and types of training (teachers, mentors, coaches, and so on).

1.7. Doctors of any medical specialties.

Lawyers are also very far from scientific and technological progress, but politics is imbued with law, therefore, persons with a legal education should be able to stand for election and be elected to any level of the democratic system of government.

2. Those who, due to their connections or interests, can slow down or harm scientific and technological progress:

2.1. To persons associated with Organized Crime.

2.2. Owners of all types of businesses.

2.3. Leaders of any National Society.

2.4. Heads of any public associations (clubs, associations, and so on); moreover, this prohibition does not apply to the leaders of social and political associations (parties, blocs, fronts, etc.).

This list, most likely, is not complete - other categories of people can be added to it that meet the requirements of the principle under consideration.

However, people who were on this list, but are no longer on it, that is, "former", should have the right to stand for election: for example, an active professional athlete has no right to be elected, and after the end of his sports career, such a former athlete should have the right to stand for election.

### ***§3. The second group of principles. Power***

#### ***Principle № 7. Three-Stage Sequence for Moving Up the Power Levels***

For ordinary states with a population of 3-5 million people and more in the system of democratic power, three levels can be distinguished. For small countries (with a population of up to 3-5 million people), it is better to use one or two levels of government, and for huge states - with a population of over 1 billion people - a four-tier system of power should apply. Below we will consider the most common three-tier system of democratic power in the modern world:

##### 1. Lower:

1.1. Heads of small towns (up to 30-50 thousand people).

1.2. Deputies and Assistants to heads on specific issues of small towns.

1.3. Deputies of the regional legislature.

1.4. District level judges.

##### 2. Medium:

2.1. Heads of medium-sized cities (from 30-50 to 300-500 thousand people).

2.2. Deputies and Assistants to heads on specific issues of medium-sized cities.

2.3. Heads of medium-sized regions (from 30-50 to 300-500 thousand people).

2.4. Deputies and Assistants to heads on specific issues of medium-sized cities.

2.5. Deputies of the legislative assemblies of the city and regional levels.

2.6. City and regional level judges.

##### 3. Higher:

3.1. Head of state.

3.2. Heads of large cities (with a population of 300-500 thousand people and above).

3.3. Deputies and Assistants to heads on specific issues of large-sized cities.

3.4. Heads of large regions (with a population of 300-500 thousand people and above).

3.5. Deputies and Assistants to heads on specific issues of large-sized regions.

3.6. Deputies of the nationwide parliament.

3.7. Judges of the highest courts in the country.

For such a step system of power, the concept of an entry point should be introduced.

**Definition № 1. *The entry point is the level in a democratic system of government that a person who has never run for office can get to.***

Currently, the point of entry into the democratic system is not defined; moreover, the sequence of advancement along the vertical of power is not defined, as this is a lack of the democratic system, due to which a person without sufficient experience in understanding democratic procedures can get too high a position. To eliminate this deficiency, the principle of a three-stage sequence should be introduced when moving up the levels of power:

1. The entry point into a democratic system of government is its lowest level.

Any person who has not previously unselected to a public office has the right to stand for election only for the lowest level of power in a democratic system - this rule also applies to major leaders, such as: ministers and high-ranking civil servants (they were appointed and approved, and not elected by the people) and the heads of large commercial organizations (such people either themselves developed their company to a large size, or were elected by shareholders, and not by the people).

2. It is possible to occupy the middle level in a democratic system of power only after having worked for at least one term at the lowest level.

3. It is possible to occupy the highest level in a democratic system of power only after having worked at least one term at the lowest level plus at least one term at the middle level.

Thus, a candidate for the post of head of state must, at least, work for one term at the lowest level, plus, in addition, work for one term at the middle level.

This principle does not prohibit moving between the executive and legislative branches of government: for example, you can win elections to the post of deputy at the district level, then win the election of the head of a medium-sized city, and then gain the upper hand in the elections to the post of deputy of the nationwide parliament. However, move between the judiciary and the executive or legislative branch should be prohibited.

***Principle № 8. One election - one position for one long term***

It is generally accepted that in a democratic society one and the same person can hold the same office two or more times (in a row or intermittently). The rationale for this decision is the following thought: if a given person corresponds to his position, then he can continue to occupy it. This logic takes place for rather slow technological changes - during rapid technological changes, another principle should be introduced: "one election - one position for one long term", that is, one person can

hold the same elective position for a maximum of one term, but however, the term of office must be sufficiently long.

Depending on the adequacy of the leader to change, he always has three ways:

1. If a given person has perfectly adapted to technological changes, then he can win elections at a higher level of the democratic system of government.

2. If a given person has adapted well to technological changes, then he can win elections either at his own or at a lower level of power in a democratic system.

3. If a given person has poorly adapted to technological changes, then he will lose any election and leave the democratic system of government.

At present, the length of one term of office is accepted equal to 4-7 years.

The choice of such a period of time is due to the fact that the manager has the opportunity to be two terms (and often more than two terms) in the same position. Such, in general, a short term in office makes elections too frequent, which devalues the very idea of elections, therefore, the length of tenure, taking into account the principle "one election - one post for one long term", it is better to accept more, for example, 8- 9 years and more.

People should wait for elections, people should want to come to them, and this can be achieved if elections are not held too often.

