

**MODERNIZATION OF DEMOCRACY TO
MÉRITO-DEMOCRACY****SONYA ILIEVA**PROFESSOR DSC
SHUMEN UNIVERSITY "KONSTANTIN BISHOP OF PRES LAV"
CHIEF EDITOR OF ONLINE JOURNAL SOCIOBRAINS**BULGARIA**

SONYAILIEVAA@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, MÉRITO-DEMOCRACY, SOCIAL CHANGE, ARISTOCRACY, AUTOCRACY, OLIGARCHY, PLUTOCRACY, BUREAUCRACY, TYRANNY, OHLOKRACY, ELECTION, SOTSIALDARVINIZM, 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 MÉRITO-DEMOCRACY, ELITES, POLITICAL ELITES, CIRCULATION OF ELITES, RECRUITMENT, MANAGEMENT, SOCIAL MANAGEMENT, MANAGERS, DEPUTY, MPs, REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE, LEGISLATION, LAW

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 post-modern version of 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 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 70s of the 20th century of the African peoples even led to power figures experts in warfare as Muammar 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.

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: NiderIndiya, 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 "masseuses" 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 Merito-democracy 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 Toflar'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 Bitoush 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 mlashta 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 pronounces 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.

REFERENCES

1. **ABERCROMBIE AND OTHERS., 1993:** SOCIOLOGICAL DICTIONARY, BURGAS
2. **BLACKWELL, 1997:** ENCYCLOPEDIA OF POLITICAL THOUGHT, SOFIA
3. **GLOBAL PARTY MERITOCRACY** , HOME PAGE: GLOBAL PARTY MERITOCRACY /SEEN IN 10.08.2013 /
4. **GOUNOD, J.-M., 1997:** END OF DEMOCRACY, SOFIA

5. **DAHL, R., 1999:** ON DEMOCRACY, SOFIA
6. **DAHRENDORF, R., 2000:** MORALS, REVOLUTION AND CIVIL SOCIETY, NATIONAL PUBLISHING HOUSE, SOFIA
7. **CANNON, P., 1995:** THE SUNSET OF DEMOCRACY, SOFIA
8. **ILIEVA, S., 2004:** AN IDEA FOR MARYTO-DEMOCRACY, SOFIA
9. **ILIEVA, S., 2008:** DEMOCRACY, MERITOCRACY AND MARYTO-DEMOCRACY, INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE "BULGARIAN SCIENCE AND EUROPEAN RESEARCH AREA", STARA ZAGORA, 5-6 JUNE
10. **OSIPOV, G.V., 1998:** ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SOCIOLOGY, MOSCOW
11. **PANTEV, A., 1997:** HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF POLITICAL DEMOCRACY, SOFIA
12. **POLITICAL FIGURES FROM AROUND THE WORLD, 1989,** A COLLECTION PARTIZDAT, SOFIA
13. **THE CHANGING FACES OF DEMOCRACY, 2000,** A COLLECTION EDITED BY D. MINEV, SOFIA
14. **SOCIOLOGICAL VOCABULARY, 1995** SKOPJE
15. **TOFFLER, A. AND H., 1995:** NEW CIVILIZATION, SOFIA
16. **FOTEV, G., 1993:** HISTORY OF SOCIOLOGY, FIRST VOLUME, SOFIA
17. **CHARTER 2013:** FOR BREAKING PLUTOKRATICHNIYA MODEL OF THE BULGARIAN STATE, SOFIA
18. **ARON, R., LE SPECTATEUR ENGAGE ,** PARIS, JULLIARD, 1981
19. **CASEY, W., 2009:** FIRSTS: ORIGINS OF EVERYDAY THINGS THAT CHANGED THE WORLD. PENGUIN USA
20. **DAHRENDORF, R., 2004:** REFLECTIONS ON THE REVOLUTIONS IN EUROPE, TRANSACTION PUBLISHERS
21. **ESTLUND, D., 2003:** WHY NOT EPISTOCRACY IN: DESIRE, IDENTITY AND EXISTENCE: ESSAYS IN HONOR OF T.M. PENNER, ACADEMIC PRINTING AND PUBLISHING
22. **FAUST, M., 2010:** THE MERITOCRACY PARTY, HYPERREALITY BOOKS
23. **FISHKIN, J., 1991:** DEMOCRACY AND DELIBERATION. NEW DIRECTION FOR DEMOCRATIC REFORM, LONDON
24. **FISHKIN, J., 1997:** THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE: PUBLIC OPINION AND DEMOCRACY, YALE U. P.
25. **FREEDOM IN THE WORLD:** THE ANNUAL SURVEY OF POLITICAL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES, 1966 - 1967
26. **HELD, D., 1996:** MODELS OF DEMOCRACY, 2D ED, STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
27. **HENRY, M., 1988:** UNDERSTANDING SCHOOLING: AN INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY OF AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION, PSYCHOLOGY PRESS, P. 81
28. **KAZIN, M., 2010:** EDWARDS, R., AND ROTHMAN, A., THE PRINCETON ENCYCLOPEDIA OF AMERICAN POLITICAL HISTORY VOLUME 2, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
29. **LAMPERT, K., 2012:** MERITOCRATIC EDUCATION AND SOCIAL WORTHLESSNESS, PALGRAVE-MACMILLAN, UK, DECEMBER 24
30. **LEVINSON, D., SADOVNIK, A.R., 2002:** EDUCATION AND SOCIOLOGY: AN ENCYCLOPEDIA. TAYLOR & FRANCIS. P. 436
31. **LOUKAKI, M., 1997:** UNIVERSITÉ. DOMAINE BYZANTIN, IN: DICTIONNAIRE ENCICLOPEDIQUE DU MOYEN AGE, VOL. 2, ÉDITIONS DU CERF, PARIS
32. **TOFFLER, A., 1995:** TOFFLER, H., CREATING A NEW CIVILIZATION: THE POLITICS OF THE THIRD WAVE, TURNER PUB.
33. **YOUNG, M., 1958:** THE RISE OF THE MERITOCRACY, 1870-2033: AN ESSAY ON EDUCATION AND INEQUALITY. LONDON: THAMES & HUDSON
34. **YOUNG, M., 2001:** DOWN WITH MERITOCRACY: THE MAN WHO COINED THE WORD FOUR DECADES AGO WISHES TONY BLAIR WOULD STOP USING IT. THE GUARDIAN, LONDON, 29 JUNE