



Original Contribution

Journal scientific and applied research, vol. 4, 2013
Association Scientific and Applied Research
International Journal

ISSN 1314-6289

CHANGE OF POLITICAL SYSTEM: MODERNIZATION OF DEMOCRACY TO MERITO-DEMOCRACY PAPER AT SOCIOLOGY OF POLITICS

Sonya Ilieva

*KONSTANTIN PRESILAVSKI UNIVERSITY OF SHUMEN, SHUMEN 9712,
115, UNIVERSITETSKA STR.
e-mail: sonyailieva@gmail.com*

Abstract: 24 years after the changes in Bulgaria nationals are again in the streets calling for change in the system. The public debate is clear that this change is meant only as a change in the voting system - from party lists to the majority model. The author of the paper, however, believes that it is not only this, but for a comprehensive review of the democratic model to be placed in the light of meritocracy. The basic idea is the following: is needed modernization of democracy as a system based on meritocratic elements. This is a reason for a new type The Social Contract - a fusion of the positive components of meritocracy and democracy. This means to keep the basic democratic values of democracy, but to give power of knowing their proven expertise and intellectual people to be defined by democratic election procedures competitions to fill the positions and test expertise.

Key words: democracy, meritocracy, merito-democracy, social change, aristocracy, autocracy, oligarchy, plutocracy, bureaucracy, tyranny, ohlokracy, election, sotsialdarwinizm, Magnaura, AONSU, national assembly, monarchy, constitutional monarchy, socialism, socialist bloc, totalitarianism, vote, political system, political legitimacy, authoritarianism, criminality, corruption, marginalization, values, values of democracy, values of merito-democracy, elites, political elites, circulation of elites, recruitment, management, social management, managers, deputy, MPs, representatives of the people, legislation, law

Events associated with the collapse of the socialist system in Eastern Europe were kind of revolution for the liberation of the rich and the poor. Ten years later, the differences between them became overwhelming. Succeeded all the vchance caught with some financial and intellectual capital, and protections in the country and abroad. For the mass citizen's dilemma was to survive unemployed between cold and hunger. This proved to be the answer to their choice to live in a democratic society, rejecting totalitarian, but

relatively well-developed society. The population was most disappointed by democracy where corruption prevails - mainly in Central and Eastern Europe.

Today, 24 years after the changes in Bulgaria nationals are again in the streets calling for change in the system. Public debate is clear, however, that this change is understood as a change in the voting system - from party lists to the majority model.

The public emotions that brought out on the streets for months

dissatisfied and angry citizens is part of the global process of liberalization. There are many reasons that cause these public events. Since 1989, Bulgaria entered the world of irresponsible nomadic capital changed owners and fields with the speed of light, at the same time average person is forced into something of a ghetto. Political democracy is a fact, but it's political class tends to become a corporation that is to protect class interests. While most of the media has gradually degenerated into a cheap supermarket gossips and nonsense. The civil society even cause the corporation of activists from Non government organizations who follow the passwords rided down form their sponsors, simulateing activities, and often have no contact with reality.

Appears on Charter - 2013 [16], signed by over 60 lawyers, NGO representatives, activists of culture, teachers, journalists and environmentalists. It presents basic problems of society - corruption, nepotism networks of secret societies and corporate cartels that operate through public areas, unsuccessful fight against criminality, the problematic media environment, the lack of legal certainty for big property, sting independence of the court and established culture of dependency and subordination in public administration. The Charter also lists more of the problems in the country associated with the malfunctioning of democracy. It feels that we are in a deep crisis of the social contract and totally discrediting state institutions.

In this swarming of different worlds and increase the centrifugal forces are talking about changing the system that the citizens of the street and / without / responsible political class in trans repeat: change the system, but this change is associated with only with making a new election Code.

The author of this study, however, believes *that it is not only this, but for a comprehensive review of the democratic model to be placed in the light of meritocracy.*

It's about what will show you at last, 24 years after the Wall, new centripetal idea to bind crumbling worlds into a new social contract?

Already in 2004 the author of this study published his monograph "An idea for Merito - democracy" [9], [8], the main idea is the following: Democracy in its familiar form is exhausted and it evolves towards modernization, including in itself increasingly meritocratic elements, which in turn is the basis of a social contract of a new type. Corresponds to the idea expressed in this thesis by world renowned futurologists Alvin and Heidi Toffler, who wrote [15, p.125-127]: "... Nowhere throwback are not as advanced and dangerous as in our political life and in any other area today will not find a great lack of imagination, experimentation and continuous thinking the fundamental change ... The prospect of deep political controversy changes their accompanying risks is so frightening that no matter how surreal and depressing the status quo is it suddenly starts to look best of all

possible worlds... We need to start the widest possible public debate on the need for a new political system, tailored to the needs of civilization ... We have a responsibility to change. This means to fight murderers of ideas that rush to destroy any new proposal on the grounds that it is impractical while protecting everything that exists as a practical matter how absurd, oppressive and ineffective can be. This means to fight for freedom of speech - the right of people to express their ideas, even if they are heretical ... Above all, it means to begin the process of reconstruction now, before the deepening collapse of existing political systems to bring to the streets marching oppressive forces and make impossible the peaceful transition to democracy in the 21st century. "

In this context, the main lines of those expressed in "An idea of meritocracy" are the following:

The New Social Contract, albeit subject to complement consists in the idea of Merito - democracy, i.e. the synthesis of the positive components of meritocracy and democracy. It has already named their real expressions in practice. Voters are increasingly oriented, albeit within the party lists to individuals, experts, learn to manage in their field. People continue to want democracy as a political system that guarantees their freedoms, but would like more communities to be managed by adventitious people in government. This drive will continue to expand, and democracy will continue to modernize. It will find new transformations that will be the

direction of expert management in democratic circles, i.e. will increasingly work in practice the idea of Merito - democracy.

