



Published by the decision of the Scientific Council
of Khachatur Abovian
Armenian State Pedagogical University



Department of Philosophy and Logic
named after Academician Georg Brutian



W I S D O M

3(19), 2021



*WISDOM is covered in Clarivate Analytics' Emerging Sources
Citation Index service*

YEREVAN – 2021

ISSUES OF COMPLEMENTING THE POLITICAL AND CIVIC CULTURE IN THE CONDITIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC TRANSITION OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA

Abstract

In this article, the authors have investigated the issues of complementarity of political and civic cultures in the Republic of Armenia and the importance of participation in their effective development. It has been stated that in the conditions of a democratic transition, participatory democracy can be false or marginal in nature, due to which it can be perceived as irresponsible freedom, but the reality is different. The manipulative and philosophical bases of participation were also studied. It has been substantiated the approach that in the absence of a consolidation, the new democratic space formed due to the active participation of the masses does not solve the problem of political stability, but on the contrary, deepens the crises of political development. It emphasizes that the effectiveness of the process of overcoming crises in the conditions of democratic transition of the Republic of Armenia requires scientific-analytical management based on the principles of consolidation, the professionalism of the strategic elites; especially after the “Velvet Revolution”. The relationship between democracy and demarchy were also studied.

Keywords: political and civic culture, democratic transition, participatory democracy, responsibility, biopolitics, E-participation, citizenship, demarchy.

Introduction

In recent decades, in the world scientific community, the study of political, civic culture and participatory democracy has been and will be one of the priority areas of scientists, which is very important and natural. This circumstance is explained by the fact that the citizen with political and civic culture, with his conscious participation, has a decisive influence in the process of improving his own quality of life, which is directly related to the development of the latest network society, information technology, mass media, manipulative, psychological and philosophical tools. We have observed political culture as *a set of cooperative principles* that define the expected behaviour of performers in the political system, emphasizing the need to reconcile liberal and traditional cultural values. *Political*

culture itself is “a political system embedded in the knowledge, feelings, and assessments of its citizens” (Almond & Verba, 2014, p. 29). G. Almond and S. Verba defining culture as psychological orientations towards social objects, considered the political culture of the nation to be the distribution of models of orientations on political objects among the members of the nation. Moreover, according to them, political orientations are “views and positions on the political system, its different parts, their own role in this system” (Almond & Verba, 2014, p.30). Referring to the American anthropologist C. Geertz’s concept of culture, which, in his own words, “It’s essentially semiotic,” then, agreeing with M. Weber’s view, C. Geertz (2004) states that “the human being is alive depending on the web of woven meanings” and “culture is part of that web” (p. 11). According to C. Geertz (2004),

“culture is the most important condition of human existence and the set of control mechanisms - programs, recipes, rules, instructions that regulate human behavior” (pp. 55-56.) According to the American researcher - the founder of symbolic-interpretive anthropology: “If a person was not guided in his behavior by models developed by symbol design systems, his behavior would be practically uncontrollable” (Geertz, 2004, p. 57). During the research, we set ourselves the task of studying and defining that a citizen with a political culture is able to clearly separate the priorities, formulate requirements and to present to the elite the democratization issues of the culture of exercising power. The next task was to identify the causes of the RA “Velvet Revolution”, the tools of implementation and the charisma of a leader. Confirm once again that information technologies, digital, manipulative and psychological tools were of key importance in the above-mentioned process and highlight the unity of the population, the consolidation of the centre-periphery. Analyze biopolitical power and processes and present the relationship between democracy and demarchy.

Results and Discussion

Modern political science has many definitions of political culture. The latter, we can say, is attached to the civic culture, and one is the logical complement to the other. Returning to the definitions of G. Almond and S. Verba civic culture, *we should state that the participatory type of political culture is more dominant in this case.* In such societies, where civic culture is already shaped, people have civic and political activity, but this does not mean that one is always at the centre of political processes, but *that he realizes the role of his participation in political processes and in case of need, he can make a smooth transition from passivity or marginality to conscious active civic and political participation. In conclusion, a citizen with political culture, having complete information on political development*

and modernization, knowledge, the idea of his / her participation, realizing its importance in the process of achieving the desired result, is able to clearly separate the priorities, formulate requirements and to present to the elite the democratization issues of the culture of exercising power.

