

Legitimacy of Political Power in Modern Russia: Problems of Implementation

Alexander Kerimov

Department of Political Science
Ural Federal University named after B.N. Yeltsin
Russia, Ekaterinburg
a.a.kerimov68@mail.ru

Anna Shutaleva

Department of Ontology and Theory of Knowledge
Ural Federal University named after B.N. Yeltsin
Russia, Ekaterinburg
a.v.shutaleva@urfu.ru

Abstract—The paper is devoted to the analysis of the problems of the legitimacy of political power in modern Russia and the identification of factors that delegitimize political power. In the paper, the category ‘the legitimacy of power’ and the problems of the legitimacy of political power in modern Russia are considered. The authors propose a set of measures aimed at overcoming existing problems in the sphere of the legitimacy of political power.

Keywords—*legitimacy; political power; the personification of power; paternalism; democracy*

I. INTRODUCTION

According to a sociological survey conducted by the All-Russia Public Opinion Research Center in November 2017, 83% of those polled approved the work of the President as a whole [1]. For comparison, let us turn to the indicator in August 2014, which was 85.6%. In November 2017, 54% of residents approved the activities of the Government of the Russian Federation, in August 2014 this figure was 64%. In November 2017, 54% of residents approved the activities of the Chairman of the Government, in August 2014 this indicator was 69.3%. In November 2017, 56.3% of residents approved the action of the Federation Council, in August 2014 this figure was 48%. In November 2017, 51.3% of residents approved the activities of the State Duma, in August 2014 this indicator was 49%.

Based on the presented data from the sociological survey, it can be argued that political power in Russia enjoys a fairly high degree of legitimacy. However, the issue of the legitimacy of power in Russia is urgent and important for discussion. There are arguments in the open press that legitimacy in Russia has lost its universal character and encounters the legitimacy of another nature coexisting with it within the framework of one socio-political space [2].

Today we are seeing a consent in the relationship between government and society. However, the appeal to the problem of the legitimacy of political power in modern Russia is topical. If the consent is a consequence of a successful domestic political and effective economic course, then the legitimacy of power for society is unquestionable. But if the consent becomes a consequence of foreign political and geopolitical factors only, the result can negatively affect the legitimacy of political power. The high level of legitimacy demonstrated by the latest polls was achieved on the wave of

patriotism, Russia's attempts to revive itself in the status of a world power. However, overcoming the fundamental contradictions that exist between power and society is one of the main tasks for modern government. Contradictions between the authorities and society are determined both by fundamental phenomena and by procedural issues that require immediate resolution.

Historically, the process of state-building in Russia has characteristics that require attention from the political authorities to maintain the level of legitimacy. A personalized character is one of the characteristics of political power in Russia. This phenomenon in Russia has deep historical roots. The personal nature of political power is determined by the political culture of society, which directly affects the process of forming public authorities and the political activity of the population. The traditions of paternalism also prevent the achievement of a democratic version of legitimacy. The expectation from the supreme authority of action and belief in its boundless opportunities to implement changes in society is typical for Russian citizens. This circumstance negatively affects the political activity of citizens. Such a factor as the ‘separation’ of society from the state plays a colossal role in the de-legitimization of political power in Russia, which undermines the citizens' confidence in the state.

Methodologically, this paper is based on general philosophical and socio-humanitarian practices and methods. We used empirical data taken from open sources. This article is based on theoretical developments, in which the essence, features, characteristics, features of the legitimacy of political power under different regimes are analyzed. The authors paid special attention to the works devoted to the problems of the legitimacy of political power in modern Russia. The disclosure of the phenomenon and problems of legitimacy in general and its separate aspects is devoted to the work of J. Baudrillard [3], J. Habermas [4], R. Rose [2], M. Weatherford [5], P. Rosanvallon [6], S. Lipset [7], M. Kivinen, T. Cox [8], P. Rutland [9], J.-L. Chabot [10], D. Held [11], A. A. Kerimov [12], N. S. Rozov [13], E. B. Shestopal [14, 15] and other researchers.

The authors refer to the analytical material and empirical data, which allow them to set the following tasks in carrying out this study: to explore legitimacy as a category of political science; to investigate the problems of the legitimacy of political power in modern Russia; to develop directions and

mechanisms for achieving the legitimacy of political power in modern Russia.