But before I justify Merito - democracy is necessary to provide *basic information about both contained political -social phenomenon contained in its name: meritocracy and democracy.*

MERITOCRACY

Etymologically the term generally means merit and comes from the Latin word *mereō* - win and the greek word *κράτος*, *kratos* - power, strength. It reflects the political philosophy that power should be granted only to individuals who deserve this. Progress according to this system is based on the intellectual ability measured by testing and / or proven successful in the field in which it is implemented. The term is defined in political and sociological sense by Michael Young [33], which uses it in a futuristic book "The Rise of the Meritocracy" (1958) and further developed at a later stage [34]. But as will become clear in the statement below, the idea of meritocracy has a deep, ancient roots.

In the scientific literature in sociology and political science very small and insufficiently understood is the term "meritocracy." If you overview of the issues that affect this and are available to Bulgarian readers will find that this term means:

- Political system in which the positions and ranks are based on merit, according to generally accepted criteria for excellence, not according

to age, sex or its property qualification [1, p. 41];

- Authority based on merit. Management of the most worthy intellectually, morally, and more. relations. Concept, according to which power should be performed by people, distinguished by their achievements, abilities and professional competence rather than social origin or attributed status [10, p.176];

- Contemporary social stratum placed on top of the social hierarchy, is authorized through knowledge and the real merit of its members [14, p.172];

- Meritocracy conceptualizes merit in relation of tested competencies and capabilities, and probably measured by coefficient of intelligence based on standardized tests of excellence in a particular area [30];

The following table shows the types of management systems addressed to the questions: "Who manages?" and "How is it acquired the power?"

Answers to these questions provide a greater opportunity to define meritocracy as a political system.

Table №1

Contrasts relation of management systems reviewed in the light of their relation to authority

Political system	Who manages?	How is it acquired the power?
ARISTOCRACY	Power of the noble and the rich.	The power is inherited
AUTOCRACY	Unlimited power of monarchs and dictators; Strong presidential regimes.	The power is passed by inheritance or by imitation of free elections with predetermined results.
OLIGARCHY	All authority - economic, political and military is in the hands of a small group of society.	By seeming democratic or repressive procedures
PLUTOCRACY	The decisions lie with a powerful circle of high society, made up of wealthy people.	Through a seemingly democratic procedures.
BUREAUCRACY	Authority of the administration of officialdom.	Do not dominate politically, increase the role of the administration in certain times or in certain areas of social development.
DEMOCRACY	Power to the people for the people.	Electivity at all levels of public life.
TYRANNY	Authority of tyranny, oppression, harassment (repression).	Through strength, military and others repressive procedures
OHLOCRATSIYA	Management of the crowd, of the simple people.	Situational, spontaneous transfer of public functions to the crowd in a certain period of time; is not known practically built ohlokratic management system.
MERITOCRACY	Authority of knowing their proven expertise and intellectual people.	through democratic electoral procedures competitions to fill the positions and parallel - testing expertise.

In view of the presented table can be referred to the characteristics of meritocracy, which it is

distinguished from these political systems.:

1. To the question Who manages? - Within the meritocracy, the answer is

people distinguished by their achievements, abilities and professional competence.

2. To the question How is it acquire the power? - I.e. way of acquiring power, the answers are:

- democratically through elections; to be chosen represented by the political parties fighting for the power;
- through the transition of authority by inheritance, such as monarchies; through forceful methods - the acquisition of power by dictatorships and others, authoritarian and totalitarian regimes and others.

Taking into account this point, which is an input referred to as the development of the idea of democratic Merito-democracy is:

In view of social management Meritocracy is such a political system in which manage competitions nominated by members of the public not only competent in their field, but also trained to manage.

According to William Kezi first system of meritocracy is realized in the second century BC in China since the Han Dynasty which introduces exams assessing the merits of the officials in the empire. [19] At a later stage as a concept it spread from China to British India in the 17th century, and from there to Europe and the United States. The first European power that successfully applied meritocracy in the civil service is the British Empire in the Indian administration. There, local managers are encouraged to hire employees on the basis of competitive examinations, in order to prevent corruption and

favoritism. [28] This practice is transferred to the territory of England, supported by the erudite George Stuart Mill, who advocates meritocracy in his book "Considerations on Representative Government" - 1861. His model is for elections to give more votes to the more educated voters. His views are explained in detail by David Estland in his book "Why not epistocracy?" [21, p.57-58].

Michael Henry describes that in 1850 Australia as part of the British Empire also began creating programs in state universities to promote meritocracy by providing specialized training and credentials [27, p.81].

The European continent during the time of ancient democracy two great thinkers of his time - Socrates and Heraclitus pleaded not for the control of the demos but for those who are trained to manage. Of Heraclitus belong the famous words rising the role of skill over randomly selected demos consisting of [16, p.119-129]: "A man goes to me as ten thousand, as long as it's best!" And further: "What is their own sense and reason? They believe the singers on the street and the crowds are teachers, not knowing that the majority is bad and the minority - good."

At a later stage in Europe, supporters of Social Darwinism argue that Darwinian theory itself justifies social inequality as an expression of meritocracy and may be associated with human ambition for success. In his book "meritocratic education and social uselessness" (2012), philosopher Ken Lampert argued [29]

that understanding educated meritocracy is nothing more than a socialdarwinism.

As the 21st century in the UK is a global meritocracy Party [3], which pronounces a new world political order based on meritocracy. Announced objective focus on the following priorities: Meritocracy to replace democracy, as the last has become one of the biggest obstacles to human progress. To eradicate nepotism, cronyism and privileges, etc. This example proves that democracy in the eyes of citizens already discredited and humanity should increasingly turn eyes to meritocracy.

Global political practice shows that meritocracy in the management of a country in a democracy has its clearest expression among monarchs and presidents [12].

At the same time global political practice gives examples that meritocracy in the management of a country in a democracy has its clearest expression among monarchs and presidents. In most cases they have acquired education which corresponds to the vision of managing their societies. For example, Akihito - the Emperor of Japan is a graduate of the Faculty of Political and Economic Studies. Juan Carlos I - King of Spain graduate humanities, Naval War College, Military Academy, economics, finance and law. Beatrix - Queen, long ruled the Netherlands (abdicated in April 2013) is a

post-modern version of

graduate sociology, law and Doctor of Juridical Science. Margaret II - Queen of Denmark has graduated in Economics, Political Science and archeology, etc. The examples show that the monarchs of the world have acquired and exercised controls within their communities with knowledge of social science and the military, who are in the direction of meritocracy management - management of the trained to manage. The situation is similar in the presidential institution in the world. For example, among U.S. presidents - John Kennedy is a graduate of political economy and international relations, Richard Nixon - Legal Studies, Bill Clinton - international relations and law, Barack Obama - international relations and law, etc.

