Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai

Facultatea de Istorie ş i Filosofie

<u>**Synopsis**</u>

Doctoral Thesis

<u>**Contemporary debates concerning the axiology of democracy**</u>

Doctorand: *Coordonator:*

Felix-Corneliu Ardelean   **Prof. Univ. Dr. Liviu-Petru Zăpârţ an**

Cluj-Napoca, 2010

Content:

Current debates on the axiology of democracy

I.   Conceptualization, justification and methodology

For over two millennia have passed since the first conceptualization of democracy in ancient Greece as both theory and practice of that period were the raw material for one of the fundamental debates of mankind. Wherever there is a community, any community is the inherent problem that the rules governing it. As the community grows in complexity, as it turns into a company - inevitable - Social Norming becomes an absolute necessity. Has long been a commonplace that the individual and society are living, somewhat paradoxically, both symbiotic and conflicting factors. The main consequence of this conflict is what the Greeks called Politeia (πολιτεία) and extrapolating what we call Norming society. Regardless of ideological attachment, axiological orientation or political pragmatism can give an axiomatic character of society need standardization.Varying degrees and shades in this normalization process is subjective but the process entails an absolute necessity.

Within these social norms distinguish a number of categories more or less relevant: moral norms, legal norms and economic rules. I will refer to all rules of social policy of any kind, from their conceptualization to development and how their implementation, involving all or part of a community.Before going further conceptual clarification is necessary as some, for others, namely purely semantic distinction between political science and political philosophy. At first glance, the distinction between the two domains of knowledge is that one is science and one's philosophy. For many people, identified with political philosophy and political theory thus becomes a subdomain of political stint, which procupă while theory and political practice.

A new conceptualization of the nature of political philosophy and a reaction against the rationalism of Western thinking is exacerbated notes from Michael Oakeshott, *Rationalism in Politics,* (1962).Rationalism is seen as a tragedy because the recent past giving us an independent conservative neo-classical tradition to associate it with religion, moral or social hierarchy. Also during these years his works have been published which Hanah Arendt, from the

apolitical nature of human nature critical of traditional political philosophy whose redefinition is crucial for understanding the past totalitarian regimes, *The Human Condition* (1958), *Between Past and Future* (1961).Arendt sees politics as active participation in public life, as opposed to seclusion in the needs of each individual. Politics, as common public life becomes a noble expression of human nature which collectively create institutions and laws governing daily. Following Arendt, the social come to dominate politics, the burden fell increasingly common ruling of land administration needs converging mass movements, economic forces and state interference. Arendt's distinction between political and social present is rejected on the grounds that the social must be a constant concern of politics, social justice is a sine qua non of freedom and equality.

In the same period were published two essays of Isaiah *Berlin, Two Concepts of Liberty* (1958) and *Does Political Theory Still there?* (1962) outlining the plurality of moral values as a concept reducible, thus causing monism moral majority's past political philosophy. Rough shape and modern liberalism that gives Berlin is proving extremely influential in the coming decades.

We can not move forward without mention Karl Popper, Leo Strauss, Eric Vogelin or FA Hayek, whose influence was observed consistently in subsequent political concepts. Can be identified three major characteristics of political philosophy in the years 1950-1960, by Bhikhu Parekh, *Political Theory: Tradition in political philosophy* (1996).First, these decades have belonged to Guru. Major figures listed above were not engaged in critical dialogues, each with its own followers and establishing their own schools of thought. For example, Arendt's entire work there is almost no reference to Berlin and Popper, but only a few to Oakeshott. Secondly, all these thinkers have dealt with criticism from various political philosophy without current as positivism, existentialism and behaviorism. Reduced the political philosophy of criticism from some personal preferences without universal legitimacy being either impossible or necessary, or both.

The turning point in recent political philosophy was the opposite undoubtedly Magnus 1971 John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice.* The main conceptual difference between Rawls and his predecessors was the allocation of normative political philosophy, or political philosophy is not only assuming the right to propose desirable political structure, but was also ready to deliver a theory about man, not only about the company. Putting justice as the central concept of his

philosophy, Rawls tied her economy, psychology or social policy. Rawls's work was interpreted by many, wrongly I might say, as an argument to intervenționalismului state in establishing a social and economic equality and this coming from a liberal theorist. Rawls has provided theoretical support to legitimize a liberal democratic state to intervene through its public policies to ensure a relatively egalitarian distribution. Sudden reaction was realized in *Anarchy, State and Utopia* Robert Nozick (1974) which stated that an equal distribution is derived directly from the free transfer of property originally legitimate interference in free trade is wrong in principle.Nozick's theory provides the conceptual core of liberty, Rawls tries to create a balance between liberty and equality, compatibility being one of the fundamental problems of recent political philosophy.

Subsequently, noted several attempts to resolve the dispute within the meaning of continuation and improvement of Rawls's theory. Thus, it proposes an egalitarian liberal conception of justice based on a neutral dialogue (Bruce Ackerman, 1980) or participatory democracy as a fundamental value of egalitarian liberalism (Amy Guttman, 1980) or a social-democratic political program compatible with liberal values (Wellman, 1982, Streba, Goodin, 1988). Amartya Sen's attempt should be highlighted to show that equality-freedom opposition is false. In *Inequality Reconsidered* (1992) is growing freedom and exercise of human skills amid egalitarian ethic vary according to individual needs.We must not forget the contributions of Marxist-inspired left as Kai Nielsen in *Equality and Liberty* (1985) where the two values are considered compatible or R. Peffer *in Marxism, morality and social justice* (1990) J. Reiman and the *Justice and modern theory morals* (1990), which combines theory with Rawls' conception of anti-social and economic exploitation.