II. LEGITIMACY AS A CATEGORY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

The concept of legitimacy is disclosed in a meaningful way as the consent of the people to power, the recognition by the people for the power of the right to make decisions that are binding for all. However, the aspect of legitimacy that includes specific technologies of legitimacy, which presuppose effective methods for creating effective communication between society and power, an attractive image of the state, political institutions, and the power elite, is also significant for this study [16]. It is important to note that legitimation does not have legal functions and is not a legal process. Legitimation is based on the recognition of the right of the holders of authority to prescribe norms of conduct to other individuals [17].

In political science, the analysis of the essence of legitimacy is traditionally carried out using three approaches, which subsequently led to the emergence of the following concepts of political legitimacy.

The conservative and authoritarian approach led to the formation of the first concept of legitimation, which can be defined as a loyalty concept. The main provisions of this concept are set forth in the works of Th. Hobbes, J. de Maistre, L. de Bonald, K. L. von Haller, E. Burke, J. D. Cortés, Ch. Maurras, A. Maur, O. Spengler, K. Schmitt, G. Gentile, E. Stadler and other researchers. A faithful concept justifies legitimacy by appealing to such sources of power as tradition, fear, religion, the authority of a strong personality, and the social hierarchy. This concept is formed on the dominance of the interests of the state and the complete subordination of society.

The liberal approach led to the formation of the second concept of legitimization, which can be defined as a civilian concept. The main ideas of this concept are reflected in the works of J. Locke, Ch. de Montesquieu, J.-J. Rousseau, I. Kant, A. de Tocqueville, J. Bentham, J. S. Mill, G. Mosca, J. A. Schumpeter and other researchers. The basis of the civil concept of legitimacy is the idea of the inalienability of natural human rights, the idea of the importance of the individual as an independent unit of social action and the idea of the people's ability to rationally self-determination on the basis of majority consent. The civil concept of legitimacy is based on democracy, the sovereignty of the individual, the rule of law, pluralism, representation, elections.

The socialist approach led to the formation of the third concept of legitimacy, which can be defined as a collectivist concept, which is ideological in nature. At the heart of the collectivist concept lie the ideas of equality, justice, solidarity and self-government.

It is not difficult to see that the above-mentioned concepts are primarily practical in nature, that is, the nature of political doctrines that proclaim, substantiate and defend certain relations between state power and society. However, in these concepts, relatively little space is given to the theoretical question of the nature of legitimate and illegitimate power.

The question of the nature of legitimacy is the question of why, in the society, the phenomenon of voluntary subordination of the object of power to its subject arises.

The study of legitimacy and the solution of problems associated with the vein of the classical approach laid down by M. Weber. The essence of M. Weber's approach is that legitimacy plays a secondary role as a category of political science. An insignificant segment of socio-political practice belongs to legitimacy. The study of legitimacy is reduced almost always to the analysis of more general categories, such as power, the state, society and other political categories. Since Weber's concept in science has been studied quite widely, the authors of this article do not consider it necessary to dwell once again on the characterization of this concept. Suffice it to say that in real life, none of the types of legitimacy identified by M. Weber, practically does occur in its pure form. The society deals with their certain hybrid combination in one way or another.

A modernized version of the classical Weber's concept of legitimacy is the concept proposed by D. Easton. For D. Easton, legitimacy is a problem whose solution must answer the question: how do political systems manage to survive in both a stable and a changing world? [18]. D. Easton believes that the legitimacy of political power depends on the conformity of the solutions offered by the authorities to people's moral principles, their ideas of correctness and justice. According to D. Easton, the sources of power are ideology, political regime and political leadership [18].

An important concept for analyzing the problems of legitimacy is the J.-L. Chabot's conception. In Chabot's interpretation, legitimacy is the correspondence of the real or perceived qualities of the bearer of power to the expectations of those who are governed, willing to accept his power [19]. In his theory, J.-L. Chabot identifies four types of legitimacy, combining them into two groups, based on the logic of power relations. The first group consists of democratic and technocratic types of legitimacy associated with political actors, and the second group includes ideological and ontological types united by a paradigm of political action.

J. Habermas refers to such an important feature of legitimacy as the fact that legitimacy refers to the maintenance and preservation of social integration, the normatively defined identity of society, and serves to satisfy these claims. That is, legitimacy shows why existing institutions are worthy and competent to exercise legitimate power in such a way that the fundamental values of a society's identity are realized [20]. We agree with the Habermas' opinion that the norms are legitimate if they meet the criteria of communicative rationality, that is, they deserve the free recognition of each member of the legal community.