It will not be possible to set too long terms, since the principles of "the maximum age of being in a democratic system of power should be established" and "three-stage sequence in moving up the levels of government" limit the career opportunities of leaders. For one and the same country, for different positions, it is possible to set different lengths of tenure in power, or it is possible to establish the same term in power for all elective posts.

In general, a period of 8 years (for a three-tier system of power, the scheme 8-8-8) looks like the most acceptable period for natural movement up the career ladder: at 25-30 years - reaching the first level of democratic power, at 33-38 years - achieving the second level, and at 41-46 years old - a victory at the third, highest level, power. Schemes 7-8-9, 6-8-10 and 9-9-9 also look good. Longer-term schemes, such as 10-10-10, 8-10-12, or 7-9-11, are also acceptable, but in these top-level managers, in many cases, will not be able to fully work out the entire term: from On the one hand, this is a disadvantage (I did not complete the entire prescribed period), and on the other hand, it is dignity (people striving for politics should be politically active at a young age, which the democracy of change allows them to do). Each state must determine the scheme for finding power at different levels independently - there is no universal recipe for all countries of the world.

A rather long term in power, equal to 8-10 years, may cause concern among voters: "And if not the best candidate wins as a result of the elections, will he lead us for so long?" You should not worry about this: in accordance with the law on 99% of

people [19, p. 16-21] a bad candidate will be only slightly worse than the rest, and a good chosen candidate will only be slightly better than the rest. In general, it is not so important who the voters choose, it is much more important that a system of checks and balances works, which could block the activity in the seizure of additional power by the chosen person, and also was able to direct the energy of the chosen person in the direction desired by society.

Long terms in power reduce the number of elections per unit of time, which makes them more rare. "They never lie as much as during the war, after the hunt and before the elections" (Otto von Bismarck), therefore, a decrease in the intensity of the electoral process will have a beneficial effect on the level of lies in society - it will become much less.

***Principle № 9. The head of state is not a military man***

Until the beginning of the era of active scientific and technological progress, the presence of military experience in the head of state was considered an advantage, since such a leader could firmly defend his state even during a war.

At present, mankind is gradually moving away from this understanding of the role of the head of the country as a military leader: many heads of countries in the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century, although they are the leaders of their armed forces, do not have a professional military or paramilitary education. This tendency also manifests itself when a civilian rather than a professional soldier is appointed minister of defense.

War is a part of politics, and politics is an economic derived from Economics, in which production relations, in turn, are very dependent on the technologies used; therefore, the person who has chosen as his profession military affairs or some kind of militarized service (for example, law enforcement) is too far away not only from scientific and technical changes, but also from rather rapidly changing economic relations. The essence of military affairs is the preservation of the existing one, and the essence of scientific and technological progress is constant changes, therefore, a professional military man should not have the right to occupy the highest post in the state, either after resignation or during service.

At the same time, it is acceptable when the military, after resignation, are elected as deputies or heads of cities and regions - by doing so, they introduce an element of order and rigidity into a fairly free democratic system, but the part should always remain less than the whole, that is, the military should not lead the development of the entire country.

***Principle № 10. Working minors can stand for election***

Elections are a competition, which means that the one who most fully meets the interests of the people at a given time wins. Based on this understanding of elections, a minor young person should also have the right to win an election

campaign; At the same time, a minimum age should be established, upon reaching which a young man or girl receives the right to stand for election for an elective public office - roughly, this age can be taken equal to 15-16 years, while there should not be an age limit for standing for election.

***Principle № 11. Working qualification is necessary***

To understand how industrial relations work, all those who want to stand for election must have the minimum required industrial experience, that is, a labor qualification. The lack of such experience is likely to negatively affect the decisions made by such people in the system of democratic government.

Work qualification properties:

1. Can be discontinuous.
2. Can be obtained only in the sphere of production and services.
3. Cannot be obtained from sports, culture, art, paramilitary service and so on.
4. Cannot be obtained from a private firm owned by a person or persons in a family, relationship or love relationship.
5. When working part-time, the work qualification must be higher than when working full-time.

Working like this, a person will understand from his own experience what work for hire, unemployment, job search, work in a team of strangers and lack of patronage are.

The working qualification scheme can be as follows:

1. A candidate for the lowest level of government must have a working qualification equal to one year of full-time work or two years of part-time work.
2. A candidate for the middle level of government must have a working qualification equal to two years of full-time work or four years of part-time work.
3. A candidate for the highest level of government must have a working qualification equal to three years of full-time work or six years of part-time work.

The duration of the labor qualification should be consistent with the principles "one election - one position for one long term" and "the maximum age for staying in a democratic system of power should be set." Based on this, the schemes for the labor qualification can be different - not only as the scheme 1 (2) -2 (4) -3 (6) considered above, but also, for example, as follows: 1 (2) -2 (4) - 4 (8), 0.5 (1) -1 (2) -2 (4), 2 (3) -2 (3) -2 (3), 1 (2) -2 (4) -2 (4 ) and so on.

However, the scheme of the working qualification cannot be as follows: 1 (1) - 2 (2) -3 (3) or similar, since this is prohibited by paragraph 5 of the properties of the working qualification.

***Principle № 12. Avoid duplication***

When forming the power structure, duplication of functions should be avoided, as this generates unnecessary competition, which slows down the implementation of



changes, because a lot of society's energy and time begins to go into bureaucratic struggle; in addition, the absence of duplication allows you to clearly see who is responsible for what. Duplication of functions breeds irresponsibility, which is well described in the proverb "seven nannies have a child without an eye." A good example of the absence of duplication is the army, which, in its essence, is prone to one-man command, therefore the entire military system works as a single mechanism: it is not for nothing that a powerful army is said to be a military machine.