A number of different views on the role of politics in society have emerged in modern times. A first vision for a political philosophy as interpretative and local scale (Michael Waltzer, *Interpretation and Social Criticism,* 1987).He criticizes abstract political philosophy requiring it to be applied to a specific community. Undoubtedly a significant pragmatic value - which is hard punch of this perspective - it is waiving the universe too high a price to pay for a domain of knowledge whose aspirations do not take into account cultural differences.N u can talk about politics without discussing people and can not talk about people not report us to the universal.Another view has it that the main spokesman Richard Rorty, who in *contingency, Irony*

and Solidarity (1989), based on a concept of postmodern theory challenges the primacy of thought suggests an empirical political philosophy.Although somewhat hidden, local nature and interpretation of this doctrine remains visible, so they raise the same objections as the previous theory. Nevertheless be retained realistic criticism to theoretical thinking that require a less rigid way of thinking and abstract. These two were said conceptualization more than historical reasons that real options are clear, we believe that the nature and extent of political philosophy can not only convey the universality. The third concept is the thinkers belonging to the years 1950-1960 (Arendt, Vogelin, Berlin, etc..) Reborn in the works: *After Virtue* (Alistair, MacIntyre, 1981), *Political Theory and Modernity* (William Connoly, 1988) or *the Sources of Self* (Charles Taylor, 1990).For them, despite the moral dimension of politics is a branch of moral philosophy but should focus on understanding human beings in modernity and to apply this understanding to specific contemporary political life. Contemplation and no prescription is the basic directive, self-knowledge and sharing this knowledge. At the other pole we have the followers of John Rawls's moral philosophy promoting regulatory policy aimed at the final design of political institutions and procedures.This prescriptive moral character and is found in works such as: *Social Justice in the Liberal State* (Bruce Ackerman, 1980) and *Democracy and Power* (B. Barry, 1991).

Whether a designation theory, science or philosophy, the study involves the study of modern politics and the human as an individual member of society, rights and responsibilities inherent in that status, the study of institutions and political systems, their legitimacy and morality rather than them trying improve them for Policy Studies is a bare presentation of the past but a necessity to highlight and outline the opportunities and prospects, challenges and solutions to evolutionary perspectives. Academic distinction between these terms, even if questionable value education and this is the result of petrified ivory towers in the dichotomy between contemplation and critical reflexivity prescriptive.A narrow vision of politics requires a fundamental limitation of the knowledge birth results and therefore unacceptable conclusion.

Returning to the essence of the current debate, as described above policy has been reduced to a modern framework within which determined the place all relevant debates.This is the democracy in general and in particular Western democracy. David Hume states *"Research on*

human intellect" that any significant statement of the universe must be treated with some degree of doubt.

We use as example the following statement: Democracy as a form of government with universal jurisdiction, applicable to all mankind, it is preferable to any other form of governance for any individual.Applying maximum of Hume, we adopt an agnostic approach (α - γνώσις) through which the truth value of this proposition is either unknown or can not be proved and we will try to determine the possible connotations and interpretations will be maintained either cancel for initial agnostic perspective.

Viability and desirability of democracy itself in the long term are put under a magnifying glass to review the current democratic primary deficiencies. Chronic inefficiency due to irrational premise vote, majority tyranny, moral decay, instability and corruption are facts to be found in any modern democracy. However no alternative has not demonstrated the superiority of democracy, whether we speak of a particular form of totalitarianism, fundamentalism, communism, anarchism or protectorate.

We can build ja drawing a syllogism.Thus the first premise is: Democracy is imperfect, possibly unsustainable long term. The second premise is: Not yet identified any alternative to democracy. The bottom line is our initial statement on preferabilitatea democracy.

I have so far avoided getting into rigid definitions specific to a more flexible conceptualization of the subject of this paper. Without postulating failure of democracy we can say its fallibility. Thus to understand and clarify the theoretical and practical mechanisms of democracy have to try a deconstruction of democratic theory. As I said democracy means an accumulation of social norms of various bills that define us all of us in community life. These rules are the application of principles, which, in turn, are concrete values that represent the foundation of any theoretical or practical construction. How individuals and society rank, and apply these values are reflected reflective process of self-definition. Any democratic system is built around binomial freedom-equality. Perpetual conflict between these two values is the fine line that anyone who wants to intervene, is bound to fly. Various rules and concepts that no longer apply uniform policy for all individuals requiring a new theory of both authority and legitimacy of political obligation in general, but a sufficiently flexible so as to accommodate

different morality. Traditional definitions of crucial concepts of political philosophy must be so adapted to a multicultural society.

This paper seeks to explore these values and based on this analysis to identify thread axiological between empirical values and democracy as the ultimate goal of eliminating the specific flaws of political modernity. It is our belief that rethinking axiological perspective on democracy is the only way to avoid long-term transformation of democracy into a colossus with feet of clay.

II.   Axiology of democracy

In this second chapter we conceptualize components of democracy. We begin by synthesizing axiological concept of freedom as understood in modern political philosophy, with specific references to Hayek and Berlin as the main teroreticieni of its ideological synthesis followed by an analysis of freedom, reflected in everyday politics in modern liberalism. Chapter contains a presentation symmetrically equal on the same coordinates. We start from the Rawls-Nozick debate, where social justice associate with egalitarian distribution of resources in society, to get equal rights Dworkin identified only related ultilizare prinr a right to liberty. Finally, consider briefly the egalitarian ideology of social democracy and its modern recptarea.