In Bulgaria, the presidential institution is occupied by only one lawyer - Petar Stoyanov. And our first choice of president since 1989 Zhelyu Zhelev's philosophical education. However, we should celebrate the overarching philosophy as science, with a hint of irony may be noted that most likely there is set wish all Bulgarians to "philosophize" nationwide - one of the characteristics of our transition from totalitarianism to democracy. Our current head of state Rosen Plevneliev is an expert in computing, an established businessman meritocrat in their field, but not with knowledge in social management.

The need for certain specialists in warfare since the national liberation movements of the 60s and

Gaddafi (Libya), Mengistu Haile Meriam (Ethiopia), Daniel My (Kenya), Hosni Mubarak (Egypt), Ali Seibu (Niger) and others. The examples show administration of meritocracy in those countries in view of the need for expert military rule, according to the needs of a particular stage of their development.

The historical epochs give worthy examples of the meritocracy in management. In different historical times have always been a kind of training center managers, meritocrats. For example, this is Magnaur school [31], which is trained Bulgarian King Simeon the Great. If you connect this fact with his management we can not make a connection between this fact and the Golden Age of the First Bulgarian Kingdom. The Magnaur school was founded in the 30s of the 9th century by Byzantine scientist Lion Mathematician as a center of higher education - in the context of the era. Later it was reorganized in high school with the rank of university. It prepare persons for higher spiritual and secular positions in the empire. It is divided into two departments - legal and philosophical. The teachers are outstanding scientists - Lion Mathematician, Photius, Todigiy chimney, Scholasticus. In Magnaur school teaches and creator of the alphabet - Cyril, who later became professor of philosophy in it, Anastasius the Librarian - Roman ecclesiastical writer.

70s of the 20th century of the African peoples even led to power figures experts in warfare as Muammar

In this respect it can be mentioned the experience of ex socialist countries and the way in which the party class taught her range in management skills. In Bulgaria this training center was the Academy of Social Sciences and Management (ASSM) established in 1969. It was organized as a center of the Bulgarian Communist Party for research, scientific applications, services and training to higher education in the field of social sciences and social control. Such academies of social control had been established in all socialist countries. Obviously personnel trained in them received a brilliant education, as in Bulgaria, they were able to preserve through various political parties present at all levels of government in a democratic state. I.e. these specially trained to manage the totalitarian state and various social organizations in supporting its indestructible with his life the importance of meritocracy, still persist in democracy.

It can not ignore the fact that a number of Western and American universities are incubators for senior statesmen in the world. Such are, for example:

- *University of Cambridge - trained 15 British Prime Ministers, including Robert Walpole, considered for the first Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and over 23 foreign heads of state, including the Governor-General of Barbados Prime Ministers*

of India, Singapore and Jordan, nine British monarchs, including the current heir to the throne Prince Charles of Great Britain and a number of other royals, including alumni are historical figures - 3 people signed the Declaration of Independence of the United States as well as in the far 17th century - Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector of England, and others.

- *University of Oxford - in it acquire management knowledge Philip - King of the Belgians; Herbert Huber - former U.S. secretary of state and other.,*

- *Stanford University - in it are trained former Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama and Taro Aso, the ex President of Guatemala Jorge Serrano Elias, the current President of the Maldives Mohammed Hassan, William Kennard U.S. Ambassador to the European Union and others.*

- *Yale University - training as meritocrats there received U.S. presidents William Howard Taft, Gerald Ford, George H. W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George Bush - Jr., U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Dean Acheson, ex President of Mexico Ernesto Zedillo; ex President of the Philippines Jose Laureano and others.*

- *Eton College - reported in 2013 19 prime ministers of Britain were its students, including current David Cameron, Mayor of London - Boris Johnson, British princes William and Harry and others.*

The examples show the need and applicability of meritocracy in a

democracy and the need for specialized training for those who run or to stand on the public drive. The state is like a ship - can not manage it selected sympathetic persons, and persons with expertise in the management knowledge to be able to translate perfectly in underwater reefs policy. In Bulgaria, for democratic governance in the country after 1989 became known called "Blue academies" conducted by the UDF government, followed by the others - "red academies" that were held after every national election of the pleiad politicians from the legislative and executive. The result is a legitimate political circle: people just elected representatives acquire some experience at the back of the society and it's time for new elections to recruit others, etc. who are just beginning to learn. That is why all the long, unfinished and knows when it will complete the transition from totalitarianism to democracy passes as permanent a series of "trial and error"

Hence, there is principally important question: can they be trained in the future managers or they can be trained further once you have taken power positions? Hardly anyone would argue the possible correct answer: necessarily to be trained in advance. Maybe that is the truth about the longevity of the monarchy and the government half a century of socialist countries.

DEMOCRACY

The democracy is being discussed than 2 500 years, but it would be a

mistake to assume that it was invented once.

The true birthplace of democracy is considered ancient Greece from the Classical period (V-th century and the beginning of the VI-th century BC is) It is the first time defined the relationship between state and citizen, thus the foundations of all modern political systems. Its variety is the Roman Republic Senate When Julius Caesar in 44, the republic became the empire. With this, a few exceptions, democracy, which in its conception, is clean, direct democracy as a political regime disappears until around 1100, and reappeared in the flourishing Italian cities - Venice, Florence and others.

Between 600 and 1000, there were local meetings of the Vikings, as though they, in 930, established a national assembly, which is a precursor of all later parliaments, i.e. the representation of the management representative. Around 1000, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, created the first regional and later national meetings. In the fifteenth century Sweden established the predecessor of the modern representative Parliament, which creates a king called a meeting with representatives of different social classes. At the time of King Edward I in XII XIII century on the basis of periodic meetings convened by him was conceived representative parliament in England.