Examples of duplication of functions:

1. The presence of the head of state (president or a similar position) and the prime minister at the top of the executive branch at the same time.
2. The presence of a ministry of industrial policy and a ministry of economic development, a ministry for the protection of internal law and order and a separate body to investigate any special types of crimes, and so on.
3. The presence of a personal representative of the head of state on any issues or on any region with the right to make decisions. Such a representative of the head of the country partially duplicates the functions of already existing representatives of the executive branch.

#### ***§4. The third group of principles. A responsibility***

##### ***Principle № 13. Minimal success***

Do voters want to know the biography of this candidate? No.

Do voters want to know about the past success of this candidate? No.

Do voters want to understand why this candidate is better than others? No.

Voters generally do not want to go to elections or be interested in politics - people are simply forced to do this in a democratic system, since democracy does not function without them.

It is for the fact that a candidate standing for an elected office takes the time and attention of many other people against their will, he must be held accountable!

Minimum Success is the minimum possible percentage of votes for a given candidate; if the candidate receives votes less than the minimum success level, then the person should lose the right to stand for any elected public office for life.

The size of the minimum success should be fixed by law. The size of the minimum success in the range from 1% to 5% looks quite acceptable.

The essence of introducing the principle of minimum success is for candidates to realistically assess their chances of winning, and if a certain candidate is too arrogant, then he will be a bad leader (self-centered, inadequately assessing reality, prone to excessive risk, and so on), which means that a person has nothing to do in a democratic system of government. Also, the principle of minimum success allows you to minimize the appearance of random people and so-called "technical

candidates" on the ballot (the purpose of which is to take votes from one candidate so that the candidate associated with them gets a larger percentage of votes).

If this candidate received more votes than the principle of minimum success requires, but did not win, then no sanctions can be imposed on the loser, since this person simply lost the election, although he had real chances of winning.

***Principle № 14. Maximum is two attempts***

In accordance with the principle "one election - one position for one long term", the number of elections in which a person can take part during his life, in reality, turns out to be approximately equal to three or four (for example, at 25, 35 and 45 years old or at 20, 28, 36 and 44 years old), so there is no point in giving a candidate too many attempts to take up a public office: if a candidate stand for election twice and lost twice, then he should forever lose the right to stand for election.

This principle limits the number of candidates who receive more votes than the minimum success principle requires, but still not enough to win.

The principle of "maximum - two attempts" limits candidates regardless of the level of the democratic system of government and with what sequence the losses occurred. For example, if a given person lost, and then won the elections at the lowest level, and then won the elections at the middle level, and then lost the elections at the middle level, then such a person should lose the right to stand for election, which means that he will not win the elections on the average neither at the highest, nor even at the lowest level of democratic government.

If instead of two attempts to allow the candidate to lose three or more times, then it makes no sense to restrict those people who want and try, although in reality they have a ghostly chance of winning.

***§5. Fifth group of principles. Separation of powers***

***Principle 15. Three separate elections across three branches of government***

One of the foundations of democracy is the principle of separation of powers. In order for the three branches of government to be independent from each other, a system of checks and balances is applied, which does not allow any branch of government to become unnecessarily strong. The main danger for democracy lies in the broad natural capabilities of the executive branch: first, the executive branch controls the electoral process, which means that it can manage it with the aim of winning candidates advantageous for itself in the legislative and judicial branches of government; and, secondly, the executive branch controls the law enforcement agencies (the armed forces, law enforcement agencies and special services), which enables it to exert pressure on other branches of the democratic government. That is why most of the coups d'etat in history were carried out by the leaders of the executive branch of government, and the military often became authoritarian leaders

after the coups. Advances in technological change are constantly strengthening the executive branch: technology is what uses the real world of people, and the executive branch is precisely the branch of government that applies these technologies, so their development constantly gives an advantage to the executive branch as a whole. For example, the development of information technologies at the beginning of the 21st century made it possible to collect and analyze huge amounts of information about people, which gave an advantage to those structures that own them, that is, special services and law enforcement agencies, and therefore the entire system of executive power.

In general, in the context of a system of checks and balances, the executive branch has three advantages over the other two branches of government: control over elections, management of power structures and receiving benefits from technological change, therefore the democratic system is constantly under the threat of transformation into an authoritarian democracy or into a pure one authoritarianism, on the basis of which, the system of checks and balances should be recognized as outdated and all three branches of government should be made absolutely independent from each other.

The principle of three separate elections in three branches of government is when the citizens of a country elect members of parliament, cabinet ministers and members of the main court in direct general elections.

The principle of three separate elections in three branches of government introduces new elective offices: members of the cabinet of ministers and members of the main court in the country, which should also be subject to all the principles that are adopted in this state for elective offices.

Citizens should elect members of the executive branch who are at the middle and lowest levels in a democratic system, as this corresponds to the principle “if there is political power, there must be elections”. Elections for members of the executive branch at the middle and lower levels should be conducted in a manner similar to the country's cabinet elections, which are described below.

### ***Parliamentary elections***

Parliamentary elections are elections to the main structure of legislative power in a country. A party aspiring to parliament carries with it an idea; individual candidates aspiring to parliament carry with them a personal aspect, so parliamentary elections should combine both elections by party list and single-mandate constituencies. The best one should be recognized as the system according to which one half of the parliament is formed as a result of elections according to party lists, and the other half is formed according to the majority system.