At the end of chapter axiologiei democracy, analyze the relationship between two fundamental values, both in terms of consensus and conflict. The most visible manifestation of conflict is seen in terms of ideological, political doctrines built on these values, being in constant social and political conflicts in any modern democracy. As to consensus, but we relate to the role of the modern state, whose existence undisputed within any democratic ideology. Operation of consensual reality, even poor, freedom-equality of the binomial in modern states is obvious. Any inter-human relation needs a system of rules for operation. This system is analyzed from the perspective of philosophy of law as a reflection of political values set.

A first understanding the concept of political freedom was the result in order and enlightened leadership. It is in Plato's Republic and the aim of democracy presupposes a lack of control variable that individuals and people, resulting in a rise of demagogy that end in tyranny.

Plato added that only virtuous action is entirely voluntary, so theorizing so-called inner freedom or moral. Thomas Hobbes in Leviathan while rejecting the notion of "philosopher kings," believe that freedom inherent in the natural state to be limited to achieve the desired order, a full freedom of an individual being in conflict with freedom of others. We are so conservative origins. Hobbes obviously not completely despise freedom. For him, a false vision associated with self-government and political freedom only popular republics were free, like John Milton or Nicollo Machiavelli and correct vision of freedom was concerned that "silence of laws" and "exemption from certain duties to the community" is relevant form of government. On this basis and created by Benjamin Constant's famous distinction between the ancients and the liberty of the moderns, unlike Hobbes, as he self-government as a form of freedom.

In modern political freedom value reached a level of worship, is overrated in the first and most basic human need resulting principle of liberal political doctrine. Even theorists of freedom but some amendments were accepted. Thus the *Four essays on liberty* (1969), Isaiah Berlin recognized that: "It is true that some people give in rags, illiterate, malnourished or debilitated by disease, political rights or safeguards against state interference in their private life is to beat your her game. Before understanding the significance of increases of their own freedom and to enjoy using it, these people need medical care and education. What is freedom for those who can not use it? What is worth it without the conditions essential to use them? Should start with the beginning [...] individual freedom is a primary necessity for any man " [1] .

Introducing the concept of liberty as he understood it in contemporary political philosophy must begin with the most complex contemporary restatement of the values as reflected in the work of Friedrich Hayek. Undoubtedly, *The Road to Serfdom* (1999), *Constitution of Liberty* (1960) and *Law, Legislation and Liberty* (1979) is a trilogy that redefines a number of concepts from the underlying freedom and any discussion about the value of freedom. Although Hayek treats the relationship between freedom and reason, tradition, responsibility. law, the welfare state, we will focus in this chapter only the value of freedom of political philosophy in terms of identifying key elements behind them, which we hope will allow a viable definition, freedom. We have already identified the state of freedom with the absence of coercion, that coercion smallest of the state or our peers.

Another confusion, probably the most common, associate freedom with the ability to do what we want, perfectly illustrated in one of Voltaire's statement: "To be truly free means to be. When can I do what I want, here's my freedom. " Dangerousness you customize that definition is presumed omnipotence in order to influence social event, with a special equate freedom and power. Identifying "get free" with "to get power, it was that" the notion of collective power over circumstances to replace the individual freedom and - in totalitarian states - that freedom is suppressed in the name of freedom " [2] .

A lofty for our discussion is that these meanings are not the same gender.Freedom of political power and freedom are different concepts of individual freedom and share it only with the linguistic aspect.They form a whole, there are branches of freedom but are simply some concepts, sometimes related, but fundamentally different. Thus, freedom as the absence of coercion is the sense in which we will refer below. Modern corollary of this pseudo-definition is obviously coercive monopoly of the state. Abstraction and depersonalization coercion backed by its Standards and monopolized by state security transormării is a tool they use to society as a whole.

The most important modern conceptualization of freedom is based on Isaiah Berlin's essay of *1957, Two concepts of liberty,* the freedom to differentiate between positive and negative liberty.Negative freedom is defined by the absence of state constraints or other people and involves restricting the minimum level of state intervention to protect the rights and fundamental freedoms. Positive freedom is greater as defined by identifying freedom with the ability to do what you want to be your own master. Hence the distinction between potentiality of the individual to do whatever he wants in the abstract that positive liberty theorists considered as fundamental, and timeliness of the possibility of abuse of that freedom. Negative freedom implies therefore a main limitation of the concept of preventive liberty, and the presumed positive to total freedom and state intervention only in situations where freedom of others is affected. Positive freedom, but using advertising to ensure each state "power or ability to do something positive worth doing or worth to enjoy" (Norman Barry, *An Introduction to Modern Political Theory,* 1995).

Once freedom was transformed from a purely philosophical value in a rule in November on a conception of political power, freedom of expression and it becomes a law requiring

protection, a method of training in state decisions. A speech on civil liberertăților, liberalism is a "form of institutional engineering" (Pascal Delwit, *Liberalism and liberal parties in Europe,* 2003).Liberalism is the concept that proclaims the validity and effectiveness of response to the challenges of democratic norms. It was even considered, the primary constituent syntax of political thought "or" one size of our political imagination. "

In conclusion, in short, liberalism may be characterized by several ideas that d efinesc political nature.Thus, the political order can and should be based on each individual. On the basis of political order that the individual standing is able to control their passions and desires.Policy agenda is the manifestation of this capacity for self-control individuals. Nature has endowed human beings with the ability to think independently and act according to his ideas. Interest in own self, enlightened by reason, is a legitimate action principle and foundation of social order. Each individual is free to choose their way of life, ultimate values, social position, etc..

Desire to complete freedom is an essential feature of human nature. Law prevails and should reign over everyone as long as is in accordance with natural right to life, liberty and property. Free research may reveal the nature of reality, a reality whose laws can be permeated and understand the human mind.