In the spring of 2018, political processes took place in the Republic of Armenia, where we witnessed civic interest in the newly emerging political force with a stream of participation. Due to the growth of public consciousness in the RA and civic activation, a “Velvet Revolution” took place. According to our deep conviction, it was conditioned by the conditions of democratic transition in Armenia and with the aim of overcoming protracted political development crises.

The nature of the “Velvet Revolution” was conditioned by the leader N. Pashinyan’s charisma, which was accompanied by the skilful use of new information and communication technologies, and the rationalized hermeneutic speech to overcome the alienation of citizens - compassion, accurate description of reality, sensitivity and use of vocabulary in the areas of language thinking of an ordinary citizen. The key desired result of civic participation was the removal of the current government, which fit the view put forward by N. Harari (2020): “If the government is corrupt and fails to improve people’s lives, sooner or later a critical mass will be formed that will realize it and change the government” (p. 32). Accepting the above idea as a starting point, let us state that the internal political problems in Armenia, the social polarization, the alienation of the members of the society from the state apparatus, the relatively low level of political participation led to a revolt with the expectation of transformation. It was launched under the slogan “Take a step, reject Serzh”. It was accepted by the participating citizens, once again proving *that people come out to streets more united not only to oppose but also to anticipate expectations, as well as through the expectation of sensory hunger and the overcoming of alienation.* In that context, rapidly, the revolutionary actions of the

citizens (some of which can be considered illegal, such as the capture of the public radio station) covered the whole territory of the republic. The actions were carried out through strikes, hunger strikes, the closing of interregional and interstate roads, attempts to enter government buildings, access to places of public importance, disruption of work, etc. *In fact, what happened united the population of the regions creating an atmosphere of centre-periphery unity. In our opinion, such a rapid development of the processes was conditioned by social media activity. Clear instructions were given through live broadcasts by the leader and almost always received an operative response from the participants of the revolution.* On April 23, 2018, the RA Prime Minister Serzh Sargsyan resigned, generalizing: “Peace, harmony and logic to our country. Thank you”.¹

Information technology, digital and psychological tools played a key role in the above-mentioned process. In this context, the Internet is often seen as a kind of public sector offering potentially countless options for cultural participation with endless prospects for consumption, collaboration, and creation. *They enable alienated and marginalized groups to express their voice promoting cultural diversity and showing appreciation and valuation for that diversity.* Undoubtedly, it provides an opportunity to participate in the democratization of the culture of implementation power. “It’s a fact that splitting changes took place in the form of cultural trauma, which was accompanied by the virtualization of socially-networked reality and the turbulence of all spheres of public life” (Margaryan, M. M., & Margaryan, M. G., 2020, p. 151).

Philosophical bases of participation. Let us consider being guided by the slogans “*dukhov*”², “the future of Armenia depends on one person,

and that one is you”, “free and happy Armenia” which are peculiar to philosophical thought, as they are based on the abstract values expressed in the course of history, and transcendental values expressed in political time according to the situation, in this case, the use of spirit, will, self-power, the use of a person and pointing out the possible ways of manifestations.

As G. Hegel mentioned in his “Philosophy of Law”, the center of gravity of the state’s existence is in the balance between internal, civic and external, military forces, any violation of which leads to the degradation of the state. The two-tier nature of the political system is “the organization of the state, the course of its organic life in relation to itself, the exceptional unity regarding others, as a result of which it transforms its differences into external ones, including certain disagreements related to its own ideals” (Hegel, 1990, p. 310).

The transition of political control is possible through numerous riots against the current government, “targeting the people more than the territory” (Foucault, 2011, p. 187), and the great French Revolution was just such a riot. Naturally, the course and destiny of revolutions, including the destinies of their charismatic figures, are extremely sensitive and can be groundbreaking. Therefore, they should not be attracted only by creating a revolutionary environment but *should increase control and the level of responsibility through the “centre of action, government and administrative bodies”* (Shmitt, 2005, p. 185). *In our opinion, such an approach would allow the charismatic leader of the RA “Velvet Revolution” to use the need to adopt the rational-legal (legal-bureaucratic) principles of leadership in parallel with his charisma, to give himself an opportunity to legitimize the legitimacy of the government. In order to substantiate our thesis, let’s state that revolutions in post-soviet countries due to political development crises are, of course, expected and sometimes predictable.* At the same time, the neglect of the rule of law is evidence of the marginalization of the political

¹ *Serzh Sargsyany hrazharakan tvets. Pashtonakan* (Serzh Sargsyan resigned. Official, in Armenian) 23.04.2018. Retrieved from: <https://armtimes.com/hy/article/136111> (Viewed: 17.02.2021).