Reformation marked the beginning of pluralism in Europe. It is a precursor of political freedom. But

the beginning and ideological justification of modern democracy is placed in the eighteenth century - the Enlightenment, the age of Rousseau and Montesquieu, Locke and Franklin, Leibniz and Kant. If in ancient times under democracy is understood to control the people, the philosophers - educators raise the issue of democracy as: government by the people, but with the freedom of the individual.

Not through revolution, but through national-war democracy prevailed in North America.

In the history of democracy, French Revolution occupies an exceptional place with its principles of freedom, fraternity and equality. Before that no state organization has stood as its official motto these three words.

In the first half of the XX century democratic system in the form of a constitutional monarchy established itself in almost all small countries in Western Europe: Niderlndiya, Portugal, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland. In Italy, the battle for national liberation ends with the formation of a united parliamentary and liberal state When the First World War destroyed four empires: the Austrian, German, Russian and Turkish - in every one of them occur very different types of democratic change.

Three decades after the Second World War and the recent collapse rightist authoritarian regimes in Spain and Portugal. And in 1989 the revolutionary changes in the countries of the so-called. "Socialist bloc".

Avalanche they are covered by the democratic changes as peacefully (except Romania) were rejected leftist totalitarian regimes.

So far indicate the practical line of establishment of democracy in different regions of Europe from antiquity to modern times. But if these who knew democracy "inside" during the time of its establishment were unanimous in their attitude towards it?

In ancient Greece attitude towards democracy was not straightforward. Greeks rejected tyranny - Management outlaw anarchy - anarchy and ohlokratsiyata - mob rule . But their strategists and philosophers - Pericles , Herodotus , Plato , Socrates were too critical of democracy. In the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas , Niccolo Machiavelli and others. also had a negative attitude towards it . Since the modern era in postmodernizama - until today known social thinkers are also critical to this form of social control. Examples of this are Nikolai Berdyaev , Karl Popper , Maurice Duverger , Raymond Aron , Ralf Dahrendorf and others. - Their skepticism is directed to the fact that the current democracy is not " government by the people " as most people think . " Marginalization of democracy " - this is one of the main conclusions of Patrick Cannon [7]. "Those communities that allow themselves to be administered by individuals whose only quality is that they have won the race for the popular vote , will alternate mistake

after mistake and eventually get off the stage. "

From the time of Socrates and Heraclitus to modern democracy has suffered as their victories and their losses. But after its territorial expansion since 1989 more and more people are asking themselves: in fact, is that democracy that we crave? And in parallel, increasing their desire to be democratically governed, but from a minority that is well trained to manage. In order not to make democracy an inefficient political form must increasingly turn it into a system, the head of which stands experts. Actually, it is a reduction of the power of the people, despite overwhelming odds to the contrary. The obvious reason for this is that the maximum power of the people is possible only in simplest societies where the tasks of government are relatively simple. And with the growing complexity, become interconnected and gigantic growth mechanisms in society, the expert must become more and more weight than his voice as a voter. And although considerations of electoral success can make a politician not to immersion the advice of many experts today making power of initiative is more in think tanks and technoexperts. This development should not worry, because democracy is alive, while the most important thing that announces to the control remains in the field of democratic control.

How does this lead to the differentiation of democracy as a

concept and democracy as a performance?

Although a democratic imperatives, there is a growing feeling that they are in conflict on the democratic idea, and even more of a dream for the participation of everyone and anyone in management. The equilibrium point between conception and the outcome of democracy is increasingly moving away from the demopower. In the years after 1989 the management scene in Bulgaria went all persons with exotic occupations and professions as "counter disinformators" and "masseuruses" and the 38th National Assembly had so many reporters that it looked like more information agency than legislative authority.

From 1989 to present Bulgaria is in the transformation of society from totalitarianism to democracy. Since then, democracy has repeatedly been called seriously into question by conflicting internal events difficult subject only positive assessment of classical democratic positions. There was a crisis of political legitimacy where there is a failure of institutions to solve the problems of society, they are unable to deal with the opposing its main political actors and the inability to defend democracy as an effective political system.

Among the new political elites claimed as new Democrats began to widespread commerciality and clientelism, which undermined the established moral values in society. It became apparent inability to manage the complexity of the processes

precisely because of a lack of preparation to manage. This raised doubts about the quality and the selected pose of the demos is in government. In the context of this present citizenship Bulgaria believes that elections insufficiently can change social reality. It is disappointed by the long and unpredictable transition with crushing economic consequences for people and are beginning to believe that democracy itself is not so important and not for something any price to achieve it is acceptable. Feel preferences for order and security in the state, although at the expense of some restriction of democracy. In a sense, people are starting to support authoritarianism, fearful of widespread crime, corruption, marginalization in society that go hand in hand with democracy [4], [5], [8].

The democratic life in Bulgaria confirms the bitter lessons which makes Ralf Dahrendorf [6 p-.108] that the consequences of the 1989 revolution are anarchy and anomie that lead to calls for the restoration or establishment of effective government by persons who have monopolistic claims. According to him, "The Revolution went down predictably somewhat unsatisfactory ... The inability consequences of the new political class to become acceptable ruling class is dire ... The center do not hold, so the parts begin to be scattered and often turn against each other. People are looking for links that take the place of the social contract of association and contract

management. But even those do not create viable elements ... "

In light of the above can be formulated as follows:

Democratic process is in Bulgaria over the past years performed as above formula "trial and error" that led to the fact that people still share the values of democracy, but are disappointed with the way it is performed. Mostly people are disappointed by their representatives in government and universal suffrage does not always allow citizens to choose their real representatives. [18] Choosing what party lists available and inevitably have to choose between them came after 1989, Bulgaria has disappointing and short-lived governments, among which the first office of A. Lukanov - 201 days, a second study of A. Lukanov - 73 days , a study of D. Popov - 359 days; cabinet Videnoff G. - 696 days and the selected cabinets in May 2013 began immediately "shaken" after his first days as a result of management errors, followed by a strong momentum of civil protests.