Considering gender as a correspondence relationship between a group of people who have the same quality as regards at least one point of view, this should highlight the distinction between equal and identical or similar concepts. Generally known two understandings of the concept of equality, on the one hand the people that Fundation an equal beings, and secondly, a distributional justification for a more equitable distribution of property among men economic, social opportunities and power political.Fundation equality derives from the famous phrase: "all men are created equal." Obviously, this equality does not mean physical, intellectual and moral people as different as possible in these matters, somehow measurable. A first effect, as far as relevant, of the equality resulting from reporting the quality of human being, unlike animals, as is reflected politically. Theories of natural rights, as opposition to paternalistic governments argue that all people are endowed with the ability to înțelge rights and obligations. Utilitarian theory also says that every person has a similar capacity to feel pleasure, pain, etc.. Hence all of Kant's theory that all people have dignity as moral agents, capable, rational, which can make

moral laws which are subject to. The result of these theories is the conclusion that all people be treated equally.

The term "equality" should be read in conjunction i in itself to identify its correct meaning.From Aristotle issue was still relevant cases, saying the policy he (1282, b): "Persons who are equal should be equal part (...). But in what respect the equal and unequal? ". Aristotle's conception, the criterion for differentiating between relevant and irrelevant bases is the determination of human virtue which he deserves some good.

There are, of course, some areas almost unanimously recognized that equality is clearly evident.Thus it is not controversial legal equality before the law, political equality and equality in human rights, civilian or the moral. Major debates in the field related to economic equality and social views are specific major political ideologies.

This brings me to the conflict between equality and freedom and I argued that social and economic equalization automatically implies a restriction of freedom.Yet reality shows us that equality as mere absence of discrimination, contravenes one is incapable of emergence of social conflicts, and any political theory must be reported to practical reality. Practice tells us that pure liberalism is insufficient, and the corollary of this statement is that however we must start from the liberal views that adapt to the realities of life.

Any good political order must have as one of its fundamental principles of justice.His company went so far right was synonymous with a good company, which is a dangerous exaggeration.

To illustrate the problem of justice will make a parallel between how this concept is reflected by two authors representative of contemporary political philosophy, John Rawls in his *A Theory of justice* (1971) and Robert Nozick in *Anarchy, State and Utopia (1974).*Both authors consider that the company relies on some principles variable not defined on what a good life means. In their theory, the law is mainly good. Differences that separate them resulting from their ideas on how to configure the distribution company and the economic and social goods.

Regarding individual rights should consider a presentation of the concept of Ronald Dworkin, as a leading modern theorists of rights.So he asks if we have a right to liberty? Thomas

Jefferson considered and the time to give the right to liberty enjoyed more attention than those of his rival rights to life and the pursuit of happiness. Freedom has named the most influential political movements of the last century and many of those who now despise liberals reasons that they are not liberal enough. Of course almost everyone agrees that the right to liberty must be limited for example by restrictions that protect the safety or property of others.However the consensus in favor of a certain right to liberty is important.

Essential philosophical conclusion is that freedom is the foundation of law, both in fundamental human rights system and in the regulation of state authorities.

Political philosophy are the values that distinguish the various doctrines and political ideologies. How reporting to freedom, equality and justice leads to different classifications that marks this policy. A classification of political ideologies as political values provides Ronald Inglehart, in several books recounting his measurements on five continents.Axis, materialism / post-materialism "Inglehart's was initially much simpler, comprising only four terms (freedom of expression and greater public participation in government decisions that election and post-materialist" and combat price increases and maintaining public order, the election, materialistic "), to create after, the extension study and on other continents than Europe, the eight terms (less impersonal society, more participation in professional decisions with more participation in decisions Political ideas are more important than money, free speech, most beautiful cities - like elections, post-materialist "and combat price increases, maintaining a stable economy, economic growth, maintaining order and strong army - elections, materialistic."

Therefore say that the line in individual liberty is between two political concepts mentioned, tending a dogmatic assertion, like "truth is always in the middle, but a statement based on practical reality. Excessive liberalization and political laissez-faire led to broad social problems and excessive asistenţialismul led to bankruptcy and violation of the principle of freedom. Consequently, reflections on freedom need to understand this.

Relations between people requires a stable institutional framework. Law that requires the rule of law is a universal value reecunoscută.We will try to link p are present in this section of the core values addressed in previous chapters and philosophy of law in the shape of the current show.

The notions of right and wrong are interdependent and complementary. However strange it may seem right because there is essentially rape and its violabilității. If the lack of injustice, it would make sense affirmation law because it could not establish a distinction between fair and unfair actions and could not rule any action.

III.   The Libertarianism – Communitarianism Debate

The third chapter is dedicated to the debate between libertarianism and communitarianism and its role in modern axiological debate crystallization. In essence, the debate started from a postulation of the failure of humanity as a whole to reach a common conception of the good. Theoretical disputes arising out of this debate have many facets axiological, with direct results in modern political practice.

Last years of political philosophy were and are still marked by ideological conflict between two ideals of social organization, which has one center and one individual and his rights to organize society around the idea of community. Terms and comunitarianism libertariansim cover the meaning given in this paper, a wide range of valences and meanings in order to identify valid arguments. Liberal thinkers like John Rawls, Robert Nozick and Ronald Dworkin focuses its projects on the values of liberty, equality and tolerance, accepting the idea of an infinite variety of human archetypes and social models.

Among them there are, however, strong differences of view, of which it is noted first aspect of the fundamental values enshrined in its concept of human rights and the second aspect of value from a utilitarian perspective, functional. Libertarian model involves developing a concept of human rights that are not based on a subjective view of good, but self-determination characteristic of a multi-cultural society. Communitarian challenge to this model supports the one hand there is a single viable social model - idealized - based on shared values in the community coupled with a strong civic spirit. Thus, thinkers like Alasdair MacIntyre, Charles Taylor, Michael Sandel generally oppose liberal individualism and independence of the general concept of good in particular.