² The meaning of this slogan is a call to be bold, confident, unyielding.

elite (Margaryan, 2019, p. 205). Cause, as a result of the alienation of the existing crises, the norms of coexistence in the public space are violated, which prepares the ground for the riots and the revolt of the citizens. In this context, the citizens come out to the streets, trying to assert their right to participate in the development and implementation of democratic political and civic culture. In his treatise “Political Conversations on Coup d’état”, M. Foucault proposed a plan of revolution on this issue, which is necessary for the state for its integrity and force when laws and discipline lose their influence. The revolutionary aspirations of Armenia also began with this approach. *However, let us state that, by creating political turbulence, the revolution is mainly able to gather those people who do not have the support of the old order and want to create a new order, but that is all.*

We see such a static panorama of power formation even in the events of the Great French Revolution, which is usually presented as a constantly evolving sequence of voluntary decisions of its leaders and peculiarities of speech and gestures. At the same time, the spontaneity of the process is visible in it, when none of the parties makes a decision and all the motions, slogans with different contents are the result of behind-the-scenes decisions. Moreover, all this is adapted to the newly formed revolutionary, but already to the rational-bureaucratic system. Contemporaries have already noticed this feature, in particular the active critic (paradoxically, the secret supporter) of that revolution, Joseph de Maistre, who wrote that *“the revolution is led not by the people, but revolution uses them”* (Berlin, 2014, p. 269). In this case, the anonymity of the active force becomes a matter of doubt because it is a fact that history is accustomed to view such phenomena *as a struggle of individuals who have a significant name, authority, and seek to pass it on to generations, provoking and using the participation of the masses, their expectations. However, in these cases, the revolutionary forces bring the idea of freedom to*

the arena, which we witnessed during the “Velvet Revolution” in Armenia. The revolution started criticizing the crisis of political development for implementing the slogan “the winner gets everything” after the victory, as a result of which the government was not legitimized, but there were contradictions between the administrative methods and the expectations of the citizens. In this sense, we can conclude that after any revolution, freedom gradually gives way, being oppressed as a result of decisions made by the administrative structures, the guarantor of which is mainly the charismatic revolutionary leader. Facing the political reality, the charismatic leader in the guise of hidden justice and intelligence rationalizes his behaviour and circulates new agendas with the expectation of forgetting his promises: often pseudo. In this sense, the victory of Robespierre, the real leader of the great French Revolution, is remarkable, which he won against Mirabo, bearer of political realism and Danton, who had a life-loving temperament. But after the victory, Robespierre appealed to the people of France for unity and “common will” to struggle for a new kind of crystallization that could never have happened, as there was no any place to “gather everyone” (Arendt, 2011, p. 334) and he put an end to the revolution and finally to his power (Arendt, 2011, p. 344).

It is clear that the state interest is not equal to the legality and legitimacy, so under its name, one can go beyond the law and, as C. Schmitt states to declare ‘State of emergency’ only to preserve the state as a dominant institution of the political system and to democratize the culture of state-building. In this context, we consider the need for the use of violence in the professional literature to be significant for the existence of the state institution one of the examples of which is given by M. Foucault; subordination of the Saxons to Carlos the Great “Who appointed the Saxons judges who judged without examining or prosecuting any case” (Foucault, 2011, p. 345). Such anonymity, illegality, ruthlessness, invisibility, rapid and illogical decision-making is the

immediate embodiment of the revolution. It is noteworthy that the revolution influenced and transformed the classical theatre “organized around a coup d’état” (Foucault, 2011, p. 347) not only in a romantic but also in a realistic sense, thus revealing the new face of the power.