A significant range of opinions in the interpretation of the essence of legitimacy is characteristic of Russian political science. So, according to O. Shabrov, the problem of legitimacy is directly related to the problem of the recognition by the society of the legitimacy and justice of the existing political power [21]. A. Soloviev considers the legitimacy of power as a manifestation of support and trust [22]. V. Achkasov, as well as A. Soloviev, considers legitimacy as a

manifestation of support from the population [23]. N. Baranov believes that power is legitimate in the event that the 'managed' recognize her the right to rule [24]. M. Ilyin and A. Melville emphasize that the key importance is the belief in the right of a political actor to rule in any interpretation of legitimacy [25]. The authors of this article believe that legitimacy is a manifestation of popular support for the polity, which is based on the consent of the population with the power based on the values authority offers and shared by society at a particular historical stage of development.

Analysis and comparison of various definitions of legitimacy make it possible to isolate its most general principles. These principles are the following: first, the political order corresponds to deep folk beliefs and beliefs about the order of subordination; secondly, the mutual justification of power and society; thirdly, the efficiency of order in terms of population growth, economic welfare and security; fourthly, the conformity of the order of subordination to the main international principles of the structure of a certain social order [26]. The indicated principles constitute the essence of power and political regime and allow us to formulate the functions of legitimacy. The main function of legitimacy is to ensure the consent in the society about the existing political order, its legality, validity, the participation of the masses in support, creating conditions for raising and maintaining the authority of the authorities. This function is also aimed at creating a system of relations between society and polity that is able to keep people in obedience if they agree with and support the current polity.

As a category of political science, legitimacy has a number of stable characteristics that are manifested at both the institutional and the content level of the effectiveness of the functioning of political power [12]. Institutional characteristics are manifested in a temporal dimension, that is, in the duration of the existence of this power, the stability of the state system, the stability of the political regime and socio-economic structures. At the level of effectiveness, legitimacy is manifested in a number of indicators, among which the main characteristics are the following: firstly, how successfully is the country's socioeconomic development progressing, how crisis-free is it, and secondly, how high are the performance of laws, the orders of the central government, how effective is the government vertically 'center - subjects'; thirdly, in the involvement of citizens in management processes; Fourth, how successful is the foreign policy course; Fifthly, how often do the authorities resort to forceful methods to assert their positions [12].

Legitimacy is not a constant [12]. Legitimacy depends on the political, socio-economic, foreign policy pursued by the authorities. Legitimacy can change its character, the degree of public support rises or falls. In such cases, we have to talk about the crisis of power or its delegitimation, which is reflected in a decrease in the level of public support the polity [12]. The crisis of the legitimacy of power is the main cause of modern large-scale and revolutionary changes in the Russian state [27].

The reasons for the delegitimation of political power are the growing contradictions between the values of society and

the interests of the ruling elite, the ideas of democracy and socio-political and economic practice, the authorities' desire to solve problems by force, the disregard of the people's interests, the growth of bureaucratization and corruption, the lack of consensus between the branches of power, the manifestation of nationalism, ethnic separatism in multinational states. The skepticism and discontent of a large part of the population intensify the delegitimation of political power. The discontent of the population can be connected with the activities of the authorities, political elites and parties representing the interests of individual groups, unequal access to political information, advertising, finance, as well as the weakness of the government itself, its inefficiency.

The lack of power and its incompetence create a crisis of legitimacy. The crisis of legitimacy poses important tasks for preventing and overcoming the negative consequences of this crisis for the authorities and society. The search for ways out of the crisis actualizes the problem of identifying possible sources of legitimization of power.

One of the main sources of legitimization is the participation of the masses in government. Involvement of citizens in the process of governance creates a sense of belonging to the population in the decisions made by the authorities, allows the population to feel themselves participants in political life, to feel responsible for the affairs in society.

Technocratic legitimization is also a source of legitimization of political power. Technocratic legitimization is directly connected with the administrative activity of the authorities. The authorities rationalize administrative, economic, military, educational and similar activities. Thus, the government creates strong prerequisites for its own legitimization. In this case, the degree of legitimacy will directly depend on the effectiveness and results of the work done, the goal of which is to establish stability in the society and create conditions for successful comprehensive development.