Obviously there is a principled mutual recognition in relation to a number of concepts to the conflict.Thus, libertarienii deemed necessary shared vision, shared by the entire community, the human rights framework and support institutions that promote and defend these rights and values correspondent.

Comunitarians, on the other hand, recognize the impossibility of a society where all individuals share the same values, supporting the idea of a specific level of expression of individualism. Both theories recognize and accept the individual as a member of society, being intrinsically social, that the only way it can develop.The main differences consist in what kind of society the individual can obtain a maximum of meeting you, fulfillment, happiness.

One of the fundamental principles of liberal political philosophy is that democratic institutions should not depend on their neutrality, a partisan of good design, any design such as individual prerogative. Thus the community would be irrational to impose a particular vision of the good. An autonomous and rational individual selects its own set of conceptions of the good while accepting another set of moral rules applicable to the community. This customization is what Alasdair MacIntyre critical, calling it "privatization good. Post a recent collection of articles by Charles Taylor, but can suggest the best light in which it is placed: *"How much community needs democracy?"*That the Communist movement began in the '80s in the U.S., the works of political philosophy of Charles Taylor, Michael Sandel and Michael Walzer. New the Communist philosophy are united by the conviction that policy should pay more attention to practices and shared meanings in each society. They agree with the fact that it requires a modification of traditional principles of liberalism and social rights. They however differ in terms of how these principles should be modified. We can distinguish three different trends, sometimes conflicting, of the Communist thinking. Some believe that the Communist community replaces the need for principles of justice. Community justice and others as being perfectly consistent, but consider that a proper assessment of community values require us modify our conception of what justice really is. The latter fall into two camps. One camp argues that community should be seen as a source of principles of justice, the other camp argues that community should play a greater role in the content of principles of justice.

In the following pages we examine libertarianism as a moral concept with strong political implications.Any design starts from defining moral differences between good and evil, from the

viewpoint of liberal ethics we refer only to the moral may affirm a society. The essence of liberal ethical doctrine lies in the fact that it is not an alternative to other moral doctrines but constitute a general framework within which a person may follow different alternatives, thus representing a basic doctrine on which to base various other ethical ideologies, some different. Jeffrey Reiman calls this version liberal "ideal of individual sovereignty" [3] .This ideal is to maximize individual liberty so that they can lead lives according to their will. Obviously here we associate the idea of negative freedom that Berlin and maximize individual liberty mention may be made to limit the cost of freedom of another individual. Apply a liberal standard in a choice of voluntary ethical concepts and conscious individual and the mechanisms of such individual choices must be inspired by an education system compatible.

It would be a wrong perspective to understand that the criticism of the state without liberal democracy and Communitarianism wants the suppression of individual self-determination within the state. In contrast, Communitarianism wants preservation of democracy (where it exists) and the policies he proposed, just trying to improve democratic structures. Moreover, Communitarianism and wants to be a critical autoritasismului and totalitarianism of all kinds, as we shall see. I just made this statement to insert criticism of Communitarianism bring democracy. This is a devastating critique in the sense that Marxism-Leninism (which he did not deny democracy, formula) bring democracy "bourgeois." Communitarianism critical democracy (especially the liberal) as a form of government that should be improved and not changed. For the Communist democracy is as necessary as for liberalism, because the communities they develop and interact freely (default) compete with each other, it coagulates in autodivid and social organizations whose need is on the reality of existence at a time in society.

IV.   <u>A new axiological paradigm</u>

In previous chapters I have attempted a deconstruction of democratic theory, by reducing it to those fundamental elements, against which modern society is built. Thus, we argued that social norms that govern our daily practice is the applicability of political ideologies, ideologies based on a set of functional principles that represent the formalization of baseline. I further argued that such an axiological perspective of society in general and democracy in particular, is the only realistic way to combat the inherent flaws of modern democracies.

Undoubtedly, the complexity of modernity seems at first sight difficult to be subsumed under such an axiological perspective that by its very definition they seek to simplify and clarify. The shift from simple to complex, from values to principles of the ideology and principles of the ideology to rule also requires the shift from simple to complex, from the particular to the universal. But the process itself, axiological quantification methodology is not the democracy that works. Our argument is that modern democracies functional failures are caused by deficiencies in the process, a process that certainly needs many improvements, but the axiological basis of democracy itself. I have previously argued that this dichotomy is based on freedom, equality axiological. Obviously not deny the existence of the binomial to democracy, only his sufficiency.

To further analyze the failure axiological theory of democracy, introduce the concept of ethical discussion. In putting this issue, that is to see politics and ethics into a totality, the most appropriate form of thinking which would assume this responsibility would be the dialectic. But on this view and this preference can not yet make a fundamental attitude.

Thus, one of the first thinkers who never saw an opposition between morality and politics was Fichte. His philosophy, existentialism solipsiste opposite vision, expressed all the dialectical unity between individual and social. This, of course Fichte did by his own logic by empirically demonstrating the relationship between ego and ego completely. This transition, from me to another, that French existentialism was unable to demonstrate an even Fichte outpaced by its

assertion of the idea, because he just turned me from an already populated by other me (this deduction is But for Fichte can not only started a solipsist cogito).

On the other hand, by Polin's view, Hegel is the first modern thinker besides states shows that between May and there is a moral and political unity.

Hegel highlight a nine indisputable doctrine regarding the relationship between moral and political, is the problem of antinomies nemaipunându. However, this design contains an error Polin's partly because Hegel himself fell into an antinomy when the state has - as the main expression of politics, under the concept of ethics.