The best side of revolutionary ideas is discovering a new arena based on the consciousness of the rational responsibility for harmonising one’s own national, political, civic identity and the desired civil liberty. According to the idea mentioned above, a new democratic space is being formed, where all the requirements are satisfied based on “Good Governance” principles. In our opinion, any coloured revolution, adopting the principles of good governance, allows itself to unite the citizens around the “emblem of national unity” (Ozof, 2003, p.183). In the absence of the latter, *the new democratic space formed due to the active participation of the masses does not solve the problem of political stability, but on the contrary, deepens the crises of political development. Moreover, in our opinion, summing up the coloured revolutions taking place in the post-Soviet countries (Georgia, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan), we can say that the crisis of political development is enriched by marginality, that is, the society attracts the masses imbued with border values with their marginal participation: ignoring the need to complement political and civic culture.* Then a new post-revolutionary process is wrapped up, the main goal of which is to consolidate the centre of stability of the new space, create mechanisms of restraint and harmony, and subordination of turbulence to equilibrium. In this context, let us look at the relationship between demarchy and democracy. *Demarchy is an alternative model of democracy, has been largely overlooked in the field of democratic theory and political philosophy and theory generally.* The term demarchy was coined by Frederick A. Hayek (1973) and denoted equality of law for all, with an ancient root in the idea of procedural rule (p. 40). In his book “Is Democracy Possible?” the alternative to electoral politics, Austral-

ian philosopher John Burnheim (2006) appropriated the term demarchy, proposing a new form of democracy that he argued would be more effective than existing democracies which are no more than “elective oligarchies with monarchical elements”. A demarchy is a form of democracy that has several important points of departure from more conventional democratic structures and institutions. It uses decentralised political authorities in the form of legislative or decision-making committees based on the function to determine policy. Demarchy does not presuppose a certain kind of unanimity of moral ideals and material circumstances to certain anarchists and socialists have thought necessary for a wholly democratic community.

Demarchy provides a way by which each person or group can pursue its own interests and preferences by negotiation, competition and cooperation with others in the context of a network of democratic authorities. Individuals can give effective expression to their needs and aspirations in the multiplicity of material particulars they influence. Demarchy handles this problem through the requirement of random selection. No one can be guaranteed a formal decision-making role. Furthermore, the terms of service are strictly limited, so no permanent executive or clique can develop. Several features distinguish demarchy from representative democracy, including random selection, functional groups, limited tenure of office, and elimination of the state and bureaucracy. Some of these could serve as reforms to representative democracy, but there is also a coherency in the entire package. The first condition of demarchy being possible is that the society in which it is to be instituted be reasonably democratic in its social attitudes (Burnheim, 2006). Demarchy emerges at the present moment as a historically specific response to the problems and possibilities that have emerged from our present productive and organizational technology and the dissatisfaction and aspirations that are connected with them. It is the form of organization appropriate to a very

complex society that generates a host of structures of interests and possibilities. It offers a way to fulfil these with the maximum diversity in unity that is practically possible. But it rests on no assumption that any global, overriding force, either ideal or material, ensures its triumph. If it comes about it will be because the old order is increasingly incapable of handling the problems it itself generates and because substantial social forces struggle for it and against the forces that resist it. The forms that struggle will take are largely unpredictable. The concrete sites and issues on which struggle will arise are even less predictable. Demarchy is a proposal, not a prediction. However, in the context of network democratization, demarchy was pushed into the background.

We present our thesis based on the view of the famous French philosopher M. Foucault, according to which there was a transition from the categories of time and will to the category of network democratization of space (each takes as much as his consciousness). We know that M. Foucault does not accept the traditional legal approach of the government. He is convinced that the main consequence of the great French Revolution was the collapse of power relations, at the centre of which was the “royal body”, which embodied dignity and was immortal according to philosophical thought. At the same time, according to all the same medieval ideas, the artificially created body of a corporation was also endowed with Dignity, moreover, a “corporation by inheritance”, which was a plurality “not ripped apart in a certain Space, but set exclusively by Time” (Kantorowicz, 2015, p. 508).