The head of the parliament is the speaker whom the deputies choose from among themselves. The voluntary resignation of the speaker of parliament does not

lead the parliament to re-elections, and the voluntary resignation of any member of parliament only leads to by-elections to parliament.

### ***Election of the Cabinet of Ministers***

In the system of checks and balances, it is accepted that the head of state is elected by the people, and the head of the country appoints ministers in agreement with the parliament. The head of state (president or prime minister) is the head of the cabinet.

Cabinet elections are elections in which the citizens of the country vote for the composition of the cabinet of ministers along with head of the country in whole.

As a result of the election of the cabinet of ministers, citizens will receive those heads of ministries for whom they voted, as well as the head of state and his deputies for whom the citizens of the country voted.

The elections of the cabinet of ministers make the system of executive power more responsible: the head of state can no longer dismiss the cabinet of ministers and remain in charge, since the people elected him, the head of the country, and the ministers were appointed: if elections of the cabinet of ministers are held in the state, then either the entire cabinet of ministers headed by the head of the country works, or the entire cabinet of ministers headed by the leader of the state resigns. The voluntary resignation of the head of the country leads to the resignation of the entire cabinet of ministers, and the voluntary resignation of any of the ministers leads only to by-elections to the cabinet of ministers.

### ***Election of judges of the country's main court***

The main court of the state not only deals with some particularly important cases, but also regulates the activities of the entire judicial system of power.

The election of judges of the highest court in the country should follow the principle of a three-stage sequence when moving up the levels of government: only a judge who is at the highest or middle level of the judicial hierarchy can become a judge of the highest court - a judge of a lower, district level should not have the right to stand for election for the highest court of the state.

Citizens should not have the right to choose members of the judiciary at the middle and lower levels, since judicial work requires specific legal qualifications, which are difficult for citizens to assess.

Only former lower-ranking judges can become judges of higher levels.

Citizens, when electing judges, should have the right to see the results of the cases they have examined in order to make the right choice.

The voluntary resignation of the head of the country's Supreme Court leads the entire composition of the court to resign, but the voluntary resignation of one of the members of the court only leads to by-elections to the Supreme Court.

### ***Principle № 16. First - resignation, then – elections***

If someone holding an elective office wishes to stand for election for another elective office, then, first of all, such a person must leave his current office.

This principle:

1. Puts all candidates on a level playing field.
2. Prevents the same person from consistently winning elections for a new position due to the power they exercise in their current position.
3. Promotes a more complete separation of the executive, legislative and judicial powers.

#### ***§6. Fourth group of principles. Protection***

##### ***Principle № 17. There is political power - there must be elections***

This principle protects nationwide elections from being replaced by any non-democratic procedures: if there is political power in a given position within the three-tier system of democratic power, then this position should be elective.

Accordingly, if there is no political power in any position, but, for example, only economic power (the head of a state enterprise), then it is not necessary to hold elections for such a position. But if, for example, the head of state wants to have his representative in a certain region, then such a representative should be elected (if he has the right to participate in political decision-making) or should not be elected (if he only has the right to observe and transmit information) .

Elections are not identical to the approval or voting of some representatives based on the results of public discussion or voting, therefore, an initiative group of people (ordinary citizens or deputies) should not have the right to vote and approve someone for an elective position - only the people have the right to elect to such a position in direct elections.

Outside the three-tier system of democratic government, elections are not compulsory, although they can be applied at the request of citizens: for example, residents of a particular area of residence may or may not have the right to vote on the election of the head of a public school or head of a municipal enterprise serving their area.

Not a single position in a democratic system of power that possesses political power should be lifelong, since it contradicts the principle "there is political power - there must be elections." Only an honorary position without real political power can be lifelong.

##### ***Principle № 18. Only a financial barrier***

Politicians have extremely large opportunities for spending money - much greater than businessmen or military leaders [19, p. 129-131], therefore access to power should be limited: only financially successful people should be in a democratic system of power, and not those who go to power in order to get out of poverty. In addition, the presence of a barrier makes the list of candidates on the ballot much

shorter, which is convenient for the voter - it is difficult not to get confused and make a qualified choice from the list, for example, with a thousand names!

Money allows you to overcome almost any procedural constraint - so why keep and improve barriers? Isn't it easier for society for a potential candidate to simply pay once, even if a fairly high tax, and immediately become a candidate?

The financial barrier should act only for candidates to the executive and legislative branches of government - there should not be a financial barrier for judges, since, firstly, the number of judges is so small, and, secondly, the main thing for a judge is honesty (and only on second place - qualifications), and an honest judge cannot earn much, because he is not a businessman, but lives on the state salary.

The financial barrier can be legalized in the form of a tax on the candidate.

The candidate tax is a fixed one-time tax that each candidate must pay to the state budget from his own money or from his family's money in order to be eligible to stand for election for office in the executive or legislative branch of a democratic system of government.

The candidate tax replaces the procedure for nomination from a party, from an initiative group of voters, from current deputies; also, the candidate tax replaces any signature collection procedures, as well as any other procedures that are currently barriers to potential candidates.