The modern political representation of citizens in government, selected through legitimate elections has the following characteristics:

- unlike the prior art, so-called society of mature socialism, the representation of citizens is not recruited in nomenclature path, the path of democracy enshrined in the Constitution and ensuring pluralistic, democratic society;
- but through those same democratic procedures is in our political elite

selected and ex nomenclature people of the totalitarian state that differently influence the democratic process;

- There is often a circulation of elites, especially between major political parties - Bulgarian Socialist Party, United Democratic Forces and Movement for Rights and Freedoms representatives of the emerging political actors - National Movement Simeon the Second, Attac, Citizens for European Development of Bulgaria and others, resulting in frequent changes are indicative of governments;
- national representatives showing the public that can not make political decisions with a view to long-term strategy for the country;
- There is an increasing economic prosperity of representation of the people, and related families, expanding clientelism, amid increasingly impoverished Bulgarian nation;
- There is a relation "political representatives of the people - economic groups", i.e. emergence of ways of oligarchic democracy within and on behalf of the demos, in the public domain these consistency is termed citizenship as "criminal" or "mafia";
- The deputies in the legislative and executive prevailing decisions dictated by self-interest, but are not consistent with the will of the voters, for example, switching from one faction to another or declared themselves independent member of Parliament who changing the projection of the popular vote in the government;

- demonstrating behavior in public places dictated by showing off rather than rational sense, as the cameras of televisions;
- low structure and nadostatachna razvitost of civil society in the country pose a high degree of self-confidence and autonomy of people's representatives, who are divided and fall into extreme controversy over vital issues in a changing society;
- They oppose artificially large groups of people in society as polarized views on various vital issues for the country;
- despite the efforts made by government and political elite to independence and autonomy of almost every Bulgarian voters is now clear that in most cases political decisions concerning the country are set outside Bulgaria and politicians are only transmitters of another's will;
- individual representatives of the people ignore the popular vote and no matter which of the three branches of government are often benefit, emigrated to other countries, thereby undermining the credibility of the final selectivity as one of the main pillars of democracy, many then them and become customers for Themis ambiguous attitude towards law and order in society.

From all mentioned here is the emerging conclusion:

If there is a place from where it started corrosion of democracy in Bulgaria, this place is selectivity and representation More precisely: WHO is chosen and HOW it should be chosen to work effectively

democratic mechanism for the citizens and the state.

*This finding translated to the current political situation in the country confirmed the exposed eight years ago the idea of Merito-democracy democracy. Reasons for this are declared by the citizens of Bulgaria to respect the freedom and all the other values of democracy, which has no alternative as a desirable political perspective. But at the same time they wish within democracy to have a strong government that can be formulated as management of such individuals who have the knowledge and skills to manage What in your mind wants citizens as a form of political control that maintains the values of democracy, but refers to another form of representation is the expert control. It is essentially a modernization of democracy itself, the author of the study and its predecessor monograph referred to as **Merito-democracy democracy: a synthesis of the values of democracy and the ability to successfully management of the meritocrats.***

MERITO-DEMOCRACY

As already ahead mentioned modernization of democracy has taken place continuously since its emergence as a theoretical and practical form. When democracy is not proactive with modernization, it had delivered on and off the stage of history, replaced by an authoritarian or totalitarian regime Is not it time to modernize democracy not to back the

wheel of history back? Researcher democracy Patrick Cannon writes [7 p.11]: "History has shown unequivocally that any attempt to artificially construct political systems, including democracy, even when they were dictated by the best and most noble intentions, ended in inevitable fiasco. In this respect, the fate of democratic theory does not differ in any way from the theory of scientific communism. The thought at the time of unconditional supremacy of democratic values may seem heretical, but would it not also heretical thirty years ago any idea that would cast doubt on the spotless aura of "almighty and generally accepted theory of communist society" Proposed further idea of Meritocracy is based on the fast changing national, global, objective and subjective conditions in the 21st century. I.e. it is not a fictional construct, but is based on the development of domestic, can be called more technological determinants of democracy itself.

History shows this continuous modernization of democracy - from the ancient Greeks, when democracy was direct, to the present representative and "electronic democracy" It is evident also that with increasing education, training, knowledge of the people they have to be managed by the more skilled and educated people. These aspirations are developed against the backdrop of ever-unfolding information society, which is the driving force of the 21st century.

Modernization of democracy is a political and social modernization, which is determined by the logic of total civilization processes. This process requires it to be radicalized in management and organizational aspect as the top of the social hierarchy, where government occupy power positions highly qualified managers, acquired prior knowledge to manage. Strange it would be if a seriously ill man who yet complex surgery choose it to be done by an artist or a journalist, just because he is cute or known by the media. Logically he sought specialist, although his face does not "overflow" media. Government requires serious knowledge and experience, especially when it comes to making decisions requiring high expertise In no sense can not be explained in this case, the presence of people of various levels of government who have professions and qualifications have nothing to do with management And it also requires huge knowledge relevant qualifications and skills.

Modernization does not mean nihilistic negation of its achievement as a political system so far. In all cases, the desire of people to liberty, fraternity, equality proclaimed in the 19th century would be the basic and guiding public life values. They are the basic foundations without which democracy can not exist as a political system. Indeed, there is an increasing desire of people thing in management, institutions and political elites to change, but there is no doubt that the democratic regime is attractive to all mainly because of its core values.

Democratic values are the values of Merito-democracy :

- integrity of the individual;
- freedom of residence and travel;
- freedom of thought;
- freedom of science, education and art;
- the right and freedom to work;
- ownership;
- Toleration and freedom of religious denominations;
- acceptance and respect for ethnic differences;
- freedom of association;
- everyone to vote and to be elected in managing structures at national, regional, local and community level, etc.

Each of these democratic values remains in the tissue of Merito-democracy, they are its structural-start. Regardless of their stability over time does not mean that the values will not be modified and supplemented redefined in any other way, but hardly their center will be shifted out of the reach of liberty, equality and fraternity.