M. Foucault (2002) studied the practice and procedure of power theory, ensuring its activity. “I’m trying to come up with a theory based on unique empirical research in one place or another or in another special section” (p. 283). Hence derives the next methodological principle, that is, power is not based on itself, it does not exist, parallel to family or industrial relations and is not their cause or effect, it occupies these positions

in turn so that it can be considered “Power mechanics as one continuous whole” (Foucault, 2011, p. 15). In fact, the government operates in fundamentally different mechanisms, conditioned by several factors. The “disposition of power, networks, currents, transmitters, information points and potential differences” (Foucault, 2007, p. 29) is critical. In this context, let us also refer to the concept of biopolitics presented by Foucault related to the emergence of a new paradigm for exercising power. In relationship with the individual, the principles of discipline and control have been replaced by authority over one’s own person, just like any living organism, which according to M. Foucault (1996) is “biological etatism” (p. 448). with these approaches, the field of political law was transformed, in which the level of responsibility of the participatory process was rationalized. We are witnessing such transformations of democratization of political power, first of all, through the technologies implemented by the power apparatus. The human body is subject to methodical and systematic exercises, manipulations, changes, and control. *Within the new system of government framework, a submissive and executive body is needed, as only this type can be subordinated and used, changed, improved and exploited in economic matters.* The disciplinary type of government needed “obedient bodies”. In order to do this, the government uses a variety of technologies, distribution of individuals in demarcated areas, disciplinary oversight, and systematic training to enhance the usefulness of the individual and develop obedience, as well as to complete oversight and control. In the second half of the 19th century, the disciplinary type of government changed to such a power that now refers to a person not as a subject but as a living being. *M. Foucault (1996) called this kind of power “biopolitics”* (p. 448). Distinguishing the level of consciousness of individuals and a multitude of individuals according to M. Foucault’s disciplined government exploits the masses to turn them into obedient bodies and

force them to participate in public affairs for purely economic gain. And the masses, by their birth, reproduction, disease, and death, participating in local and global processes, the power exercises towards their body through the method of individualization, seizing their opportunities to identify with the human race. Therefore, biopolitics should be considered not only as an anatomical policy of the human body but also as *a struggle for the existence of the human race*. In both cases, we are dealing with participation, in the first case - individual, in the second - public. *Thus, biopolitics is addressed to the population*. M. Foucault saw the emergence of this type of power as necessary for the development of capitalist and liberal societies, as economic growth required the participation of obedient bodies in production and an interconnected perception of the phenomena valued by the population that *enabled it to participate in decision-making*. In this context, the theorist distinguishes three main areas of biopolitical power:

1. Problems of population reproduction: fertility, mortality, population growth, life expectancy, as well as disease, in particular epidemics and difficult-to-treat diseases, including the availability and accessibility of health services, the development of hygiene.
2. Issues of neutralising individuals and termination of their active deeds: senility, accidents, traumas, mutilations, etc.
3. It is the influence of the environment, and not only natural - geography, climate, but also artificial – the cities.

In fact, biopolitical power, in contrast to the disciplinary type of the power, is focused on creating a useful and obedient body, develops mainly regulatory mechanisms, which aim to predict events, minimize risks, losses, to ensure, provide compensation, that is, to create conditions for the safe life of the population. Therefore, discipline and participation regulation are mainly aimed at establishing average norms that allow to control and-discipline the body and to regulate the population. *Thus, modern democra-*

cies operating in developed and developing countries with their own characteristics, as paradoxical as it may sound, they still have one thing in common: It is solidarity with totalitarian regimes, because they pursue the goal of giving the man happiness and freedom, but operate in an environment where biological life is “occupied” by the authorities. In fact, “...everything happens as if during a disciplinary process, through which the state power makes people as a living being a unique object for him, launches another process that generally coincides with the emergence of modern democracy, where the human as a living being appears no longer as an object, but as a subject of political power” (Agamben, 2011, pp. 15-18). *According to Agamben³ (2011), the “biopolitical paradigm of modernity” (p. 151) is the camp, the real area of exclusion, in an integrated environment, in a localized area where the rule of law ceases to function, life acquires a purely biological meaning; and by ceasing to be perceived in legal value, it can be taken away without a criminal murder*.