An unpopular but significant source of the legitimacy of power is coercion, that is, the use of force. All political regimes rely more or less on coercion. But coercion without legitimacy is tantamount to tyranny for those who experience it. Thus, the crisis of legitimacy can be overcome by observing a number of conditions. The authorities must take a set of measures to restore an acceptable level of balance between the various branches of government and establish a system of regular communication with citizens in order to inform them of the activities and plans of the government. The authorities should improve the legislation taking into account the traditions and interests of the society, as well as the unconditional observance of the rights and freedoms of the individual, raising the level of the political and legal culture of citizens, and establishing a system of control over the authorities.

III. PROBLEMS OF THE POLITICAL POWER LEGITIMACY IN MODERN RUSSIA

Political power in modern Russia enjoys a fairly high degree of confidence on the part of the population of the country. This statement is confirmed by the results of the sociological survey, which are given in the introduction.

However, this support does not provide complete assurance that this legitimacy is systemic. The legitimacy of this legitimacy is questioned because in Russia there are opinions that the consolidation of society is carried out through the personification of power in the person of the President, which is supported by heterogeneous groups of values in value terms [14]. It should be noted that the personification of power in the history of Russia is one of the variants of the legitimacy of power [28] and corresponds to Russian self-consciousness.

The achieved high level of legitimacy does not indicate the overcoming of existing disagreements in the society along with all possible lines of social schism. The study of this phenomenon leads to the assumption that the legitimacy demonstrated by the political class is structurally deformed. Its problems are generated both by fundamental phenomena and by procedural issues that require immediate resolution.

The main legitimizing element in the structure of legitimation in modern Russia is the personal component. During the entire post-Soviet era, other legitimizing components, such as ideological and structural, did not develop, and the citizens of the country do not realize full value and significance of these legitimizing components. Historically, political power in Russia has a pronounced personified character. This phenomenon has deep historical roots and is determined by the political culture of society, which directly affects the process of forming government bodies and determines the nature of the country's political regime. Russian society evolved in such a way that a complex and largely dramatic historical experience has developed an unequivocally positive attitude of the people towards statehood, perceived as the decisive pledge of stability and order [29].

Russia's intermediate geographical position between Europe and Asia has brought into the nature of Russian political culture a certain duality, expressed in the interaction of two sociocultural principles, and sometimes in their confrontation. Due to natural and climatic conditions and peculiarities of socio-cultural and political development in Russia, the dominant one was the basis, which was based on such values as collectivism, sobornost, justice, the idea of equality. This beginning is characterized by adherence to patriarchal traditions.

Another beginning is European. The European principle contained the values of freedom, individualism, human rights, pluralism. The interaction of these two sociocultural principles on Russian soil was not always conflict-free and often gave rise to duality and contradictoriness in society. Thus, a certain Eurasian vector on the 'sociosphere' of the Russian mass consciousness is actually visible [30], and modern Russia appears not as a purely European and not even a Eurasian, but, so to speak, European-Eurasian country.

Historically, Russia has become dominated by the tendency to monopolize power with giving it a character of a sacramental. In Russia, such natural historical mechanisms of social evolution as individual economic interests, property, competition, and the market that have become the basis for the emergence of a mature civil society in the West have recently become widespread.

Attention is also drawn to the traditional amorphism of the social structure and the system of social relations. In the Russian environment, there is a process of folding an integrated system with clearly defined group interests, rights and duties in relation to society and the state. It is widely believed that as a result of the centuries-old policy of state paternalism, a broad, personalized perception of power and attitude toward it through the prism of political leaders, rather than political institutions, has emerged in broad sections of society [31]. Such a way of state influence on society has led to such negative phenomena as the underdevelopment of democratic political culture and civil society, the passivity of the population from the point of view of expressing its own political position and the lack of faith in the possibility of influencing political power. Under the influence of the above factors, a stable paternalistic culture was formed in the public consciousness.

The inherent paternalism of Russian society makes it difficult to establish an activist political culture and civil society. The political activity of citizens is adversely affected by the habit of waiting for the supreme authority to act and believing in its unlimited possibilities in implementing changes in society. However, paternalism cannot be regarded as a fundamentally insurmountable obstacle to the formation of a partnership between the state and society. In this respect, the experience of post-war Germany, Italy, Japan, which has taken the path of creating a democratic society, deserves attention. The examples of these countries show that cultural values are not invariable or inherent in a particular race, religious group or social class. Cultural values can be transformed through political and legal measures, economic and social reforms, through the efforts of enlightened political leaders and through the power of education and upbringing through schools, churches and the media [32, 33]. Consequently, the feeling of paternalism is also not a pre-set and an integral feature of the psychology of the people.