Characteristics of tax on candidate:

1. The money paid as tax by the candidate will not be returned to him under any circumstances. If this applicant does not correspond to the position that he wants to take on personal characteristics (age, work, convictions, etc.), but such a person transferred the tax on the candidate, then this person still does not become a candidate, and the transferred money will not be returned to the applicant, since you should pay for your mistakes.

2. The tax on the candidate must be paid only from the personal funds of the candidate himself or the funds of his family. To pay the tax on a candidate, it is prohibited to borrow money from strangers and any enterprises; it is also prohibited to pay this tax in installments.

3. If this candidate for the post meets the personal requirements for the position, then after paying the tax on the candidate, this person becomes a candidate: his name must be entered on the ballot, and this person gets the right to form his electoral fund and start an election campaign.

4. The basis for calculating the amount of tax on candidate is the average salary: the usual average or average median salary for a country or for a given region. The choice of the type of average salary must be enshrined in law.

5. To calculate the amount of tax on candidate, the size of the average salary should be multiplied by the level coefficient, since at each level of the democratic

system of government decisions are made regarding different amounts of money. Level coefficients must be fixed by law.

The following system of level coefficients looks quite acceptable:

- a) for the lowest level - 10.
- b) for the middle level - 100.
- c) for the highest level - 1000.

The system of level coefficients may look not only 10-100-1000, but also like this: 20-200-2000, 5-50-500, 10-50-500, 10-200-3000, and also somehow differently.

The lower the coefficients of the levels, the easier it is for less wealthy people to get into a democratic system of power, and vice versa.

6. For a democratic system to function properly, and not turn into an oligarchy, the levels coefficients should not be too large (an ordinary person who receives an average salary should be able to pay the tax on a candidate for a lower level of government), but also should not be too small (the common person earning an average salary should not be able to pay the candidate tax for the highest level of government, since the highest level should not be readily available).

The disadvantage of imposing a tax on a candidate is that a large number of poor people will never be able to stand for election, and there are certainly worthy candidates among them. But this disadvantage is also an advantage: those of the poor who have political potential and striving for power, in a market economy, will be able to earn money and overcome the financial barrier, and those who do not have political potential, but have only a desire for power, they will not be able to earn money to overcome the financial barrier, which means that they have nothing to do in the government.

In general, the benefits of the financial barrier are:

1. A large number of poor people who do not inadequately assess their capabilities are cut off from the authorities.
2. The number of "technical candidates" in elections is decreasing.
3. There is no possibility to prevent promising candidates from the elections by deliberately manipulating various pre-election procedures.

The last point is the most important - it is with the help of all sorts of filters and barriers that pseudo-democratic elections are made in practice from democratic elections: only the one who has to win, as well as several "technical candidates", is allowed to participate. The most common ways to deny registration to a potential candidate are as follows: he did not submit the required number of signatures, or he did not receive the required number of votes of deputies, or he submitted an incomplete declaration of income, or he was denied nomination by all parties, and so on.

The simpler the nomination system, the less opportunities for dishonest influence on the outcome of elections and manipulation of their results - which is why paying a tax on a candidate is a good way to avoid the transformation of truly democratic competitive elections into pseudo-democratic elections without real competition and without real choice, independent of the will of the people.

***Principle № 19. Protection for the Constitution***

The Constitution is the fundamental law of the state and one of the foundations of democracy, therefore the Constitution must be protected from any actions affecting the foundations of a democratic system. This protection gives the democratic system the necessary resilience, especially needed by a democracy in conditions of rapid technological change.

Those amendments to the Constitution that do not affect the foundations of a democratic system should not be protected from changes.

The technology for protecting the Constitution must be spelled out in the Constitution itself.

For example, the territorial structure of a country should not have protection: if, as a result of the war, the given state gained control over some territory, then the process of entering these new lands into the Constitution should be simple and quick enough, for example, to make changes in the territorial structure of the country for a month or two.

But if the purpose of the amendments to the Constitution is the system of elections, the rights and freedoms of citizens, the separation of powers and other foundations of democracy, then the process of amending the Constitution should be protected - this protection should be double - through the complexity of the procedure and through the length of time.

An example of the protection of the Constitution by the complexity of the procedure: first, a nationwide referendum takes place, after which in two different electoral cycles two members of parliament must vote for twice "for" and only then these changes can be approved by the head of state.

An example of the protection of the Constitution with the help of the duration of time: the duration of the term for making changes should not be 1-3 years, as is usually the case now, but about 10-15 years and longer.

The complexity of the procedure for amending the Constitution filters out all sorts of minor or radical changes, and the length of the process avoids spontaneous decisions. As a result, those changes to the Constitution that will go through all the stages will be really needed by people, society and the state, and, moreover, will be time-tested.

***Principle № 20. Abandonment from power is not difficult***



Early elections are a procedure that, first of all, removes from power a certain person or a group of persons in power. An unnecessarily complicated procedure for removing from power does not correspond to the rhythm of change, therefore, for a democracy in conditions of intense scientific and technical changes, the procedure for removing from power should be made simple - so that none of the leaders could hinder the changes. In accordance with the principle of three separate elections, all three branches of government must be elected, so each branch of government should have the right to dismiss any other branch of government.

For early resignation:

1. Any branch of government has the right to dismiss any branch of government: for example, the Supreme Court should have the right to dismiss parliament or government.

2. Any branch of government can dismiss one and only one branch of government: for example, the government can dismiss either parliament or the supreme court.