It is known that the inseparability of morality and law is one of the most important themes of Hegel's philosophy of law. In addition, policies and default state as its form of manifestation within the same category. Therefore, politics, morality and law established between them and their separate dialectical logic and history is not conceivable. And I say history because, if an objective necessity to talk about her, then this objective necessity has its basis in a move rather than universal, and also a historical reality and history itself that generality can be regarded as a single whole. Therefore, Hegel uses forced somewhat philosophical approach to the event and applies more or less individual analysis of the relationship between political and ethical and what is highlighted if it is just more of his model to deal with.

Kant public appearance in four years of work Critique of Pure Reason (1785) first research on ethics, which he considered an Introduction, namely a foundation for metaphysics of morals. It thereby aims to make intelligible the phenomenon of morality, or in other words: How is morality possible? ; Elaborating what he called the foundation of the metaphysics of morals which had to be an explanation of the possibility of morality as a phenomenon. The main point of leaving Kant to develop a moral "pure" is based on empirical moral philosophies that range from Epicurus and Hume and then to Wolff, he reprimanded them that these philosophers have chosen a method to treat the possibility of morality , relying on an inductive but with her claim of universality and necessity, in other words mixed with the empirical parts priori. On this foundation, Kant's main concern is that the real reason to report, making the transition from unstable eteronoma complexity of reality, simplicity and purity of (formal) autonomy of reason.

Kant's practical approach is the foundation to build a scientific ethics, because given the fact that what is needed not only experience but also what conditions are the terms of morality. So Kant seeks scientific foundation to base an ethic which is based on the idea of freedom and then make the transition from metaphysics of morals to the critique of pure practical reason.

Yet Kant assumes that there are still philosophers (Hume) we say that moral judgments, if they are entirely true, is true only if you are assertive in a particular experience can be felt or even if they can not be and true and false, since nothing is aserteaza not merely expressions of emotions Kant replied saying that there is a difference between moral judgments and the empirical, namely that moral judgments can not be verified by experience (inductive) "But suppose, by common man as moral judgments can be true or false (...) and if the trial proves to be true, then it should be considered a priori judgments. "

We talked earlier about the values and ideology, deliberately neglecting their application process.Without directly the subject of our work, we consider it necessary to introduce democracy in our ethical theory to a conflict of ideas that marked much of the twentieth century and whose political reverberations are felt in the current postmodern theories. In our attempt to outline a framework of ethical democracy quickly identify a conflict between theory and practice, between reality and desire, between what we want, what we do, and what is done in reality.

A comparative analysis of works of Jurgen Habermas and Michel Foucault is analogous to a fundamental tension in modernity - that between normative and real, between what should be done and what is factual. Modern democracies are established theoretical basis of such tensions. Civil society, seen as a means of strengthening democracy and the relationship between the two central ideas are found among the works of two thinkers. Habermas's discourse ethics and the concept of power as Foucault contrasts are made in the context of any attempt at democratic development of society. [4]

Valid any democratic project aims at strengthening civil society. There are many definitions of civil society, beyond which it can be said, relatively consensual, that includes a voluntary aosciere by entities outside the government and economy. Formation and participation in such an organization is one of the fundamental provisions of civic consciousness. Its basic role is to maintain and constantly redefine the boundaries between state and civil society. Here

we return to democracy axiology because relaizare way of these goals is just the expansion of individual freedom and social equality, along with restructuring and democratization of state institutions.

Following Kant, Habermas is the philosopher's "Moralitat" based on consensus, here Foucault, following Nietzsche is filosful real history, a conflict based on the notion of power. What we try to emphasize is that, in terms of axiological conflict and consensus are necessary prerequisites for a functioning democracy. We must not forget that civil society is included in the concept of inequality itself, because the original construction method.

Habermas says that the modern era was inaugurated by Kant, with its attempt to create the foundations for a democratic system. Kant's failure stems from the fact that he bases his theory on a subject-centered rationality, problems encountered in many modern thinkers. Habermas regarded as absolutely fundamental philosophical structure; necesarão social organization, failing that there are risks contextualismului, relativism and nihilism. Habermas's solution is to shift the emphasis of the subjectivity of inter-subjectivity, which will further define individuals as "gay democraticus.

One of the fundamental concepts in Foucault is of course the power. Its analysis, in particular reference to ethical and political concepts reveals a certain paradox. [5] Although Foucault is concerned about the apparent identification and operation of power relations, it does not create or build a new model assumptions would require overcoming the existing modes of domination. [6] A possible explanation suggests that Foucault could not allow a privileged political position, as this would have a privileged epistemological position. According to Foucault, all power regimes are regimes of truth and to postulate a privileged position of power involves the postulate a privileged position to the truth.

There is a strong tendency in recent years to associate the notion of irrationality democratic theory to the voter in a modern political system. Analyzing results and voter motivations Democrats, analysts like Bryan Caplan, postulates that rational voter is a myth of modern democracies. Neither efficient nor effective electoral decision is based not, but a number of subjective factors, based on personal experience of each. We chose to analyze this possibility in terms of sociological interpretation of voter action.

Choosing to make a comparison of the concept of action in Weber and Parsons has several motivations.First, in both authors, the concept of social action is central in building

social theory. Moreover, Parsons has taken this concept precisely to Weber, building, as I said, a theory is the claim of completeness, generality, unlike the theories of Max Weber and Emile Durkheim, he considers fragmentation.

We began this paper with an attempt of deconstruction of democratic theory.I found freedom, equality binomial as the structural basis on which modern democracies were built. I beheld the axiological model were formulated principles and conflicting political ideologies, which is currently dominated Western democracies.