At the beginning of the 1990s, Russia had a historic chance of developing a society and a state along the democratic path [8]. The Yeltsin regime was established on the wave of powerful popular support and possessed at the initial stage a high level of legitimacy. However, later, due to miscalculations in the implementation of reforms, adoption of inefficient decisions, corruption of the higher echelons of power, this regime lost its popularity [34]. The shooting of the parliament, the war in the North Caucasus, the economic crisis, large-scale corruption have become destabilizing factors in public life. With this development of events, delegitimization of power was inevitable, and the political elite faced the question of preserving power [35]. At this time, a social request for a leader of a charismatic type arose. Citizens of the country were waiting for a leader who could bring order to the country.

The sharp complication of the socio-economic and domestic political situation in the country became the backdrop for V. V. Putin's success of the presidential elections. This victory was also conditioned by Putin's compliance with public sentiments, the paternalistic hope of the majority of citizens for a strong and effective government capable of coping with the chaos in which the country was

submerged. The choice in favour of V. V. Putin was in full accordance with the political consciousness of the Russians.

V. V. Putin's promises were simple and understandable: to bring order to the country, to end the war on the territory of his own state, to complete the reforms announced by him, to revive the greatness of Russia, to provide citizens with a decent life. We must admit that he managed to justify the expectations of the people and become a key factor in the stability of the political regime. He is believed to have been able to restore a single legal space on the territory of the state, significantly expand the legal framework through the adoption of a number of codes and other laws, overcome differences between the executive and legislative branches of government, achieve GDP growth, increase the income of the population, bring the pensions closer to the subsistence level. Moreover, the national idea has begun to take shape and has become consolidated in the mass consciousness. The national idea included Soviet ideas of social justice and equality embodied in the symbolism of the victory over fascism and pride in the exploit of the fathers and conservative ideas related to Orthodoxy and other deeper historical traditions of Russian statehood [15].

Thus, improvements in social and economic life have become the President's main achievements. The transition from a mixed system to a proportional one in the election of deputies of the State Duma was carried out, the powers of the heads of regions were significantly reduced, power in the person of the United Russia Party is created. As a result of these measures, the stabilization of power has occurred. However, the political regime cannot be attributed to either a developed democracy or classical authoritarianism. The multiparty system persisted, elections with the participation of political parties were conducted competitively, citizens took part in the political life of the society. However, against this background, there are opinions that the existing political order is more focused on servicing the interests of the elite and steadily loses its representative functions and, while absolutizing its managerial capabilities, becomes the customer and beneficiary of state regulation [36]. Thus, the political order will redistribute the system of power and state administration to its own interests, transforming the levers of political domination into a means of self-legitimation and resource support [36].

Undoubtedly, during the years of Putin's leadership, the legitimacy of political power in Russia has greatly increased. Factors such as relative prosperity in the economy, improving the living standards of the population, recreating the security atmosphere, strengthening Russia's international positions, skilful ideological processing of the masses, helped the process of legitimizing power, restoring confidence in political power.

However, the increase in the level of legitimacy of political power in modern Russia is taking place with the weakening of resistance against anti-democratic tendencies in Russia. The mechanisms include the removal of people from political participation, minimizing the effect of its influence on managerial processes. The overwhelming majority of the population rejects liberal values, perhaps, as imposed from the

outside. At the same time, voters actively participate in electoral campaigns and thus demonstrate their commitment to the existing regime, legitimize it.

The natural question arises: why is this happening? We believe that this phenomenon can be explained by the following reasons. First, it becomes a process of development of civil political culture, which in the future will contribute to the formation of an activist type of personality. Secondly, the development model proposed to society implies a contract between the government and society on the exchange of democratic freedoms for relative economic prosperity, which happened in Russian society during the formation of the modern political regime.

The next 'pain point' of Russian society is the gap between the rich and the poor, which persists and increases. This difference affects the formation of a negative attitude to the ruling elite with the subsequent loss of its legitimacy. Social inequality directly affects the rational political activity of the population. As practice shows, entire segments of the population are excluded from the political life of society, deprived of the possibility of real participation in the political life of the country, do not have the opportunity to include their demands on the agenda, since there was a concentration of power in the hands of a narrow circle of the ruling elite [37].

