

NATIONAL POLITICAL TRADITIONS To understand the peculiarities of the development of the Russian state–civilization, it is necessary to consider several key definitions of political science concepts. There is also a kind of democratic tradition of judicial proceedings, which can be traced in the Judicial Code of 1497, which forbade the judge to conduct the trial without the participation of "the best people", a kind of rudimentary form of jury trial. Many researchers emphasize that since the middle of the XV century, the issue of expanding the social base of the ruling stratum, i.e., the addition of the aristocracy by the democratic elite, has become relevant, which is clearly observed in the internal politics of Ivan III and his successors. Nevertheless, it is possible to talk about a return to the developed tendencies of self – government only since the middle of the XVI century. Then, in the famous reforms of the Elected Rada, the principles of local self–government are formed. So, the head of the volost self–government becomes a zemstvo headman, elected from the circle of local nobles, and his assistants are zemstvo kissers (they kissed the cross when taking the oath) from wealthy local peasants. The institute of a provincial headman was introduced, who performed police and limited judicial functions on domestic issues. He was also elected from the circle of local nobles, and his assistants, lip kissers – from local peasants. In 1550, a large–scale Zemsky Sobor was also officially assembled for the first time, which forms the tradition of representative democracy, but already on the scale of all Russia. If we compare it with the parliamentary institutions of Western Europe at that time, we can say that as the upper house, the Russian aristocracy formed the Boyar Duma, which had the right to participate in the activities of the Zemsky Sobor. The Consecrated Episcopate Cathedral and the abbots of the largest monasteries adjoined the Boyar Duma. The Zemsky Sobor itself was bicurial and was formed with the help of the institute of electors. The first curia was elected from among the metropolitan and zemstvo nobles, the second – conditionally bourgeois, from representatives of Moscow hundreds and villages, as well as provincial townships. The effectiveness of democratic institutions was greatly enhanced by the element of informality in official social relations. We are talking about the responsibility of the elected to their voters. A remarkable example described by V.O. Klyuchevsky is how one of the deputies of the Zemsky Sobor of 1648–1649 felt responsible. Gavril Malyshev, who was afraid to return to Kursk two months after the end of the Council, because he did not fulfill the instructions of his constituents. The tsar even had to give him a special security certificate. The Zemsky Sobor had real power. All the most important legislative acts: the Judicial Code of 1550, the Council Code of 1649, the Zemstvo Act on the abolition of Localism of 1682 and smaller–scale laws were developed and approved by Zemstvo councils. Zemstvo councils could elect a sovereign, as they elected 16–year–old Mikhail Fedorovich Romanov, who founded a new dynasty, to reign. The zemstvo councils also had the right to depose the tsars, as in 1610 they deprived Vasily Shuisky of the kingdom, unable to overcome the Turmoil. Zemstvo councils resolved issues of annexation of new territories, war and peace. Thus, the Zemsky Sobor refused Mikhail Fedorovich to accept Azov, captured by the Don Cossacks, into citizenship, and later in 1653 gave consent to Alexei Mikhailovich to accept Hetman Bogdan Khmelnytsky into citizenship with the territories of Little Russia subject to him. In Russian history, there was an example of a sovereign who actually betrayed national interests, but the estates could not legally deprive Peter III of power due to the lack of a legitimate power institution, which led to his physical elimination. The irony is that the sin of

regicide was not committed by foreign conspirators or revolutionaries, but by the most patriotic Russian officers. The process of restoring national democratic traditions began with the reforms of Alexander II in 1861. Following the liberation of the peasants (the authorship of the manifesto text belongs to the outstanding church hierarch Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov)) zemstvo and city reforms have been passed, restoring democracy at the grassroots municipal level. The assassination of Alexander II interrupted the restoration of democratic institutions, but it was continued by the reforms of Nicholas II and, although it was not completed, the trend was very clear empire. One of the most long-suffering terms in the political science field is the concept of "empire". In Russia, even a peasant addressed the tsar with "you". The serious disadvantages of the monarchy obviously include favoritism and the randomness of the birth of an heir. Such shortcomings, as well as the disadvantages of other forms of power, were eliminated in historical reality with the help of composite political systems, when the shortcomings of some forms of power are compensated by the advantages of others. Monarchies with aristocracies or monarchies with democracies are much more common than pure monarchies. The combination of all three forms of power should be attributed to the political traditions of Russia: for Pre-Mongol Russia, which was actually a confederation of sovereign principalities, it was a prince-druzhina-veche scheme within one principality, in the Russian Empire – the tsar-Boyar Duma-Zemsky Sobor. As for tyranny, in Hellenistic society, those who came to power illegally were initially considered tyrants. In Hellas there were even virtuous tyrants who acted as champions of civil rights, such as Pisistratus of Athens. However, Aristotle was one of the first to note the presence of cruelty among tyrants as a systemic principle. It is to Aristotle that the thesis belongs that the legitimate monarch is protected by citizens, and the tyrant is protected by mercenaries. The term "tyrant" in everyday life and often in academic literature is used as a synonym for the term "dictator" (Latin dicto – dictate, prescribe). In Russian history, there is a remarkable example of a democratically appointed dictator who became a national hero – Kozma Minin, who had the unique title of "elected man of the whole earth." As a classic dictator, he appointed Prince D. Pozharsky commander-in-chief and after the liberation of Moscow from the Poles and the calling of Mikhail Romanov to the kingdom, he resigned his powers. George Washington also had extraordinary powers during the American War of Independence and can in some sense be considered a Republican dictator. However, if the dictator does not add up his powers, then, as a rule, he turns into a tyrant.