The most recent daily axiological conflict is the debate Liberalism-Communitarianism, in particular the ideas emanating from the debate.Pair binomial axiological freedom-equality with the dichotomous notions of individual and society have created need to incorporate discussion of ethical concepts.

The ethical implications of any recent democratic theory, they are not optional, democratic political system with the risk of collapse under its own weight.Complexities of modern life constantly raises new challenges to conventional democratic values sometimes seem unable to respond. Placing an ethical component in the functioning of democracy itself - not just its related elements - becomes a functional necessity.

We previously presented a brief history of relations between ethics and politics, from Hegel and followed by Kant, Nietzsche, Habermas and Foucault.Currently the role of Ari was to identify a guiding thread, the evolution of coherent connection between politics and ethics.

Movements for economic justice and equality that have defined progressive politics of the early modern era had gradually to accommodate the progressive movements focused on the struggle for recognition, especially ethnic and national liberation, the civil and political rights and gender equality.

Ethics policy is the area formed by the tension between redistributive justice and fight for recognition. Questions about redistributive justice from the socialist tradition in order to redress the economic inequalities and under the influence of the binomial axiological equality and freedom. Questions about cultural recognition is derived primarily from new social movements

in post-modern, in order to redress the cultural identity of cognitive deficiencies and depreciation difference, and under the signs of recognition and difference.

Ethics Policy huge potential to mobilize moral sense of the Constituent Western societies.The common moral sense is defined notion of respect for the moral value of all persons and subscribe to many of cultural recognition applications have been successfully institutionalized in multiculturalism and equality legislation.

Ethics Policy facing the need to actively form a new political subjectivity and cultural norms necessary reform to undermine and replace the post-modern domination of daily anxiety.

Usually, public political debate is conducted arguing that doctrine or policy is able to provide maximum benefit society which is not itself the subject of public dispute. Values certainly can motivate political action and voters may prefer one party to another, based on the introduction of hierarchical values. But values are not easily changed and successful policy in general is charging values underpinning policy and the ability to effectively present to defend these values, rather than trying to change values held by voters or other political actors.

Ethics Policy extend political action and, in particular, facilitate the politicization "of everyday life in a new way. Ethics Policy political field open to all people, whether they have a political affiliation, or political knowledge and expertise. Ethics policy is both radical and non-elitist, while challenging, both mainstream and academics at a demanding level. Most importantly, a common area open ethics policy for the productive engagement of all parts of political thought.

Sometime between 1759 when Adam Smith's theory of moral sentiments and 1776 when he wrote an inquiry into the nature and causes of the Wealth of Nations, ethics and economics were finally separated, the economy is made up of people whose life was guided by the invisible hand .

Modernity has been characterized, according to Hegel, the emergence of civil society for centuries, because civil society is the first institution to introduce between families on the one hand and political life and on the other hand, these two traditional areas remained significant places for producing and defending human values and human needs, needs that could not be

supported by economic, regulatory and civil society generally. But even if the stock movement of domestic and political sphere of the economy has been effective in promoting and individual human needs, this has proved largely illusory, because the cost in community life and ethical standards undermine what has been achieved .

Global spread of democracy in the last generation was accompanied by the global spread of critics to democracy.In a sense, this is surprising: the popular ideas, tend to their opposition. The current popularity of democracy almost universally valued, institutionalized in more than three-fifths of world states, and sought by large movements in many other two-fifths makes it an ideal target for criticism. As a result, in recent years, a slow wave of skepticism and sometimes even hostility has emerged to challenge the claim of democracy thought to be the best form of government. This wave is distinct ideologies emerging from autocratic states. Unlike these ideologies, is a sustained critique, namely that democracy was developed largely by scientists in advanced democratic societies.

Unfortunately, the possible benefits of democracies could be compensated for damage done. It requires tolerance, a sense of context, and above all a full understanding of the types of human motivation to see why critics feasibility greşsesc democracy. Democracy is only possible because no alternative has developed well enough. Rather, it is possible simply because it is a form of government that evolves constantly evolving itself and its functioning necessary.Is a self-correcting in a way that other political systems do not have it. And why, ultimately, is that the demos has chosen to act in this way, people choose to be democratic.In the final analysis, they are most convincing evidence as to the possibility of democracy.

We can not have true democracy without democrats and citizens really have. An ethics education policy is the only realistic method, functional, long-term limitation of functional failures of the current democracy. While ethics is inextricably linked to any universal manifestation of democracy, involution chances they will be increasingly smaller. The existence of *homo democraticus* implies by its very nature, a strong ethical import as that red wire to a democratic future guiding universal.

Replacing a binomial liberty-equality with the equality-ethics-liberty triad in the modern democratic theory, becomes an existential imperative, necessary survival itself, democratic

political system in the evolutionary assault. However, the introduction of ethics to the shift in emphasis to democracy requires institutions and systems on the individual, regarded not only as singular appearance and Community. Democracy's dependence on the existence of a participatory, educated and responsible majority is the fundamental premise of building any modern future.

