

Democracy

All the above-mentioned makes reference to a forced mark: that of the democracy. Democracy should be understood not only as utopia or *form of ideal life*: society where it reign the freedom, the equality, the collective well-being. But also as government's form, like *form of social organization and politics* that, having for foundation the man's primordial value, it tries to be for the society an instrument of their freedom, an instrument of the justice, an effective ingredient of the collective well-being. More than to speak of an established democracy, of a situation already reached and definitive, we should speak of a long march, of a continuous exercise in search, under the sign of the freedom, the justice, the well-being. The democratic process is something incessant, insecure, accumulative of several dimensions that they conform it and characterize :

"It would be, because, inexact to say: the democracy was first freedom, later justice, and later well-being. The true thing is that if, in a first time, the democracy was a search of the freedom without a doubt, the men have understood it next as that it is the freedom more the justice, and, finally, as the freedom more the justice more the well-being" (G. Burdeau).

1) We know about long it dates that *the focus of the freedom* has been one of those more aided to come closer to the topic of the democracy, mainly in the western world, and soon after the liberal principles of the French Revolution. Already Robespierre, in their well-known speech of February 5 of 1 799, in which detailed what should offer the Republic, next to the morals (instead of the selfishness), and next to the equality (instead of the class privileges), he underlines the freedom (instead of the slavery). The freedom will accompany to all democratic or republican States. Robespierre sought that France was, under this aspect, the first democracy of the world. But we cannot forget that for then the ideas of the totalitarian Jacobins were also considered democratic. It is necessary to recognize

that this focus has prevailed in the West, and many of the essential demands of the modern constitutionalism, bound to the democracy, they come from the mental structure that considers the freedom, and its constitutional guarantees, like budget of the democracy. Biscaretti di Ruffia, already in his time, formulated the democrat State like the government of most, respecting the rights of the minority. State regulated by the <technique of the freedom> that is guaranteed legally by the constitutional Right.

2) From old the democracy has also been approached correctly from a *focus of equality*. Even recognizing that there are inequalities difficult to survive, the democracy has always claimed to equality, at least in theory. The coming of the democracy has brought with it a base of denying a legitimate to the pyramidal hierarchy of social groups. The democracy has been initially proclamation of the civic and artificial equality of the citizens. For Tocqueville and other, the democracy rests in this equality, be already accompanied by a régime of freedoms (as it was in the United States) or not (as it was in the French Old Régime). But we know that political this equality has been very subject to limitations. During a lot of time they were not granted to the slaves, to the foreigners, to the women, to the non-coreligionists. Same Robespierre in the mentioned speech, where he makes republican profession of democracy, he ends up saying that the social alone protection owes to free citizens; but in the Republic, alone the "republicans" were civic. That is to say, in the French Revolution they were excluded of the artificial equality the anti-republican ones; as they will be in the Russian Bolshevik Revolution the class enemies, in the Cuban Revolution the <worms>, in the Sandinista Revolution the Robelos and Chamorros, in the Chávez' revolution the "escuálidos".

In our time, we should tie the democracy with the equality not alone <civic> and <political>, but also with the <social> equality and the <natural> equality, following the division of Bryce. And here it is where they originate the big conceptual differences of democracy. In a simplification excess, one would not say that the different conception of the democracy in the Western countries and in the totalitarian countries of the East, it derived of the different position regarding the

grade in that it was wanted to demand the < social > and < natural > equality of the men, as well as of the means that the régime thought to use for it.