Thus, the internationally accepted value system of the state as the dominant institution of the political system with its three components – territory, law and genesis - appeared to be in crisis. The old order begins to crumble at the point when biological life is included in the legal field, that is, by being included in the nation through the act of birth in a certain area. *In this case, the sovereignty decides to implement its policy, entering the biological life of the citizens, controlling their pure and complete life, de facto the sovereign state turns into a machine that indirectly destroys its citizens who do not obey it*. Thus, “Life now becomes a part of the field of power” (Negri, 2008). At the same time, there is an antithesis: *life is power*. In other words, biopolitics,

³ Analyzing biopolitical processes, Agamben mentions the Greek words *zoe* and *bios*, which he uses to distinguish between “the original fact of life (*zoe*) and the way of life (*bios*) of the individual”. It would be better if the author points out the relevant pages. It would be better if the author points out the relevant pages. (Agamben, 2011, p. 7).

according to Negri (2008), “as it is the use of the power towards life, as well as the violent reaction of life to the power, the moment of getting out of subordination”.

Summarizing the above mentioned, we would like to refer to the “Center-Periphery” spatial divisions that occurred during the democratic transition. Studying the phenomenon at a multi-dimensional level and taking as a starting point the approaches of geopolitics H. Mackinder and K. Haushofer, I. Wallerstein conceptualized the concept of “centre-periphery” in line with current challenges, and they developed the values and anthropological features of global governance. In particular, introducing the concept of a semi-periphery, he substantiated the intermediate connection between the centre and the periphery, emphasizing the dominance of the centre to dictate participation to the periphery at its discretion. This is where peripheral poverty, government corruption, emigration, the emergence of failed states and the crisis of participatory democracy derives. In this context, we offer the following perspectives for the development of “Center-Periphery”:

1. Creation of think tanks will actually conduct research and analysis: proving the dangers of the “winner gets everything” management model, identifying the existing and potential risks and threats.
2. Carry out scientific-analytical studies: due to the tendencies to prevent the political development crises of the Republic of Armenia in transitional situations.
3. New political tendencies oblige to clarify the differences between the conditions of “transition (linear) and consolidation (harmony of social layers and conscious participation)”. Harmony, of course, gives an opportunity to discover and use the “centre-periphery” development tendencies.

Citizenship and E-participation. In order to ensure the effectiveness of the process from democratic transition to consolidation, we can stress the importance of the concurrence level of

citizenship and E-participation. *The idea of citizenship is connected with the idea of a person, not only of existence but also of the quality of the activity.* This idea is described in more detail through the right of human choice. Thus, civic consciousness is used in the process of community involvement, through which they perform their civic duties and at the same time benefit their civil rights. The role of citizens in terms of direct involvement in governance processes is direct participation, which fits into the idea of market liberalization in democratic discourse.

To sum up, the protracted crisis of political development in the countries of transition, especially in the post-Soviet one, has led to the rupture of the individual, the group and the public interest, which, by revolutionizing the citizens, permanently creates a revolutionary situation. In fact, citizen participation can be perceived as a subjectivity, which is more related to the functionality of civil society than to the restrictions adopted by the state authorities. *We are convinced that we can overcome such gaps through E-participation if, of course, we ensure the high educational level of the majority of the state and the state information security (especially cyber).* Only in these conditions is it possible not only to overcome the centre-periphery gaps but also to ensure the rational participation of individuals in ensuring public safety, planning for the future, and modelling happiness. Due to this approach, the concept of citizenship is intended to ensure not only inclusion but also the ability to develop one’s own “self”. “These are the environments where modern citizens work and live, where they should feel safe and secure” (Gordon, 2006, p. 180). Thus, the information and communication technologies (ICTs) not only improve the delivery of public services but also enable governments to better engage citizens, and this is called “e-participation”. First of all, numerous technological innovations, particularly in the field of communication and information, played a significant role, contributing to socio-political transformations. In the information age, the frequency

of events is increasing, and the speed of processes is constantly increasing. This will further increase the deregulation, as the public and traditional governing bodies do not have time to respond adequately to events.

Conclusion

Civil activity and participation in political processes can not always provide effective guarantees for democracy, but they can also endanger themselves and civic culture, the rule of law, constitutionality - everything that guarantees human security, as well as the existence of the state. As the dominant institution of the political system of the society, the state clearly expresses the supranational face of the nation and the motives of state-building, in the absence of which the society is plunged into a whirlpool of disappointment, and the citizen is alienated from reality. The decisive factor in the implementation of the priorities of the government is the level of establishment of statehood, which, by establishing a self-organized civil democracy, presupposes *demarchy*⁴. The biggest threat to the establishment of the state is the depoliticized and the over-politicized, marginalized, and manipulated citizen.