The ineffectiveness of state institutions strengthens authoritarian tendencies in the political system. The corruption of the bureaucracy, the low level of trust on the part of citizens towards the parliament, political parties and other bodies of state power create conditions for the removal of real politics beyond the framework of constitutional structures. As a result of such shift, the centre for making crucial decisions becomes structures that do not have a constitutional status. Such structures include the administration of the President of the Russian Federation, the State Council, the Security Council, the system of federal districts, public chambers.

The deformation of the structure of the legitimacy of political power is also connected with economic policy, where state corporations, transformed into semi-autonomous centres, are of great importance. As a result of this practice, 'a part of economic decisions is taken out of the sphere of competence of the federal and regional administrative elite and is delegated to the leadership of state corporations, which, in fact, constitutes the immediate environment of the president' [38]. Thus, the activities of such structures undermine the effectiveness of public authorities. In terms of the degree of influence on political processes, these structures are more influential than state authorities. They strengthen their faith in the power of the 'vertical of power', presenting it as the only one of all possible alternatives capable of leading the country out of a crisis state. This belief and commitment to the 'vertical power' of citizens of the country are confirmed by the data of sociological surveys that demonstrate the model of patriarchal attachment of Russian society to power, in which the first person of the state acts as the supreme arbiter and last resort. Meanwhile, this attitude of citizens towards government institutions undermines the process of expanding legal and rational legitimacy, and to some extent allows the ruling elite not to carry out reforms and modernization of the

political system, but only to preserve the existing situation. This happens in systems of an authoritarian type, where the authorities lose their impulses for renewal, as a number of researchers note. Agreeing with the opinion of domestic political scientists, we note that if threats either from the outside or from the inside are not taken seriously, the political elite will not be interested in creating conditions for sustainable development, providing for their personal interests by enhancing the extraction of society's resources through relevant institutions and providing its internal and external security with the help of the police and the army [39]. Against this background, a special role is acquired by a symbolic policy, trying not so much to convince the population of the constructiveness of the tasks set, how to appease the public and dose the manifestations of civic engagement. In order to broaden the base of legitimation in the program slogans of the authorities, the broadest spectrum of political slogans living in the memory of generations is represented [40].

IV. DIRECTIONS AND MECHANISMS FOR ACHIEVING THE LEGITIMACY OF POLITICAL POWER IN MODERN RUSSIA

There is no classical crisis of political power in modern Russia, but the existing problems can contribute to the accumulation of potential for its delegitimation. Among the factors contributing to this process, we can distinguish, firstly, socio-economic problems, secondly, the absence of a single elite acting on the basis of consensus and capable of carrying out the necessary reforms, and third, a realizable foreign policy that exerts additional pressure on the economy of the country. In addition, the concentration of power on its upper floors, with the obvious weakness and ineffectiveness of other 'carrying' designs of the political system, economic and social institutions, poses a serious threat to the present and future of Russia [41].

If the activities of the president were assessed on individual positions, namely how it copes with corruption, rising prices, solving health and education problems, and migrants, then the question of the long-term nature of the current political regime would become topical. However, today the question is not put that way. Today, the socio-political situation looks inertial. V. V. Putin has so far proved its effectiveness, and this is connected with hopes for him.

Let us turn to V. L. Inozemtsev's point of view on the further course of Russia's development, which notes that for the transition to a new period of stagnant stability in power today there are two instruments [42]. In politics, this is an opportunity for the liberalization of opposition parties and against the background of this process of restructuring the ruling party. With adequate management and removal of odious figures, the result may be even an increase in the prestige of pro-government political structures. In the economy, this is a further reliance on the commodity economic model. Inozemtsev stresses that any attempts to change the raw materials economy cause such obvious evidence of the incompetence of the authorities that they should not be repeated for the sake of its own self-preservation [42].

In the light of the above, a number of political decisions can be considered, the implementation of which, in our opinion, will play a positive role in overcoming the problems of structural deformation of the legitimacy of political power in Russia and restoring the confidence of its citizens in its institutions:

1. The corruption component in the sphere of public administration and economy should be eliminated. Conditions for the development of small and medium-sized businesses should be created. Authoritarian methods of management in the economic sphere violate the fundamental principles of a market economy. The decision-making process should be fairly open, only, in this case, the authorities will enjoy the confidence of the citizens.