V. <u>Bibliography:</u>

1. **Arendt, Hanah** – *Conditia Umană*
2. **Aron, Raymond** – *Marxisme imaginare*, Ed. Polirom, Bucuresti, 2002
3. **Bailly, Jean-Christophe & Nancy, Jean-Luc** – *Compărem – Politică la viitor*, Ed. Idea design&print, 2002.
4. **Bobbio, Norberto** – *Dreapta şi stânga*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 1999.
5. **Bull, Hedley** – *Societatea anarhică*, Ed. Ştiinţa, Chişinău, 1998
6. **Caplan, Bryan** – *The Myth of the Rational Voter: Why Democracies Choose Bad Policies*, Princeton University Press, 2007
7. **Châtelet, François & Pisier, Evelyne** – *Concepţiile politice ale secolului XX*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 1994.
8. **Colectiv** – *Suveranitate naţională şi integrare europeană*, Ed. Polirom, Iaşi, 2002.
9. **Colectiv** – *Filosofia americană*, Ed. All, Bucureşti, 2000.
10. **Colectiv** – *Dicţionar de scrieri politice fundamentale*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2000.
11. **Dahl, Robert** – *Democraţia şi criticii ei*, Ed. Institutul European, Iaşi, 2002
12. **Delwit, Pascal** – *Liberalisme şi partide liberale în Europa*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2003
13. **Derrida, Jacques** – *Spectrele lui Marx*, Ed. Polirom, Iaşi, 1999.
14. **Dreyfus, Michel** – *Europa socialiştilor,* Institutul European Iaşi, 2000.
15. **Dworkin, Ronald** – *Drepturile la modul serios*, Ed. Arc, Bucureşti, 1998

16.   **Gadamer, Hans-Georg** – *Elogiul teoriei, Moştenirea teoriei,* Ed. Polirom, Bucureşti, 1999

17.   **Gardels, Nathan** – *Schimbarea ordinii globale*, Ed. Antet, Bucureşti, 1999.

18.   **Giddens, Anthony** – *A treia cale şi criticii ei*, Ed. Polirom, Iaşi, 2001.

19.   **Giddens, Anthony** – S*ociologie*, Ed. Bic All, Bucureşti, 2000.

20.   **Gray, John** – *Cele două feţe ale liberalismului*, Ed. Polirom, Iaşi, 2002.

21.   **Goodin, Robert E. & Hans-Dieter Klingermann** – *Manual de ştiinţă politică*, Ed. Polirom, Iaşi, 2005.

22.   **Jurgen Habermas** – *Discursul filosofic al modernităţii*, Ed. All, Bucureşti, 2000.

23.   **Hayek, Friedrich A**. – *Capitalismul şi istoricii*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 1998.

24.   **Hayek, Friedrich A**. – *Constituţia libertăţii*, Institutul european, Iaşi, 1998.

25.   **Hegel, G. W. F,** - *Principiile filosofiei dreptului*, Editura IRI, Bucuresti, 1996

26.   **Hegel, G. W. F**, - *Fenomenologia spiritului*, Editura IRI, Bucureşti, 2000

27.   **Hinsley, F. H**. – *Suveranitate,* Ed. Ştiinţa, Chişinău, 1998.

28.   **Hoffmann, Stanley** – *Sisiful european*, Ed. Curtea veche, Bucureşti, 2003.

29.   **Hoffmann, Stanley** – *Ianus şi Minerva*, Ed.Ştiinţa, Chişinău, 1999.

30.   **Huntington, Samuel** P. – *Ciocnirea civilizaţiilor*, Ed. Antet, Bucureşti, 1995

31.   **Howlett, Michael & M. Ramesh** – *Studiul politicilor publice*, Ed. Epigraf, Chişinău, 2004.

32.   **Hugli, Anton & Poul Lubcke** – *Filosofia în secolul XX*, Ed. All educational, Bucureşti, 2003.

33.   **Isaac, Jeffrey C**. – *Democraţia în vremuri întunecate*, Ed. Polirom, Bucuresti, 2000

34.   **Kelsen, Hans** – *Doctrina pură a dreptului*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2000

35.   **Locke, John** – *Al doilea tratat despre cârmuire-Scrisoare despre toleranţă*, Ed. Nemira, Bucureşti, 1999.

36.   **Lefort, Claude** – *Invenţia democratică*, Ed. Paralela 45, Bucuresti, 2002

37.   **Manent, Pierre** – *O filosofie politică pentru cetăţean*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2003

38.   **Marga, Andrei** – *Cotitura culturală*, Cluj university press, 2004.

39.   **Marga, Andrei** – *Filosofia unificării europene*, Ed. Fundaţiei pentru studii europene, Cluj-Napoca, 2001.

40. **Mill, John Stuart** – *Despre Libertate*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2001

41. **Miller, David Coord**.– *Enciclopedia Blackwell a gândirii politice*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2000.

42. **Nozick, Robert** – *Anarhie, stat şi utopie*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 1997.

43. **Ortega yGasset, Jose** – Europa şi ideea de naţiune, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2002.

44. **Popper, Karl R**. – *Mizeria istoricismului*, Ed. All, Bucureşti, 1998.

45. **Rawls, John** – *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971

46. **Rawls, John** – *Political liberalism*, Columbia University Press, 1996

47. **Revel, Jean-François** – *Marea paradă,* Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2002.

48. **Revel, Jean-François** – *Obsesia anti-americană*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2004

49. **Rousseau, Jean-Jacques** – *Contractul Social*, Ed. Antet, Bucureşti, 1998

50. **Smith, Anthony D**. – *Naţionalism şi modernism*, Ed. Epigraf, Chişinău, 2002.

51. **del Vecchio, Giorgio** – *Lecţii de filosofie juridică*, Ed. Europa Nova, Bucureşti, 1970

52. **Walzer, Michael** – *Spheres of Justice*, Basic Books, 1983

53. **Walzer, Michael** – *Pluralism, Justice and Equality*, Oxford University Press, 1995

54. **Walzer, Michael –** *Pluralisme et Democratie*, Editions Esprit, 1997

55. **Weimer, David L. & Aidan R. Vining** – *Analiza politicilor publice*, Ed. Arc, Chişinău, 2004.

56. **Zapartan, Liviu-Petru** – *Doctrine Politice*, Ed Chemarea, Iasi, 1994

57. **Zapartan, Liviu-Petru** – *Repere in stiinta politici*i, Ed. Chemarea, Iasi, 1992