Respected futurologists Alvin and Heidi Toffler share [15, p.104-105]: "The fact that the types of controls are now obsolete is not a secret revealed by us nor it is just sick of America ... The truth is that building the institutions of the second wave includes both the design of new, more appropriate political structures. The implementation of this breathtaking in its scale painful but necessary project will no doubt take decades ... All these structures will have to radically change not because they are essentially bad, but because

they cease to operate effectively and meet the needs of a radical world. "

This attempt to justify Merito-democracy is an attempt to meet the challenge Toffler's challenge the political status quo and remodeling. It is possible that this experience should be qualified in different ways - with both positive and negative evaluations, it is possible to look more leniently than constructive, but this is an attempt to break Bitouh suggestion regarding democracy as frozen in its peak form to be taken from the beginning and the end, the only possible non-alternative type of political system in which all societies must strictly be developed without assert its peculiarities in the interpretation and application thereof..

When mental construction of possible types Merito-democracy starting points are:

1. Fundamental values of at Merito-democracy is retained;
2. Keeps the principle of separation of powers:
 - the executive, legislative and judicial powers are entrusted by the constitution of different individuals, bodies and institutions;
 - Branches power is considered relevant and avtonomnti, none is subordinate or accountable to any of the others;
 - no one branch of government can not generally exercise mlastta destined by the Constitution of the other branches;
 - the judiciary operates independently of political influence and has osigerena mandates, it may have the

power to pronounce the law constitutionally invalid.

3.. Elections to the recruitment of representation remain a major driving mechanism for the formation of management teams, but the difference now is that do not everyone can be chosen for all possible power positions, and each to be elected in the field in which he has acquired the management and skills, knowledge, experience and authority.

17th century representation is seen as a substitute for direct democracy, the growth in large countries inability to manage directly. But till now the political representation is besieged by many questions: to whom and what are obliged representatives - their supporters throughout the constituency of his party or the public interest, whether the representation should be based on the traditional divisions, parties, functional groups or and others. These issues in the 21st century must be added the question: Can anyone be elected representative at any branch of government or his candidacy must be pre-precised regarding its future management activities?

What is needed is a change of the system of eligibility. Not just working on it to go to majority of proportionality, and to decide the choice in favor of persons who have previously trained to manage. Feels need an election to compete for the trust of voters individuals with sufficient knowledge, experience and authority in the field of government. Because it is also a profession and can say most responsible profession

relating to the state and the survival of the human resources within this state.

In this direction can be defined several possible types of Merito-democracy :

Merito-democracy first type

Carried out in the framework of the current model of democracy - anyone can be elected to leadership positions in the country. But in today's world is increasingly a tendency president to be elected from among persons who have received a solid knowledge and skills in government. If at this stage there is a meritocracy of democracy on a global scale, it is reflected in the choice of president. More power positions in this institution occupy and hold meritocrats. Presidential institution in a democratic society acts as a counterweight in the balance of power between the various authorities. In some democracies president and legislature are elected separately , which is a prerequisite for mutual neutralization of their influence or actions they take . Direct election to the president suggests that they have more power than prime ministers , but they must work together with a legislative body , which is also independent under its own mandate obtained by the direct vote of the people. Therefore presidential institution suggest knowledge of social studies , social management , law, sociology, political science . As chief of the armed forces of the president he needs and knowledge in military affairs . To be established excellence of the candidates for this

type Merito-democracy political parties that represent them need to choose among experts in the field of social management , proved their worth and further tested before being nominated their candidates.

If we adopt the formula of democratic rule is: anyone can vote and each can be selected, then the first type Merito-democracy would look like this:

Anyone can vote and to be elected, but the presidential institution can be selected those who had previously educated and trained in the field of public administration, law, political science, military, with proven experts in the field and tested in advance of performing them political parties.

Merito-democracy second type

A major problem for all democratic parliaments in the world is the issue of representation of the ways and mechanisms for selecting The deputies (MPs). The main electoral systems: majoritarian, proportional and mixed give different options for deploying Merito-democracy . The second type of Merito-democracy will be realized while maintaining the current model of proportional electoral system.

In the proportional system adopted in most countries in Europe, the voters vote primarily for political party and its agenda rather than for individual candidates. Marito-democracy of this type will be made as the parties will offer pre-trained expert professionals to be selected to

run in the areas of government. For example, in the Parliament's Committee on Health to be elected only by persons with medical education in education - educational and scientific personnel; legislative committee - only lawyers and political scientists, etc. Here a crucial role in the promotion of the candidates have the appropriate parties to make accurate pre-selection among professional experts in their respective fields by testing or competitions. As a social organization represented the interests and fighting for the conquest of political power, each party towards the conquest of power that seeks to present in public their best applicants who would have occupied positions of power. In terms of the subject matter they must also be indisputable authorities and specialists in both the government and the area of social life, which are candidates of the party.

In this type of Merito-democracy formula is: anyone can vote and be elected by offering in party lists, but only in that area of government in which he is a prominent expert and authority and after receiving a positive evaluation by testing or competition.

Merito-democracy third type

It can happen only in type approval of a majority electoral system. Under this system, the winner is the one who receives the majority of its constituency. It has many advantages, but also disadvantages. Its greatest advantage is that it encourages the rise of strong and

decent people. But its biggest drawback is that it is too expensive.

Combining meritocracy and majority system in this type involves a major change in the election law - each candidate to meet certain conditions for the application of a particular place: received medical training persons to apply only to managers and members of the executive relating to health, education received and training in the management of science and education to apply only to those places, which are connected with education, science and education, etc. Apparently it is a struggle for power positions between different people, who not only have the necessary expertise in the management of a region have the characteristic of each person as one of the key elements of social reality, subject to any changes in the society. Majority pattern in the choice of candidate for the county government of the country the opportunity to see the person and in her relationships: with others in the profession, which works with other social groups and community living.

The formula of this type Merito-democracy can be expressed as follows: each person can choose and offer himself to be elected, but only in that area, which is the undisputed professional standing and have prior knowledge to be able to manage it. There is also a need to conduct testing of applicants to demonstrate their expertise.