2. It is necessary to reorganize and optimize the scope of management, reduce the number of managers while improving their efficiency. At present, the growth of the administrative apparatus in Russia has reached colossal scales, which affect the process of the country's development.

3. It is necessary to conduct an effective personnel policy. Experts should be involved in the management sphere on the basis of the principle of professionalism, and not the principle of political and personal loyalty to the leader. Constructive cooperation, as well as constructive criticism, is possible only on the condition of attracting professionals in their field, and not 'managers' who do not know all stages of production and organization of enterprises.

4. It is necessary to establish feedback between the authorities and society. An important role in setting up such a communication channel can be played by the scientific intelligentsia, whose potential in this respect is not fully in demand and realized. The importance of the intelligentsia, as a bulwark of statehood, is clearly underestimated in modern Russia, and it can be clearly argued that for the state and the stability of society there is no greater threat than excitement among intellectuals.

5. It is necessary to establish a constructive dialogue with the opposition, to abandon the rigid regulation of both protest activity and the information space.

6. It is necessary to develop parliamentarism, which has a colossal legitimizing potential of political power.

V. CONCLUSION

The analysis of the problems of the legitimacy of political power in modern Russia allows us to arrive at the following conclusions and conclusions. Political power in modern Russia has a fairly high degree of public confidence. The legitimacy achieved during the years of Putin's rule of the country is based on a gradual increase in the level of political culture and public consciousness. The legitimacy of Russian political power is structurally deformed and has its own specifics. The factors that prevent the establishment of legal and rationalist legitimacy are the following: the personification of power, its monocentric, the multifactorial nature of the strategic planning of socio-political and economic development, corruption, paternalistic traditions,

bureaucratization of the state, the complexity and multifaceted implementation of the aspirations of the ruling elite for modernization.

The specific nature of the legitimization of political power in modern Russia is determined by fundamental historical roots. This process is influenced by the features of the political culture of the society, the experience of state building, the specific nature of relations with the external environment. Legitimation of political power in modern Russia occurs in conditions of increasing authoritarian tendencies and minimizing political competition, revision of some elements of direct democracy. Paternalistic moods are growing in the society, which contributes to the personification of power and reduces the legitimacy of power.