3) *The participation focus* comes being privileged every day more as one of the formulas to extend and to deepen the representative democracy, although it doesn't stop to suppress it. We think today that the conditions of a democratic life are not completed if the individuals don't make use of their rights, that is to say, if there is not effective participation in the decisions and in the tasks; if the citizens don't influence in fact in the election of their rulers and in the daily handling of the public thing. It gives in the nail the democrat demanding when it always ties the participation lack with a vicious or bastard organization, be a production company or an union or a political party. Where participation failure is given, it is also given inequality of responsibilities and of the advantages that report the several work positions or the different knowledge of the data. In good logic, Raymond Aron proposed an approach to distinguish the political opposed régimes, that of the pluralistic system of parties that facilitates the political real participation of the civil society and that of the régimes of unique and also of hegemonic and dominant party. The first ones, régimes of real and diverse political parties ('poliarchy' according to Dahl) are characterized by a constitutional organization of the peaceful concurrence, for the exercise of the power. That is to say, there is a <concurrence>: it is admitted the opposition legally to the established power. But that concurrence is <peaceful>: it excludes the use of the violence. And the Constitution should guarantee the exercise of this peaceful concurrence. "The commitment" is the <spring> ('principle' in the terminology of Montesquieu) that allows a good operation of this type of democracies. A pluri-partisan régime works well when it makes a good use of the commitment. The wide and enriching game of the participation requires, this way, the correct use of the commitment.

4) An *opening focus of transparency communicational* ('glasnost' Gorbachev called it) it is at the present time of good acceptance. It underlines that inside a democracy, most of the population has easy access and not distorted to the information of the facts and the knowledge of the handling of the public thing. It rejects that the politics is the matter of some few ones: 'mester' in the Half Age, or

'métier' for the French artisans, and 'mystère' for the Pythagorean ones in old Greece. It allows a moat opens up among this group of <begun in the mystery> and the other ones. And this distance reduces the effectiveness of the democratic mechanisms of election and of consultation. Through the monopoly of the informations, of the rite of the communications, of the multiplication of the intermediate instances, a group of power (whichever it is), is subtracted easily to the public control. It makes the hidden things or falsely. It seems to be certain current demand of the democracy that there is a continuous opening that allows that the behaviors and the outstanding knowledge are of the public domain, that is to say, be promoted, in certain form, to the status of public things (whichever it is the number of those who penetrate this public domain).

State of Right

An authentic democracy is possible only in a State of Right and on the base of the human person's direct conception. Besides settling on 'liberté' and 'égalité', a democracy today it should be sustained on the 'fraternité', the solidarity.

For Offe, "the late capitalism" of our time has generated a crisis of governance of our democracies. Fails the legitimate representation of the parties, that which, in turn, derives in a crisis of State, when not being possible to make a correct articulation between the State and the society.

For Bobbio, the democracy more than government's form is a method, the form of organization of the social power that makes possible the solution of the conflicts without the resource to the force. He observes that the democracy has not completed three promises, like they were those of eliminating the elites of power, that of self-government and the one of integrating the formal equality with the substantial equality. And he has denounced three perverse effects (specific problems) of our democracies:

- 1) the non governance, as inability of the political system to give answer to growing demands;

2) the customer relationship in politics, when the private relationships (with the goods of the State) displace the public relationships among representatives and represented;

3) the emergence of invisible powers (be secret services or mafias or terrorist groups or other forces).

All that demands a "gradual" change inside the rules of game of the democracy, and in special (as it is the case of Venezuela) occasions a reformation of the political democracy, just as it has been working.

Three possible strategies

In the search of a balance between the efficiency and the genuineness in the action of the State, and in the subsequent control of the factors that more impact in the quality of the government acting, they can be identified two opposed ways and a "third via" that is about integrating them. In form excessively simplistic we can denominate them: A) the average statal (socialist), B) the mercantile (new liberal), C) the average integration of a third new road (social democracy or of moderate left).

In all the tendencies (so much in conceptual perspective as historical), it is about finding the best relationship between democracy and efficiency, redefining the politician and economic orders. It is necessary to reinvent some new paradigm for the relationships between State and Society and Economy. We cannot forget that all the human (scientific, social, political) revolutions are not in short of bills but discoveries of new paradigms.