3. To make a decision on resignation, it should be enough to get a certain number of votes - this figure should not be too large: it is best that it be in the range from 50% of votes plus 1 vote to 2/3 of the votes.

The described dismissal from power, in general, is not part of the impeachment, but can be part of the impeachment procedure - in general, the reasons for resignation can be both certain facts (an unpopular decision, systemic errors, etc.), and feelings ("take on too much of themselves", "inhibit the development", "lose control of the situation" and so on).

The reason why this branch of the democratic system of government dismisses another branch of government is desirable to indicate in the text of the decision, but not at all necessary.

***Principle № 21. Minister versus deputy and vice versa***

It so happens that a single person causes persistent rejection among a large group of people, for example, an extremely unpopular minister among deputies or any deputy who unnecessarily interferes with the work of the Cabinet of Ministers (from the point of view of the Cabinet of Ministers).

Such situations are quite common. Currently, these situations cannot be resolved, since it is impossible to dismiss only as single member of parliament (the entire parliament must be dismissed) or a minister (the entire Cabinet of Ministers must be dismissed).

The principle "minister against deputy and vice versa" allows you to solve this problem by dismissing one member of the legislative branch by the decision of the executive branch and vice versa:

1. The Cabinet of Ministers can dismiss any deputy.

To do this, you need to vote for the decision by a simple majority, without giving reasons. The dismissed deputy can hold any position in parliament, including being its leader.

2. Parliament may dismiss any member of the Cabinet of Ministers.

To do this, you need to vote for the decision by a simple majority, without giving reasons.

A minister to be dismissed can hold any position in the Cabinet of Ministers, including being its head (president or prime minister).

3. After a vote on compulsory individual resignation, the branch of government to which this rule was applied, receives immunity on such procedures for a certain period, for example, for a year.

If the parliament dismissed one minister, then the entire Cabinet of Ministers (including the minister who replaced the dismissed one) acquires immunity to the procedure individual resignation for a period of one year, that is, none of the ministers can be dismissed by a decision of parliament during this year - similarly for the resignation of a deputy by a decision of the Cabinet of Ministers.

The benefits of such a solution are obvious: the degree of conflict between the legislative and executive branches of government decreases.

#### ***Principle № 22. All against one***

There are situations when one member of the working collective (parliament, the Cabinet of Ministers or the composition of the court) does not suit all his colleagues at all - in this case, a vote on his forced resignation should be implemented. However, the principle of "all against one" implies that everyone should be against, not the majority, so a forced resignation should only take place if more votes for it, for example, than 2/3 or 75% of the team. The best norm is 75%, because it is quite large. Thus, if 75% or more of the members of parliament vote for the resignation of one of the deputies, then such a deputy must lose his powers - similarly for the Cabinet of Ministers and for the composition of the main court in the country. This principle should not apply for too small court teams, that is, to courts with three to four judges. If there are five or more judges, then this principle should be applied.

Application of the principle under consideration allows the authorities to independently get rid of potential or real corrupt officials, unskilled workers, inadequate personalities and others.

#### ***Principle № 23. No levels crossing***

It is impossible to cross the levels of the democratic system of power, because each level is characterized by its own qualitative characteristics. The principles of "removal from power is not difficult", "minister against a deputy and vice versa" and "all against one" should be applied each at his own level, for example: the state

parliament has no right to dismiss the head of a small town, the regional parliament has no right to dismiss the Cabinet of Ministers at the national level, the main court in the country has no right to dismiss the parliament of a small town, and so on.

***Principle № 24. Broad understanding of one post***

An early dismissal from power means that this leader has already served his appointed term in this position, which means that in accordance with the principle of "one election - one position for one long term", the former boss is prohibited from standing for election for the same position again.

The concept of "position" should be understood as broadly as possible, as in parliament, in which all the deputies are initially equal to each other, following the election results, and only then occupy different positions (head of a faction, commission, parliament, and so on). Thus, "one position " should be understood as follows: firstly, all deputy of parliament are in the same positions; secondly, all the judges of the supreme court of the country are in the same positions; and thirdly, all ministers, the prime minister and all his deputies, as well as the head of state, are also in the same positions. For example, if this leader was the Minister of Industry, then after resignation (or after the expiration of his term of office, or by forcible removal from power, or for other reasons), such a former boss should not have the right to stand for election for positions such as Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Economy, deputy prime minister and head of state, but has the right to stand for election for parliament; and if he has judicial experience, then this leader can stand for election for the supreme court of the state.

This principle, firstly, contributes to a more active turnover of people in power, and, secondly, it poses an obstacle to bureaucratic tricks used to actually extend the term of office of a given person until his death (usually applied as slight change in the name of the position held while maintaining powers or transfer to a completely different position in name, along with all their powers).

***Principle № 25. Free high moral judge***

The decision that the court makes must be free, especially from pressure from representatives of the executive branch, therefore, future judges and juries themselves must be formed as free personalities from childhood, that is, former police officers, professional military personnel, paramilitary personnel employees cannot be judges and juries. In addition, a large personal fortune should be an advantage for holding the office of a judge, since the richer the judge himself, the more independent he is.

It is not enough for a judge to have a legal education - a judge must also have a sufficiently high moral level. But moral requirements are difficult to translate into practical ones: for example, the consent of the panel of judges to the appointment of a new judge does not mean that the latter will have high moral principles - it is likely that the entire panel of judges does not have them, which means that from all possible

options, they will choose not the best but the worst judge. Morality is supported by society and is laid in the family, therefore, an applicant for the position of judge must have worthy ancestors, at least in one generation - among his parents, and even better - in two generations - among his parents and among his grandparents. Also, a future judge must understand the complexity and ambiguity of people's lives, for which he needs that in one (parents) or two generations of ancestors (parents plus grandparents) people with higher education.