Merito-democracy fourth type

Can be carried out at the crucial role of civil society, where associations and professional organizations will play a crucial role. They will radiate through her among the best senior professionals from the areas involved in the race for the parliament and the executive in those areas where they have already purchased, atoritet. The fundamental characteristic of civil society is its pluralistic nature. In its open architecture, it includes unlimited self-regulating and self-elements: private associations for industrial, commercial, scientific, cultural and others. activities, political parties, social movements, cultural institutions, autonomous from the state, cooperatives, civic associations for nature protection, rights and freedoms, sports clubs, trade unions and others. All these structures could offer candidates and alternatives for the area of government. This can be done in two ways: either they offer the parties best professionals or self-submit a tender by supporting majority performing candidates. In the first tray means radical changes in the recruitment of representation - but political parties and associations to be able to implement it, which in turn means a change in the electoral system. In the latter case, too, there is such a radical change. But if it is true that the rules (laws) follow the logic of social development in the near future is likely to witness and such a phenomenon.

In fact, if we look at the management triad: Legislative - Executive - Judicial authorities, who

are the core of democracy is evident meritocracy the judiciary. It is an illustration of Merito- democracy the fourth type. In her ruling system will stand or managerial positions without the required conditions are lawyers by training and is recognized as the indisputable authority in the class. It is hard to imagine in some places in the Legal Committee of the National Assembly chemists, biologists, educators and mass media (as was the case of a member of one of democratically elected national assemblies in Bulgaria after 1989). Rather, it can be assumed that the meritocratic principle, valid judicial system can be expected and it is best to be extended to other elements of the triad.

The formula of Merito-democracy of this type is: anyone can vote and can be elected, but only if it is represented by the class as a ruler and an exceptional professional in their field.

According to data provided by the Global Party meritocracy, the world is controlled by a global elite of about 6,000 people, of whom 94% were men and their average age is 60, only 2% of the world population owns 50% of the world's wealth by 1100 billionaires control the lives of the poorest - 2.5 billion people. European leaders of 50 major financial institutions controlled one-third of global wealth. European leaders in the 250 largest companies generate sales of around one third of global GDP.

Very few people in this super-rich elite choose. Many of them have attended elite schools, colleges and

universities belong to exclusive clubs and societies, inherited wealth, etc. They control virtually anything that can be controlled. Dictate policies stipulate puppet policies of countries and international alliances. Predetermine the outcome of the supposedly popular vote. Do not listen to people and realize only their personal intentions, protecting their interests. It is time to change this system and the management of societies and nations to put in the hands of trained experts to manage. Increasingly, humans appear willing to replace democracy as a system that inhibits the name back demos. Both developed and remote from its original zamisam in antiquity, democracy is a key tool in the global and national economic elite for political control of the masses - their brilliant trick to make people think that elections are their decision.

In modern parliamentary democracy seriously undermined because the big money disproportionately win votes. Surrounded by lobbyists, committees in parliaments, incl. in the Bulgarian National Assembly adopted inadequate political lesheniya extending over whole nations and countries. So performer, democracy representation appears in the eyes of citizens unstable, reactive and unable to deal with vital societal issues fairly and honestly. In this situation it is necessary unorthodox political thinking, a new sense of overcoming the strengths and weaknesses of democracy. Awareness that cliché is the worst form of government.

Democracy, and this species is beatification (proclaimed divinity) of mediocrity. It unleashes the power of the ignorant masses, generally led by experienced demagogues. But people are so irradiated with a lot of rhetoric about the virtues of democracy that have been brainwashed for her no alternative. In this way is transformed into something like political religion based on a great deal of misconceptions, dogmas that penalize free flow of ideas. In that situation regarding democracy succeeded in meeting its objective - are deterred intellectual reflections and discussions about its replacement or modernization. At the same time the public is informed grotesktno and convincing in its vsevechnost (like the utopia of communism).

The negatives of the pure democracy can be neutralize by Merito- democracy. This is a simple system of social control that sets educational and professional achievements in recruiting representation of the people in power. Amid all the political parties represented the real threat to democracy because instead to express the true will of the people they represent their own interests, and one of these events is the ranking electoral lists in clientelist model. The question arises: Is there life after democracy? What will happen when its institutions emptied of meaning or become metastatic something useless or even already - dangerous? Why is this happening so that democracy and the free market are merged into a

predatory organism with a narrowed vision aimed at maximizing profits? Is it possible to reverse this process? The answer to this is: Merito-democracy. In this political system will give unenlightened elites governing in the name of their main economic interests of the community trained to manage people. Merito-democratic society would be disastrous for people who are not able to be the best or the best in their professional field and cause animosity towards them from a mediocre and unsuccessful.

But it was competition between the learned and the ignorant, maybe smaller can be the foundation of this social system. Surely if the best experts in the community become its leader-managers, then this society will be the best you can be.

Merito- democracy can say is something like "antidote" for corrupt democracy, which is on track to eliminate nepotism and cronyism.

The proposed variants of Merito- democracy will enable truly elected representatives, aware of their obligations to citizens and benefiting from its expertise and experience to produce real-needed laws and policies relating to the needs of their community. Therein lies and change of system: Each member will be selected based on qualities associated with respective areas of competence. So the Minister of Finance will be selected among practitioners and economists will be elected only by other economists, the Minister of Health will be respected expert physician who works in health care

and will be elected by health workers; defense minister will be elected by armed Forces, the Minister of Education should be distinguished teacher or lecturer will be elected by educationists, etc. In other words, public representation shall not constitute a political party or geographical constituency and specific professional area where there is a demonstrable experience, knowledge and skills. Voters will be people in the same area, which can make an informed decision about their ability.

In this type of control is recommended building and a special committee comprising scientists from all areas selected for their critical thinking skills and experience to build hypotheses and meet the challenges that may face the government. These committees may also be strictly professional - for example, economists, architects, Bar, etc., and build alternative policies to those that make up the government. Only from such engagement of as many experts in different fields can be achieved national advance.

And - finally: how to educate experts who will take control. Stable and brilliant education is the basis of merit, and therefore at the heart of Merito-democratic state. The current education system is obvious failure and should be thoroughly transformed in every way to produce experts in different areas to compete for a place in government. Currently the system produce buyers - consumers of education. I.e. Current education shopping. It does not relieve the mind,

and wallet, and it is the intention of the plutocrats - lowering intelligence people in order to facilitate their management. Education should prepare high-opertavni specialists ready to respond to turbulent technological and political changes that they may be real experts in a future Merito-democracy.

