

THE IDEA OF “SOVEREIGN DEMOCRACY”: EXPERIENCE OF INTERPRETATION

MIKHAIL ODESSKIY

1. The formula "sovereign democracy" as a definition of a political system of modern Russia in the beginning has been offered by the powerful representative of Presidential administration, and then called into question by other representative not less powerful. The arbitration has not been involved. President Vladimir Putin did not show special sympathy to this formula. Disputes have begun. If the formula "sovereign democracy" expresses search of official ideology, it should undergo to procedure of philological interpretation.

2. The formula "sovereign democracy" has quite naturally raised the doubts, because it is obviously tautological. If "democracy" – is a substance and "sovereignty" – is an attribute it is meant, that "democracy" can be characterized by an attribute of "sovereignty", and at the same time can not be characterized so. However it is not so. The authority is sovereign at any form of the state: both at a monarchy, and at democracy. In XVI century - in the French kingdom - the similar thesis could shock. The word "sovereignty" formed from a word "sovereign" - the master, the monarch (compare Italian *sovrano*), did not associate in any way with democracy - authority of people. Boden accented: "the National form of governing is no other, but a part of the sovereignty ". Thus - since times of Boden - as far as democracy is the form of the state so far it is the form of the sovereignty so far it is sovereign. And no other way: there can be no "not sovereign democracy".

3. In modern linguistics the doctrine about various functions of language, however, is successfully developed. Thus base function of language - communicative - appears to be not unique: alongside with communicative (and other functions) there is expressive function of language. It is characteristic for ideology, policy, other spheres of social being. The formula "sovereign democracy" is obviously intended not for scientific, but more likely for the ideological use. At this approach indication on tautology and other logic incongruities is not a result, but the beginning of philological procedure.

4. Continuing the analysis of the formula "sovereign democracy", it is possible to ascertain, that the term "sovereignty" first of all habitually has the "international", "foreign policy" sense, designating independence of the state. Democracy is the form of the state, ideally the distinctive attribute of the state - independence, that means that ideally any democracy is sovereign and, from the point of view of communicative function of language, definition

"sovereign democracy" – is again tautological. The epithet "sovereign", being demanded on a background of "color" revolutions, declares not the state independence of the Russian Federation, but ideological line on independent - free from dictatorship of the USA and their allies - foreign policy.

5. Independence of foreign policy means independence in interpretation of democracy - the right for adaptation of known democratic principles with reference to a historical originality of Russia, to traditions of its statehood. From this point of view, the formula "sovereign democracy" reminds the Soviet formula "national democracy". In modern Russia the formula "sovereign democracy" is the declaration of original understanding of the political system.

6. The epithet "sovereign" declares independence in sphere of internal policy, readiness to resist to various groups of influence: to "oligarchs", "regionalists", - down to opposition to the civil servants, to the bureaucratic device. In this respect expressive content of the formula "sovereign democracy" is related to other modern formula - "dictatorship of the law". The "internal political" sense of the formula "sovereign democracy" is close to the formula "the stable state", popular among American politologists. The closeness is especially convincing, because Russia, as is known, during Putin's all second term exists in an atmosphere of "the problem 2008", and "stability" borrows the American experts mainly in connection with understanding of change of the state policy after the elections.

7. So, "sovereign democracy" – within the limits of expressive function of language - expresses installation on (1) foreign policy which is not conterminous with a policy (politics) of the West; (2) specificity of the self-description of the Russian statehood; (3) ideal of internal political stability. At the same time, this interpretation in any way does not cancel the initial thesis that – within the limits of communicative function of language – the formula "sovereign democracy" is illogical. Similar dual interpretation reflects obvious imperfection of the formula "sovereign democracy", and a mental situation, indicative for the modern civilized world. Culturologists define this situation as "postmodernism" that means crisis of a totalitarian, convincing word, is wider - crisis of a word. However it is lawful to predict, that devaluation of a word will lead Russia - as well as the countries of the West - not to refusal of ideological formulas, but to activization of their manufacture, to attempts to change from policy to optimization of political technologies.