A. Preponderant role of the State

A traditional road, heiress of Hobbes and that it is identified partly with Weber, it affirms that the State is the one that makes possible the modernization because by means of its monopoly of the legitimate violence, it establishes the public order and

it imposes the empire of the law, pacifying the civil society, creating the artificial security and protecting the rights (of property) of the citizens so that these can be related freely and prosperously to each other. In such a way, the State is the necessary and enough condition so that the Market can end up settling down and to be developed. This is the best justification possible of any State interventionism (already come from the cultured despotism or of the socialist 'jacobinism' or of the totalitarian 'stalinism' or of the social democracy). The Society is regenerated, it is developed and it is modernized from the power of the State. To be able to increase their military power, the absolute European States left being not only forced to develop the economic potentiality of its populations, but also to grant them political and civil growing freedoms, being made this way possible the so much modernization of the market (economic development), as of the civil society (democratization). This phenomenon is underlined by McNeill (1988), and it is also by Tilly (1992) who baptizes him like process of civil conversion of the State.

Inside this tendency, applied at our time (*socialism in democracy*), the governance is conceived as the government appropriate acting in the context of a political democratic order. The advisable strategy for the governance doesn't consist on to reduce or to cancel the democratic process of taking of decisions, with participation wide margin, but being about adjusting the rhythm of the political processes with that of the socioeconomic processes. It is about obtaining a political enough stability to achieve a "progressive order", expert this as the balance of the functions of accumulation and redistribution in hands of the State.

B. Decisive role of the Market

In the other direction, descending of Adam Smith, of Marx, of Durkheim, they look for in the mercantile capitalist economy the origin of the developmental modernism. What we call modernization would be product, ultimately, of the forces of the market, which would be this way the immobile unchaining motor of all the other processes of development that includes the military might, the science and the technology, and the same State. It would be the same market, as system of exchange relationships, the one that would generate the modernization. The source of the

wealth is no longer the internal development but the trade with the exterior: it is the growing opening of the markets what generates the great transformation (Polanyi 1989). This is the typical point of view of the liberalism, either in the classic version of Adam Smith and their invisible hand (Hirschman 1978,1989), or in Douglas North ' neoclassical version or in the most recent new liberalism (Hayek 1978 and Popper 1989).

From this point of view, the governance is associated to the necessity of putting an end to the excesses of the democracy, in the measure that the political participation and the democratic demands have generated a "overload" for the governments. This has taken to an "unbalanced expansion" of the government activities, in damage of the private initiative. A disintegration of interests has taken place; the parties have entered in crisis; it has gotten lost the government authority. In accordance with this perspective, it is not the democratic process of taking of decisions, but the market, the one that a good government guarantees. The advisable strategy is to substitute the politics for the economy, or at least, to reduce the field of action of the State. Of here the proposal arises for a "minimum State", with a very obliging hymen towards the big interests and the transnational empires.

C. Alliance of State and Market

Leaving to a side the discussion on the important role that other institutions have had as 'coresponsible' for the modernization (the religion, the science, the family, the printed writing, the computer new technology), we find right the view of who today claims for the State the main role and main character of the modernization, although in alliance and intimate relationship with the modern capitalism that is that European-western and Chinese other innovation, without which had not been possible the leader and innovative function of the political thing.

For our Latin American systems and of Caribbean (all of limited development), the Historical School begins to incline the scale in favor of the State authors (heirs of Max Weber and Otto Hintze). And even among the new liberal of advanced countries that wanted to ignore the historical paper of the non economic institutions, a figure like Douglas North, prize Nobel of Economy who claims the paper of the

State and of the rest of non economic institutions, without those that the current capitalist market could not work (North 1993, 1994).

We find in Theda Skocpol an eclectic and balanced position; she can help us for our analyses and etiology of the Venezuelan case. She represents a line of recovery of the State and couples with a line of statement of the Market. She understands the State as the dominant organization in the society, like an organization with a basic "necessity of maintaining the control and the order." This conception would help to reconcile, in our countries, the tendency to an economic certain and moderate neo-liberalism and the tendency (reissued by CEPAL) to re-affirm the State as an organizational dominant structure that should control a half national and international one problematic, and with it to help to re-structure the society that it says to govern. It is overcome, this way, the conception of those who wanted to reduce the State to a simply representative (of interests of groups or classes) government or to limit it to a half mercantile one imperfect (public square of transactions). We assume, with clarity, the interdependent paper of the State and the Market to explain the modernization processes. Both institutions, those of the State power and those of the social capital, the State and the Market, they are equally responsible of the modern change. As well Gil Calvo affirms we should intervene the two factors, at the same time, even distinguishing them conceptually:

The State is always obligatory (it imposes the empire of the Law), hierarchical (it establishes relationships of authority and subordination), centralized (it possesses a capital that promulgates norms, it emits currency, it collects taxes and it redistributes resources) and closed (it has opposite external clearly defined, beyond which it lacks to be able to).