CONCLUSIONS AND GENERALIZATIONS

1. History of democracy as a political system shows continuous modernization that process will continue for twenty-first century. Side of its modernization meritocracy in management, which gives reason to believe that both of direct democracy has evolved into a representative, so its current modernization can be identified as "Merito-democracy."
2. Eternal values of democracy in the direction of freedom, brotherhood and equality will remain an essential and leading in the future, but it will suffer changes in the recruitment of representation in the direction of experts and professionals - managers.
3. Compared to the formulation of its representation of experts in various fields of social management at this stage can be formulated four types Merito-democracy that meet the trend of power to one skilled in government. This in no way limits the ability to define modernization of democracy and other characteristics.
4. The world today is experiencing the most complex and profound evolution in the tools in the manufacturing process and the social

stratification of society. Process occurs as if simultaneously without visible and clear time sequence. Against the backdrop of these developments undoubtedly continues the evolution of social control, which is the other changes. Representation in the government also evolved through specialization, which is an integral part of any modernization. This tendency is enhanced without being able to determine how far to extend the range of the process.

5. Joining of meritocracy with democracy Merito-democracy is the chance of democracy itself to continue to establish itself as a leading political system. Otherwise amid increasingly developing technologies and innovations in all areas of society, it "technology" will grow old at the point of representation. Hardly in the age of the emerging information society, when every political entity also called "electoral unit" will want the top of democratic governance to represent someone who has completed printing rates or also to represent him in interstate cases freelance journalist, be it a beautiful woman.

6. Summary - let's flip the script to make it more clear idea of the study: whether in a normal seated male

barbershop would be shaved by a lawyer, not a barber and whether the woman would start delivery in the hands of TV presenter and not a midwife? The answer is: let's keep democratic values, but when it comes to government, it requires just as much skill and experience as indicated in the examples can be safely "birth" of democracy, but not to us "cut himself" due to inexperience to perform an action. It does need to be managed democratically Merito-democratic.

Despite the enormous ambition of futurologists to predict far into the future, in practice it is almost impossible to prevent what is happening in society. And in this sense: this study is do not timid attempt at genetic engineering policy. It reflects the direction of evolutionary change democracy to Merito-democracy that exist in all areas of social management. The time is the period in which these changes occur gradually and in Bulgaria. Paraphrase what the great scientist, explorer of democracy Andrey Pantev [11] that the declaration of democracy does not make automatic Democrat might say, which appeared in Bulgaria idea of Merito-democratic country does not make one automatically.

REFERENCES:

1. **Abercrombie and others.,** 3. **Global Party meritocracy** , Home Sociological Dictionary, Burgas, 1993 page: Global Party meritocracy / seen in 10.08.2013 /
2. **Blackwell,** Encyclopedia of Political Thought, Sofia, 1997
4. **Gounod, J.-M.,** End of Democracy, Sofia, 1997

5. **Dahl, R.**, On Democracy, Sofia, 1999
6. **Dahrendorf, R.**, Morals, Revolution and Civil Society, National Publishing House, Sofia, 2000
7. **Cannon, P.**, The Sunset of Democracy, Sofia, 1995
8. **Ilieva, S.**, An idea for Maryto-Democracy, Sofia, 2004
9. **Ilieva, S.**, Democracy, Meritocracy and Maryto-Democracy, International Conference "Bulgarian science and European Research Area", Stara Zagora, 5-6 June 2008
10. **Osipov, G.V.**, Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sociology, Moscow, 1998
11. **Pantev, A.**, Historical evolution of political democracy, Sofia, 1997
12. **Political figures from around the world**, a collection Partizdat, Sofia, 1989
13. **The changing faces of democracy**, a collection edited by D. Minev, Sofia, 2000
14. **Sociological vocabulary**, Skopje, 1995
15. **Toffler, A. and H.**, New civilization, Sofia, 1995
16. **Fotev, G.**, History of Sociology, First Volume, Sofia, 1993
17. **CHARTER 2013** for breaking plutokraticchniya model of the Bulgarian state, Sofia, 2013
18. **Aron, R.**, Le Spectateur engage , Paris, Julliard, 1981
19. **Casey, W.**, Firsts: Origins of Everyday Things That Changed the World. Penguin USA, 2009
20. **Dahrendorf, R.**, Reflections on the Revolutions in Europe, Transaction Publishers, 2004
21. **Estlund, D.**, Why not epistocracy In: Desire, Identity and Existence: Essays in bonnor of T.M. Penner, Academic Printing and Publishing, 2003
22. **Faust, M.**, The Meritocracy Party, Hyperreality Books, 2010
23. **Fishkin, J.**, Democracy and Deliberation. New Direction for Democratie Reform, London, 1991
24. **Fishkin, J.**, The Voice of the People: Public Opinion and Democracy, Yale U. P., 1997
25. **Freedom in the World: The Annual Survey of Political Rights and Civil Liberties**, 1966 - 1967
26. **Held, David: Models of Democracy**, 2d ed, Standford University Press, 1996
27. **Henry, M.**, Understanding Schooling: An Introductory Sociology of Australian Education, Psychology Press, p. 81, 1988
28. **Kazin, M.**, Edwards, R., and Rothman, A., The Princeton Encyclopedia of American Political History Volume 2, Princeton University Press, 2010
29. **Lampert, K.**, Meritocratic Education and Social Worthlessness, Palgrave-Macmillan, UK, December 24, 2012
30. **Levinson, D., Sadovnik, A.R.**, Education and Sociology: An Encyclopedia. Taylor & Francis. p. 436, 2002
31. **Loukaki, M.**, Université. Domaine byzantin, in: Dictionnaire enciclopedique du Moyen Age, Vol. 2, Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1997,
32. **Toffler, A.**, Toffler, H., Creating a New Civilization: The Politics of the Third Wave, Turner Pub., 1995
33. **Young, M.**, The rise of the meritocracy, 1870-2033: An essay on education and inequality. London: Thames & Hudson, 1958
34. **Young, M.**, Down with meritocracy: The man who coined the word four decades ago wishes Tony Blair would stop using it. The Guardian, London, 29 June 2001