References

- [1] VTSIOM: Approval of the activities of state institutions. Retrieved from: http://wciom.ru/news/ratings/odobrenie_deyatelnosti_gosudarstv_ennyx_institutov/
- [2] R. Rose, "The impact of president Putin on popular support for Russia's regime," *Post-Soviet Affairs*, vol. 23 (2), pp. 97-117, 2007.
- [3] J. Baudrillard, "Simulacres et simulation," Paris: Galilée, 1981.
- [4] J. Habermas, "Legitimation problem in the modern society," *Communication and evolution of society*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1979.
- [5] M.St. Weatherford, "Measuring political legitimacy," *American Political Science Review*, vol. 86, pp. 149-156, 1992.
- [6] P. Rosanvallon, "La légitimité Démocratique. Impartialité, réflexivité, proximité," Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2008.
- [7] S.M. Lipset, "Political man. The social basis of politics," Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- [8] M. Kivinen and T.Cox, "Russian modernisation - A new paradigm," *Europe - Asia Studies*, vol. 68 (1), pp. 1-19, 2016.
- [9] P. Rutland, "Post-Soviet nobles in Russia," *Polis*, vol. 3, pp. 55-72, 2016.
- [10] J.-L. Chabot, "Introduction a la politique," Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1991.
- [11] D. Held, "Models of democracy," Stanford University Press, 1990.
- [12] A. Kerimov, "Legitimacy of the political power: issues of definition and basic theoretical models," *Proceedings of the Ural State University, Series 3. Social sciences*, vol. 1, pp. 81-91, 2015.
- [13] N.S. Rozov, "Foundations and criteria of legitimacy of the post-revolutionary power," *Polis*, vol. 5, pp. 90-107, 2014.
- [14] E.B. Shestopal, "Axiological properties of the Russian politics and the strategy of the country development," *Polis*, vol. 2, pp. 61-71, 2014.
- [15] E.B. Shestopal, "Perception of V.V. Putin by Russian citizens: 15 years at the helm," *Polis*, vol. 6, pp. 68-80, 2015.
- [16] S.N. Fedorchenko, "Network technologies and legitimacy of the political regime," *Bulletin of the Moscow Region State University. Series: History and political sciences*, vol. 4, pp. 129-137, 2015.
- [17] V. Lysak, "Society as a system," Taganrog: TTI YUFU, 2012.
- [18] D. Easton, "Paradigms of the system analysis of politics," in "Political studies: anthology," Saint Petersburg: Piter, 2006.
- [19] J.-L. Chabot, "Legitimacy," *Polis*, vol. 5, pp. 137-143, 1993.
- [20] J. Habermas, "Relations between the system and the world under the conditions of the late capitalism," in *Thesis*, 2, 1993, pp. 123-136.
- [21] O.F. Shabrov, "Political administration: the issue of stability and development," Moscow: Intellect, 1997.
- [22] I. Soloviev, "Right and politics as mechanisms of legitimation the state projects," *Recognition of right and principle of formal equality: Collected papers of the international scientific conference in Voronezh, 10-11 June 2015*. Moscow: Modern economics and right, 2015.
- [23] V.A. Achkasov, "Power legitimation in the post-socialist Russian society," Moscow: Aspekt Press, 1996.
- [24] N.A. Baranov, "Legitimacy of power: political experience of Russia," *Socio-humanitarian knowledge*, vol. 1, pp. 18-29, 2008.
- [25] M.V. Ilyin and A.Yu. Melville, "Power," *Polis*, vol. 6, pp. 146-165, 1997.
- [26] Z. Dibirov, "Theory of political legitimacy: series of lectures," Moscow, Russian encyclopedia of politics, ROSSPEN, 2007.
- [27] P.P. Baranov, A.I. Ovchinnikov, and A.Y. Mamychev, "The state authority constitutional legitimacy in modern Russia," *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 6 (5S3), pp. 201-208, 2015.
- [28] N.S. Kollmann, "Representing legitimacy in early modern Russia," *Russian Review*, vol. 76 (1), pp. 7-21, 2017.
- [29] A. Galkin, "Political stability in the days of changes and crises," *Power*, vol. 7, pp. 5-9, 2016.
- [30] G. Vorzhetsov, "Issues of consolidation the modern Russian society," *Power*, vol. 7, pp. 148-152, 2016.
- [31] V.N. Rudenkin, "Civil society in Russia: history and modern times," Yekaterinburg: Ural State University, 2002.
- [32] L. Harrison, "Jews, Confucians, and Protestants. Cultural capital and the end of multiculturalism," Moscow: Mysl, 2016.
- [33] A. Kerimov and A. Shutaleva, "Education as a factor in preventing ethnic conflicts in modern Russia," *INTED2017: 11th International Conference on Technology, Education and Development*. Spain, Valencia, INTED, pp. 1382-1391, 2017.
- [34] M.Yu. Martynov and A.I. Gaberkorn, "Features of mass consciousness perception of corruption in Russia," *Sociological studies*, vol. 6, pp. 79-84, 2017.
- [35] A.Y. Mordovtsev, A.Y. Mamychev, T.V. Mordovtseva, and A.A. Plotnikov, "The legitimacy of the government in the political, legal and economic space of modern Russia: Features of understanding of the socio-cultural reasons," *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, vol. 6 (8S), pp. 179-183, 2016.
- [36] I. Soloviev, "Ruling elite in Russia: on the question of mechanisms and technologies of the political supremacy," in "Power and nobles," A.V. Duka, Ed. Vol. 2, Saint Petersburg: Intersotsis, 2015.
- [37] Yu.A. Krasin, "Social disparity in the political dimension," Retrieved from: <http://pravo33.wordpress.com>
- [38] Yu. Zudin, "To the 'elite community'? Transformation of the political regime in Russia," *Social sciences and modernity*, vol. 5, pp. 71-86, 2010.
- [39] M. Lebedeva, M.V. Kharkevich, Ye.S. Zinovieva, and Ye.N. Koposova, "Archaization of the state: Role of the modern information technologies," *Polis*, vol. 6, pp. 22-36, 2016.
- [40] I. Soloviev, "State as a politics maker," *Polis*, vol. 2, pp. 90-108, 2016.
- [41] V.V. Petukhov, "Recessionary reality and the potentials of political transformation of the Russian society," *Polis*, vol. 5, pp. 8-24, 2016.
- [42] V.L. Inozemtsev, "Prospects of Russia development in the new political cycle," *Polis*, vol. 3, pp. 7-18, 2012.