Judges do not belong to the law enforcement system (the judge is the judiciary, and the law enforcement structures are the executive branch), therefore, the courts should be separated from the police and special services as much as possible: courts should have separate funding, a separate location, a separate economic structure, and so on.

### ***Principle № 26. Only independent expertise***

Expertise is getting a true and independent opinion of a specialist on the issue under discussion in order to help in making a decision. To obtain a high-quality expert opinion, an expert must not only have the appropriate qualifications, but also be independent (that is, not be afraid to tell the truth) from the body that needs the expertise. The purpose of the examination is to reveal the hidden shortcomings of the future solution, as well as to see other ways of solving the problem, therefore, you need to strive in every possible way for the expert to tell the truth, and tell the truth only those who are on the enemy's side speak it, since "enemies always tell the truth, friends never" (Mark Cicero).

In general, the examination scheme should look like this: the expert and the one who needs the examination should at least have different bosses and different sources of funding.

Here are examples of truly independent expertises:

1. Expertise of the decision put forward by the given party should be carried out by experts belonging to the competing parties.
2. Expertise of decision affecting the interests of a given city (region, region) should be carried out by experts from other cities (regions, regions).
3. Expertise of a decision affecting the entire state should be carried out by experts, including those from other states.

Each country has sovereignty, therefore, foreign expertise will not only be completely independent of this state, but also, most likely, will promote the interests of its country, therefore, for the decision under consideration, it is best to obtain three different expert opinions - two internal (one from an independent private organization, the second from an independent government organization) and one from a foreign, possibly international, organization.

One should not be afraid of a truly independent expert opinion - all the same, you will have to pay for mistakes, not even this generation of people [19, p. 7]! It is better to let the result of expertise be unpleasant (pleasant and unpleasant are the area of feelings, and they are changeable) than then pay for the wrong decision with money, time and blood.

### **§7. Analogies**

Many of the proposed principles for a democracy of change already have analogies in modern, real-life democratic systems, in particular:

1. The principle of minimum success is similar to the principle of a passing barrier for parties during parliamentary elections. The entry barrier, which ranges from 3% to 7%, separates parliamentary parties from parties not represented in parliament.

2. The principle of "three-step sequence in moving up the levels of government" is similar to the requirement to be over a certain age for the head of state (in many countries, the minimum age for holding the highest office in the state is 35 years).

3. The three-level system of democratic power is analogous to the military hierarchy: there are lower commanders, there is an average command staff, and there are top military leaders; in addition, the career growth of a commander is possible only from the lowest level to the highest, and the entry point into the military hierarchy is the lowest level of command.

4. The principle "the head of state is not a military one" is similar to such requirements, widely applied requirements to the future head of state, such as: have no criminal record and reside in the country not less than a certain period.

5. The principle "only completely free personally vote" is analogous to the fact that certain groups of citizens, for example, those who are incapacitated or deprived of the right to vote by a court decision in modern democratic systems do not have the right to vote.

6. The principle of "voting from majority to retirement" is analogous to the modern principle that prohibits all minors from voting.

7. The principle "those who are far from scientific and technological progress or can interfere with it, do not stand for election" is similar to the principle that restricts previously convicted citizens in voting rights, as well as the principle that does not allow businessmen to simultaneously engage in business and apply for some public office.

8. The principle of "one election - one position for one long term" is similar to the principle that permits the same person to hold a given office for short terms two or more times in a row.

9. The principles of "minimum success" and "maximum - two attempts" increase the responsibility of the candidate and complicate his nomination, which, in general, makes these two principles similar to the modern requirements for candidates in terms of the number of collected votes for nomination and / or payment of a deposit before elections.

10. The principle "those who have left to live in another country do not vote" considers the country from which a person left, and is a reverse analogy for the current system of obtaining citizenship through a residence permit, which considers the state in which a person came.

11. In principle, "three separate elections in three branches of government" is analogous to elections to the cabinet of ministers and the head of the country are elections to the parliament by party lists, and the elections of judges to the main court of the country are similar to elections to parliament in single-mandate constituencies.

12. The principle of "labor qualification is necessary" is similar to the naval and land qualifications in the army.

13. The principle of "only financial barrier" is now implicitly applied now: only a wealthy person can independently go through all kinds of procedures before registering as a candidate for an elective position.

14. The principles "minister versus deputy and vice versa" and "all against one" are similar to boycott.

15. The principle of "no level crossing" has already been partially implemented in the construction of a vertical bureaucracy, in which the lower levels of the hierarchy cannot influence the higher ones.

16. The principle of "free and highly moral judge" is an extension of the principle of judicature independence already applied in a democracy; and the moral requirements for a future judge are similar to the popular understanding of an intellectual: "How to become an intellectual? You must have three higher educations. The first is for you, the second is for your father, and the third is for your grandfather!"

17. The principle of "only an independent examination" is currently widely used in legal proceedings, as well as in the scientific and technical field.

### ***§8. Advantages and disadvantages***

There is only one drawback of this system of principles - it is the restriction of universal suffrage for certain categories of citizens.

