

Democracy Theory

Janis Piils

Researcher

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6861875>

Published Date: 19-July-2022

1. INTRODUCTION

Democracy is the most universal political concept and with the best image of all political theory. What is already indisputable is “when can democracy be given?”, where dictatorships have taken the opportunity to allow democracy when it could be (in their opinion), which in a way legitimizes them and / or gives them a lot of coverage. The truth is that Democracy is susceptible at any time or place.

Democracy is based on the fact that it is the citizens who choose who governs. It implies the separation of powers (the Legislature, the Government and the executive branch, the Judiciary). Democracy is executed by voting. This is a formal Democracy [when the forms are met, something of Democracy is always there; but where there are no democratic forms, there is no Democracy]. In cases of democratic transition, the strongest point at which to cling to the new system is democratic formality.

Democracy raised from the perspective of pluralism and raised from the existence of a democratic political culture and with democratic formality, do not exclude other approaches. This occurs in countries with an advanced democratic culture. They are complementary perspectives.

- The existence of a democratic culture (important in cases of transitions): a society that is not able to handle the processes that allow the manifestation of a political will, can not have a democracy. Culture is strictly important (in the strict sense of the word), to know and practice all the mechanisms of democratic action. Scholars of political culture have focused on power (“what is it?”). For us, power is at our service. Democracy can only be based on democratic culture, because otherwise, it fails, even if the forms are correct. Almond and Verba embodied this in Civic Culture (also known as Democratic Culture). They defined the types of culture: parochial (in the sense of the English expression = dispersed, individualistic culture), of subject and participating culture. The first is one in which there is no true concept of what is public, common, so everything is done through the perspective of the individual. It is not able to contribute to collective power or demand collective power, so it is far removed from power. The second identifies the common interest with which power does, but does not have a full consciousness of claiming its rights before power; he is only ready to obey.

2. GENERAL APPROACH AND POLITICAL PARTIES

The third would be one in which the citizen participates in the process of social construction. According to Almond and Verba, in no society is there exclusively one of the three types, but there are mixed cultures, which are what need to be analyzed. Democracy is rooted in the parish-participant culture, because this citizen is aware of individuality and his interests, so he is motivated to act (he knows what he wants and wants to achieve); and he knows that to achieve this he must be integrated into the collective. The problem, for example, socialist, was that they lacked parish culture, even though they were fully aware of the common interest and action.

The proportional system of seats tends to give them to more than one list, directly or indirectly. The qualitative difference between one system and another is that the majority system tends to reduce the number of parties; and the proportional, in plural number of parties.

In the majority system only those who have won in one or more constituencies can have seats. A two-party system is more manageable and more stable the formation of governments. When a society is plural and there are minorities, they are always left out of Parliament with the majority system. Therefore, it only works in societies with a long political tradition and very homogeneous.

The proportional system makes it possible for small parties to get seats, and encourages the survival of these parties or the formation of new ones. The great advantage of this system is that it does not eliminate any party.

The majority system usually involves uninominal constituencies (one name per constituency). They are usually small, to accommodate one deputy only. The deputy in the small constituency is a well-known person, and tends to be more attached to the problems of the citizenry than to party strategies.

The proportional system tends to make large constituencies with many deputies, which is what allows for distributions between lists. It is a system widely used in new democracies and in not very integrated societies.

In Spain, in a new democracy and with a proportional system, society itself "created" a perfect majority system, with a tendency to reduce parties. This is the cause of great integration.

The corrected proportional system gives even more seats to the winner of the election, punishing small parties.

The lists can be:

- Open: where the voter can vote, within a list, the names they want. Obviously, they are not blocked.
- Closed: the voter votes ready, but not its members, giving more power to the party than the voter. They can be:
 - Blocked: in addition to the above, we can not change the order of the names.
 - Not blocked: we can change the order of the names in the list.

The Spanish system is of closed and blocked lists, which is simpler but more rigid. To vote on deputies and not on parties, the best thing is a majority system.

*? * (...)

• Political parties:

They are basically financed through taxes. Parties are organizations without capital (there is no investment), so their management tends to be bad (they spend a lot and badly), so they have huge funding needs. Advanced democracies have many electoral processes (European, general, regional, municipal ...). The big parties have campaigns in geometric cost progression. Possible solutions:

- Try by law to cut costs:
 - Prohibit certain types of actions (such as sending ballots home [printing, distribution ...], shorter campaign duration ...).
 - Remind parties to spend theirs, and stop subsidizing them. This would kill small parties. A procedure along these lines would be negative for democracy.

2°) Increase state funding. In theory, it could end up with illegal funding. In practice, parties, the more funding they have, the more they spend.

3°) A mixed system: seek that the parties activate their own resources (pay for seats and funding, to activate the participation of their militancy).

Illegal funding is one of the scourges of current political parties. In the US it is more settled, as funding by employers or companies is recognized and admitted; just as it is also often admitted that the favor is resolved.

Parties penetrate society through a whole fabric of organizations close to the parties (such as the BNG [SLG, CIG, A Nosa Terra ...]), although not always (PP).

Often, politics becomes a clientele business of: votes = political favors (i.e., political favors paid for with votes)

3. CONCLUSIONS

The parties make their decisions based on the forecast they make for the conquest of power. Before, parties selected their electorate, it was from there that they won their votes, and only exceptionally received votes from other social areas. Today, parties seek to capture the entire electorate, seeking to make fewer social distinctions. If parties need to give up ideology to win votes, it is done. This is greatly transforming the democratic process. Democracy is an instrument of social action that seeks to solve social problems and in trying to stay in power.

Politics is an instrument of maximum complexity, so its analysis is complex. Often, the narrator seeks the good reception of what he is saying, disregarding rationality; and often a newspaper article is reduced to a few sentences made.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Geschwender, J. A. (1968). Explorations in the theory of social movements and revolutions. *Social Forces*, 47(2), 127-135.
- [2] Johnston, H. (2011). *States and social movements* (Vol. 3). Polity.
- [3] McAdam, D., & Sewell, W. H. (2001). It's about time: Temporality in the study of social movements and revolutions. *Silence and voice in the study of contentious politics*, 1, 89-125.
- [4] Ramiro Troitiño, D. (2022). The Essence of Europe: Understanding Europe Through Its Designers. In *The European Union and its Political Leaders* (pp. 1-4). Springer, Cham.
- [5] Ramiro Troitiño, D. (2022). Jean Monnet: Neofunctionalism at Work in the European Integration. In *The European Union and its Political Leaders* (pp. 121-140). Springer, Cham.
- [6] Tarrow, S. G. (2011). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics*.
- [7] Troitino, D. R. (2013). *European integration: building Europe*. Nova Science Publishers.
- [8] Troitiño, D. R. (2021). La «Década Digital» de la Unión Europea: desarrollos e impactos sobre su ciudadanía y economía. *IDP: revista d'Internet, dret i política*, (34), 1-14.
- [9] Troitiño, D. R. (2021). Winston Churchill y el proceso de construcción europea. *Revista Notas Históricas y Geográficas*.