ARISTOCRACY AND OLIGARCHY. In modern everyday life, the aristocracy is often called a community of representatives of the hereditary nobility. The Hellenes called such people Eupatrides, i.e. having a noble origin (Greek. ?? – good, good, glorious; ????? – father). In the political sense, an aristocrat is a eupatrid exercising public power. One of the main advantages of the aristocracy (unlike monarchy and democracy) is the ability to store, reproduce, develop and transmit national culture. This feature is associated with the reproduction of the nobility, in which education plays a special role. The main values of aristocratic upbringing are the ability to obey and command, as well as make decisions and bear responsibility. The serious disadvantages of the aristocracy include the randomness of the birth of heirs, and, unlike the monarchy, this disadvantage has a cumulative effect. Throughout history, various methods have been used to prevent the degeneration of the aristocracy, and all of them are based on the principle of replenishment. For example, the mechanism of "annobling" works according to this

principle, i.e. elevation to the dignity of nobility for special merits. In the earliest empires of Iran and Ethiopia, the title of head of state meant "the king of kings." That is, there were kings who were part of empires (with the loss of sovereignty) while retaining their titles, such as the king of Armenia or the king of Lydia were part of the Persian Empire with their kingdoms. Similarly, the king of Bavaria or Wurttemberg retained his powers as part of the German Empire. Russia embarked on the path of forming an imperial organism before it became a unified and independent state. Even during the reign of Ivan III's father, Prince Vasily the Dark, the noble Murza Kasim with relatives and vassals left for Moscow service. He was allocated land and presented with the Gorodets Meshchersky of the Ryazan region, which has since been called the city of Kasimov. Thus, within the Grand Duchy of Moscow, and then the Russian Kingdom, there was the Kasimov kingdom, with the only difference that its monarch was not called the "Kasimov tsar" (for the tsar is the emperor, he was in Moscow), but the "Kasimov tsarevich". When introducing the "individual good", J. Schumpeter appeals to positivism, within which there are only isolated and clearly demonstrated things. Thus, there is confusion in terms of the principle of comparing salty and red, when heterogeneous categories are compared: monarchy (form of power) is compared with the republic (principle of formation of public administration), and democracy (form of power) is compared with authoritarianism (type of political regime). For clarity of presentation, we will use the classical set of definitions. Aristotle in his assessments sympathizes with the principles of aristocracy, but recognizes the monarchy as the best form of power, with the proviso that the most worthy of the aristocrats becomes the monarch. He also showed interest in the "power of full-fledged citizens" and recommended maintaining the system of access to civil rights in such a state that "average people" (in the modern view, people of average income) were allowed to political life. Gradually, the circle of citizens grew, but in order to preserve from "devaluation", the principle began to operate: the more rights for one's own, the less rights for others. The ancients were well aware that the extension of civil rights to the entire population would lead to the complete disappearance of the concept of citizen. And if more than 90% of the population are citizens in the state, then there is no need to talk about democracy, it is replaced by ochlocracy. In modern society, democracy is separated from ochlocracy by a system of various qualifications: age, educational, property, and the qualification of settlement. Even in class societies, there is a social division into three unequal categories – the elite, the middle class and the social lower classes. And the most important task of society and the state is to counteract the growth of the social grassroots. The reverse trend is a characteristic feature of ochlocracy. Every healthy society has a complex structure, but if simplification processes begin to dominate in it, then, according to the famous formula of K.N. Leontiev, "any simplification is degradation", it rapidly turns into an ochlocratic mass. Vsevolod III The Great Nest for these purposes convenes in 1211 a "meeting of all ranks and ranks of people" from all over Russia, a kind of prototype of the Zemsky Sobor. If we consider this date to be the beginning of domestic parliamentarism, then this event is more than half a century ahead of the convocation of the first English parliament. In the XII century. Russia was so strong that no one wanted a single state. The author of "Words about the Destruction of the Russian Land" bitterly writes about the missed opportunities that at that time "the Polovtsians in the name of Vladimir Monomakh frightened their young children in the cradle, and the Lithuanians did not show up from their swamps, and the Ugrians

(Hungarians) strengthened the stone walls of their cities with iron gates, and the Germans rejoiced that they far beyond the Blue Sea."Moreover, there was no slavery in Egypt, but there was a dependent peasantry.?????????