References

- Agamben, J. (2011). *Homo Sacer. Suverennaya vlast' i golaya zhizn'* (Sovereign power and naked life, in Russian). Moscow: Evropa.
- Almond, G., & Verba, S. (2014). *Grazhdanskaya kul'tura: politicheskie ustanovki i*

⁴ Demarchy - a network of decision-making groups that combine group, public and state interests to work together to ensure stability and security for each other. By carrying out multidimensional actions, such groups involve a wider range of citizens in the decision-making process, giving them the opportunity to take the initiative, strengthening their self-governance and self-realization process. Retrieved from <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/opendemocracyuk/demarchy-can-people-rule/> (17.01.2021).

demokratiya v pyati stranakh (The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations, in Russian) Moscow: Misl.

- Arendt, Kh. (2011). *O revolyutsii* (On revolution, in Russian). Moscow: Evropa.
- Berlin, I. (2014). *Filosofia svobodi* (Philosophy of freedom, in Russian). Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.
- Burnheim, J. (2006). *Is democracy possible?: The alternative to electoral democracy*. Sydney: Sydney University Press. Retrieved from <https://setis.library.usyd.edu.au/pubotbin/toccer-new?id=burisde.xml&data=/usr/ot/&tag=democracy&part=front>
- Foucault, M. (1996). *Volya k znaniyu. Istoria seksual'nosti* (The will to knowledge. History of sexuality, in Russian). Moscow: Magisterium, Castal.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *Intellektualy i vlast: Izbranye politicheskie stat'i, vistupleniya i interv'y'u* (Intellectuals and power: Selected political articles, speeches and interviews, in Russian). Moscow: Praxis.
- Foucault, M. (2007). *Psikhiatricheskaya vlast'* (Psychiatric power, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: SP.b. Science.
- Foucault, M. (2011). *Bezopasnost', territoriya, naselenie* (Security, territory, population, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: The science. Leningrad branch.
- Geertz, K. (2004). *Interpretatsiya kultur* (The interpretation of cultures, in Russian). In *Rossiiskaya politicheskaya entsiklopediya* (Russian political encyclopedia, in Russian). Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Gordon, D. (2006). *Transformation & trouble: crime, justice, and participation in democratic South Africa*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Harari, Y. N. (2020). *XXI dari 21 dasery* (21 lessons for the 21st century, in Armenian). Yerevan: *Newmag*.

- Hayek, F. A. (1973). *Law, Legislation and Liberty*. Great Britain: T. I. International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall.
- Hegel, G. V. F. (1990). *Filosofiya prava* (Philosophy of law, in Russian). Moscow: Misl'.
- Kantorowicz, E. Kh. (2015). *Dva tela korolya. Issledovanie po srednevekovoi politicheskoi teologii* (The King's two bodies: A study in medieval political theology, in Russian). Moscow: Published by the Gaidar Institute.
- Margaryan, M. M. (2019). *Qaghaqakan ardiakanatsman hramayakannery' Hayastani Hanrapetut'yunum*. (Imperatives of political modernization in the Republic of Armenia, in Armenian). Yerevan: State Service.
- Margaryan, M. M., & Margaryan, M. G. (2020). *Qaghaqakan turbulentut'yun. Martahraverner ev Hayastani bnakanon ardiakanatsman hnaravorut'yunnery'* (Political turbulence. Challenges and opportunities for normal modernization of Armenia, in Armenian). Yerevan: Public Administration.
- Negri A. (2008, December 3). *Trud mnozhestva i tkan' biopolitiki* (The Labor of the multitude and the fabric of biopolitics, in Russian) *Sini divan* (Blue Sofa, in Russian), 12. Retrieved from <http://www.polit.ru/article/2008/12/03/negri>
- Ozof, M. (2003). *Revolutsionnii prazdnik: 1789-1799* (Revolutionary holiday 1789-1799, in Russian). Moscow: MGOU.
- Shmitt, K. (2005). *Diktatura. Ot istokov sovremennoi idei suvereniteta do proletarskoi klassovoi bor'by* (Dictatorship: From the origin of the modern concept of sovereignty to proletarian class struggle, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: Nauka.