On the other hand, the markets are institutions: voluntary (because their transactions are free), egalitarian (because the relationships are of symmetry among competitors or of complementation among borrowers), distributive or decentralized (because all the points of the mercantile net possess the same transaction capacity) and open (because all their actors can enter and leave the market when they want,

contracting and revoking their reciprocal relationships of mutual agreement, according to the free will of the parts).

Now then, the States (territorially contiguous but separate others) and the markets (diffusely superimposed and interconnected) advance mutually, although they don't coincide to each other.

We find attractive for Venezuela the proposal of this new one "third via", very adapted to the aim and peculiarities of the current Venezuelan that maybe could channel the ideological several elements that are moving - with dialectical force - for the Republic of the new millennium. The two beds or rails should be: first) the democratic one and second) that of social justice. It is the proposal of a "third via" like an intent to overcome and to transcend the social democracy so much to the old one as well as the new liberalism with their unavoidable load of social injustice. Its main values are: equality; protection of the weak ones; freedom as autonomy; any right with responsibility; any authority with democracy; cosmopolitan pluralism; philosophical conservatism. The "third via" refers to a thought mark and practical politics that it looks for to adapt the social democracy to a world that has changed essentially throughout both or last three decades. It is a third via as soon as that is an attempt to transcend the Social democracy, so much the Old one as the New liberalism.

Situation pre-revolutionary

Some people ponder on the critical joint of Venezuela in these last years. ¿Does it predispose for a revolutionary successful explosion? And when qualifying commanding Chavez his movement like 'revolutionary', ¿does it indicate that he has in mind this horizon? In his work, already classic, Gurr classifies the several forms of violence that imply an institutional break in: "Tumult" (spontaneous and disorganized), "Conspiracy" (convergence of several types of violence inclusive army and organized), "Internal War" (attempt of overthrowing the system that counts, at the same time, with the population's popular wide support)."

Octavio Paz, Nobel of Literature in 1.990, has a very clear delimitation of these concepts in his work "Corriente alterna" (alternative power):

The *revolutions*, daughters of the concept of lineal progressive time, mean the violent change of a system for another.

The *rebellions* are acts of groups or marginal individuals; the rebel doesn't want to change the order, as the revolutionary, but dethroning the tyrant.

The *revolts* are daughters of the recurrent time: they are popular risings against a reputed unjust system and they intend to restore the original time, the inaugural moment of the pact among the equals.

The violent manifestations happened in 1989 in Venezuela would allow to speak of tumult or revolt as a popular rising against a fair system, but of quite spontaneous and disorganized character. But there was a clear indicator that a situation pre-revolutionary was gestating. And commanding Chavez took advantage of it to impel his 'revolution'.

The most appropriate formula to explain the Venezuelan case that of Davies (the principle of the curve J). This author attributes the revolutionary explosion from a society to the resulting frustration of a depression happened after a long period of expansion that fed hopes of a sustained growth. This model borrows elements of Marx's theory as like of the against-theory of Tocqueville. It takes borrowed elements of Marx when he affirms that the society appeals to the revolution when its socio-economic conditions worsen, since in that moment "it doesn't have nothing else to lose but their chains." And it takes borrowed elements of Tocqueville, when he sustains that they are the individuals whose economic situation has changed favorably, those that are under better conditions of going to the revolution, since they no longer contemplate the poverty like a not well unavoidable one, but as something remediable. Davies combines both positions when he tells us: "Both ideas have an explanatory value and possibly until a predictable value, if they are put together and placed in the temporary fair sequence". This principle of the curve J

is valid in some socio-political situations as the current Venezuelan case, in which the conjunction of the two factors it has been given.