The system of principles under consideration has many advantages:

1. Each of the principles can be applied both separately and together with the others.

2. The more principles are applied simultaneously, the higher the general level of democracy in society becomes.

3. The democratic system is becoming adequate to rapid technological and social changes.

4. Citizens and politicians are better educated in the rules of democracy, and this learning comes from their own life experiences.

5. The democratic system becomes more stable in relation to attempts to seize excessive power (including with the aim of establishing an authoritarian system) or with the aim of using power to satisfy personal interests.

6. The level of lies in society is significantly reduced.

7. Young people begin to feel and take responsibility for their actions and decisions earlier.

8. Citizens begin to feel more responsibility for their choices.

9. The three branches of government become completely independent from each other.

10. Saving public and private money in elections occurs due to the fact that:

10.1. Most retirees will be deprived of their voting rights.

10.2. Prisoners and privates will be denied the right to vote.

10.3. Elections will be held less frequently.

***Application. Analogies between biology and social structure of society***

An analogue of biological evolution should be recognized as social and political evolution, while the analogue of a biological species is the state.

Definition № 2. ***Social and political evolution is the changes observed in political systems, leading them either to complication, or to simplification, or to disappearance.***

Complexity of political systems from simple to most complex:

1. Chiefdom [13] - the lowest level of complexity.

2. Authoritarianism [7] - medium level of difficulty.

3. Democracy [9] - the highest level of complexity.

As you can see, today democracy is the most complex form of the political structure of society.

Table 1 shows analogies of socio-political processes with such biological concepts of evolution as struggle for existence, aromorphosis, idioadaptation and degeneration.

Table 1. Analogies between biology and social structure of society

№	Biology	Politics
1	Struggle for existence	Struggle between states
2	Aromorphosis of the first level	The transition from chiefdom to authoritarianism
3	Aromorphosis of the second level	The transition from authoritarianism to democracy

4	Idioadaptation of the first level	Complicating the chiefdom
5	Idioadaptation of the second level	Complication of authoritarianism (various forms of authoritarianism with elements of democracy)
6	Idioadaptation of the third level	Complicating democracy (in particular, various forms of democracy of change)
7	Level 1 degeneration	The transition from authoritarianism to chiefdom
8	Level 2 degeneration	The transition from democracy to authoritarianism
9	Death of the species	Death of the state

### References:

1. Blyakhman L. S. Scientific and technical progress. GRE. Volume 22. Moscow, 2013. P. 159-160.
2. Vasiliev N. M. The First World War 1914–18. GRE. Volume 25. Moscow, 2014. P. 590-600.
3. Vilinov A. M. Innovation process. GRE. Volume 11. Moscow, 2008. P. 392.
4. Gadzhiev K. S. Dictatorship. GRE. Volume 8. Moscow, 2007. P. 747.
5. Egorova N. I. Cold War. GRE. Volume 34. Moscow, 2017. P. 132.
6. Kolganov A. M. Italo-Ethiopian wars. GRE. Volume 12. Moscow, 2008. P. 217.
7. Ledyayev V. G. Authoritarianism. GRE. Volume 1. Moscow, 2005. P. 167.
8. Ledyayev V. G. Democracy. GRE. Volume 8. Moscow, 2007. P. 513.
9. Lopatnikov D.L., Strashun B.A. and others. Spain. GRE. Volume 12. Moscow, 2008. P. 26.
10. Scientific and technological revolution. GRE. Volume 22. Moscow, 2013. P. 158-159.
11. Orlov A. S. The Second World War 1939-45. GRE. Volume 6. Moscow, 2006. P. 69-77.
12. Restructuring. GRE. Volume 25. Moscow, 2014. P. 668-670.
13. Popov V. A. Leadership. GRE. Volume 5. Moscow, 2006. P. 557.
14. Popov Yu. N. Totalitarianism. GRE. Volume 32. Moscow, 2016. P. 316-317.
15. Samburova E. N., Gudoshnikov L. M. et al. China. GRE. Volume 14. Moscow, 2009. P. 75.
16. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics // Encyclopedia Krugosvet (Electronic encyclopedia, on Russian). URL: [http://www.krugosvet.ru/enc/istoriya/SOYUZ\\_SOVETSKIH\\_SOTSIALISTICHESKIH\\_RESPUBLIK\\_SSSR.html](http://www.krugosvet.ru/enc/istoriya/SOYUZ_SOVETSKIH_SOTSIALISTICHESKIH_RESPUBLIK_SSSR.html) (date accessed 10.06.2018).



17. Sysoeva A.S., Telnova N.O. et al. Chile. GRE. Volume 34. Moscow, 2017. P. 575-588.

18. Chirkin V.E. Monarchy. GRE. Volume 20. Moscow, 2012. P. 717-718.

19. Schemelinin K. S. Money. Simferopol.: IT "Arial". 2014. (on Russian)

20. Schemelinin K. S. Scheme and principles of school education, which by the age of 18 will form a spiritually free, creatively developed, healthy and patriotic specialist. Alley of Science. 2018. No. 1 (17). Volume 4. P. 245-246. (on Russian)

21. Schemelinin K. S. Theory and laws of civil wars. Synergy of Sciences. 2018. № 20.

22. World Population Prospects - Population Division // United Nations (Electronic database). URL: <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/DataQuery/> (date accessed: 18.10.2018).

Note: GRE is the abbreviation for the Great Russian Encyclopedia (on Russian)