MEDWIN PUBLISHERS
Committed to Create Value for Researchers

The Delegated-Cooperative Democracy as an Alternative to the Crisis of Contemporary Democratic Policies

Tendai Chingore T*

Doctorate in Philosophy, Pedagogical University, Poland

*Corresponding author: Tiago Tendai Chingore, Doctorate in Philosophy, Pedagogical University, with a Sandwich Doctorate in Philosophy from UFC-Brazil. Professor of Political Ethics, Philosophy of Law and Political Philosophy in the Department of Social and Philosophical Sciences at UP, Beira Delegation. Coordinator of the Research Group on Culture and Development: Modernizing the Traditions of CEMEC (Center for Mozambican Studies and Ethno sciences), Research on Political Thought and models of Governance, Education, Political Ethics and Intercultural Philosophy, Poland, Email: ttendaigamachingore@gmail.com

Abstract

This article aims to analyze the issue of democracy the delegated cooperative democracy as an alternative to the crisis of contemporary democratic policies. At first, the theoretical premises that guide the theoretical framework that underlies the liquid-cooperative democratic model are exposed: starting from the philosophical reflections of John Dewey and Axel Honneth. In a second point of view, from procedural deliberative democracy to liquid-cooperative democracy: How can we redirect power to citizens in the context of today's democracies? In the third point we present the idea that lies behind the "spirit" of net-cooperative democracy as a credible alternative to democracies in the 21st Century. We consider this credible democratic model that can "rally" power to citizens. Methodologically, the work is based on deconstruction and reconstruction, accompanied by the reading, analysis and interpretation of texts that deal with the subject under study. It is concluded that the time has come to institute a democratic policy that can 'redouble' power in the hands of citizens in order to participate equally in public life, thereby minimizing the great social, political and economic inequalities prevailing in the various States considered democratic in the world and in Mozambique in particular.

Keywords: Deliberative Democracy; Cooperative or Delegated Democracy; State; Power and Crisis Politics

Introduction

This article has as its main objective the elaboration of a philosophical critical analysis that starts from the liquid-cooperative democracy as an alternative to the crisis of contemporary democratic politics. The effort undertaken in theorizing this text aims to present a possible alternative to the crises that democratic policies have gone through in recent years, and if we look at the strong gap that democratic regimes are facing today. In this context, liquid-cooperative democracy would be or would consist of a new type or, if we want, democratic model that combines authoritarian practices and institutions with effective existence of "writing" power and rights in the hands of citizens, which characterizes political democracy (as it is the case of choosing the political governance project, the holding of free, fair and transparent elections).

However, we consider it pertinent and current, if we look at the chronic deficit that democratic states have been experiencing in recent days. Our presentation is structured around three fundamental points. At first, the theoretical premises that guide the theoretical framework that underlies the liquid-cooperative democratic model are exposed: starting from the philosophical reflections of John Dewey and Axel Honneth. The main objective of this part of the analysis is specifically aimed at explaining the theoretical bases that guide this democratic model, based on the reflections of the aforementioned authors. In the last two sections, more will be analyzed on how to "redact" power to citizens in the context of current democracies, seeking in a more detailed way to situate it in the current context of the processes that guide the crises of democracy. We also present the idea behind the "spirit" of liquid-cooperative democracy as a credible alternative to democracies in the 21st century. Our thesis is that liquid-cooperative democracy can be considered an alternative to contemporary democracies, as long as it is responsibly embraced by history's benefactors.

Theoretical bases that Underlie Liquid-Cooperative Democracy

We currently live in an era in which political power, States and governments are in trouble in the face of various difficulties no less serious than those that accompanied its construction process at the beginning of the modern era. Current politics are rather weak in the face of powerful competition from financial flows and media powers; its own space is lost in the unprecedented formats of globalization and in the face of the particular demands of individualization processes. Another big problem that is expected and that presents a good part of contemporary states is related to the fact that society or if we want to, we do not expect them so much in the guarantee of rights as in the realization of them John Dewey in his work The Public and Its Problems (1954) states that, although much of his democratic theory focuses on the second position, it is necessary to return to the first so that the radicalization of the democratic project can materialize. That is, understanding the functioning of the political system and improving its institutions is not enough. In turn, it is necessary to have very clearly the ends of democracy so that adequate means for its realization can be thought of. Still in the same perspective, the author argues that such means would not be ready in institutions such as suffrage, periodic elections and majority rule.

Democracy is, according to him, a project that is remade all the time, and its radicality resides in this dynamic nature [1]. Democracy has a striking feature in common with other political concepts: it is contestable. Throughout Western history, a fierce controversy has raged about the virtues and defects of democracy, seen as the government of the people.

Nevertheless, in recent centuries this controversy has often been limited to a comparison between regimes that is, between the relative merits and demerits of democracy as compared to monarchy and aristocracy.

Dewey's critique of what he calls "political democracy" actually reveals a critique of the modern state. As a form of government, "political democracy" consists of a set of political arrangements and institutions from which the modern idea of the State was consolidated: sovereignty, representation, majority rule and universal suffrage. In order to oppose this "political form" of democracy, Dewey elaborates the concept of the "idea of democracy". As an idea, democracy is a way of life, an indefinite and limitless set of shared practices and local political experiences. The idea of democracy thus consists of a way of living in community, a way of communal life [2]. While, therefore, the critique of "political democracy" reveals a critique of the modern State, the defense of the "idea of democracy" highlights a defense of the community as a form of political organization able to take the place of the State and its institutions. The State would be just one of the possible "political forms" that could be assumed by the "idea of democracy", but never the only one.

What Dewey understands by association does not consist of an intermediary organism between the State and civil society, nor does the democracy on which it is based merely consist of a modality of associative democracy based on the activity of bodies that mediate the relationship between the State and civil society. On the contrary, the association is precisely what allows the community to dispense with political mediations, thus resolving the contradiction between the State and civil society on which modern politics is based.

By making the transition from the State to the community, and from "political democracy" to the "idea of democracy", the association becomes cooperation and, within a normative political theory conceived by Dewey, implies self-determination and self-government. In other words, the association is what founds the community and cooperation is what allows it to be preserved, fortified, organizing itself in a self-governing and self-determined manner. As a way of life, democracy is an associative and cooperative way of life. As an associative and cooperative way of life, democracy is a self-governing and self-determined political form De Augusto F, et al. [2].

As Dewey defends: "the two criteria for assessing the value of some kind of social life are the extent to which a group's interests are shared by all its components and the breadth and freedom with which this group collaborates with others groups" [3]. In this author's perspective, the coexistence of these two criteria to a great extent characterizes

a democratically constituted society. Hence the concept of democracy, which for him, "a democracy is more than a form of government; it is, essentially, a form of associated life, of joint and mutually communicated experience".

However, in a democratic society, the first criterion proposed by the author, that of shared common interests, means the expansion in number and variety of points of participation and, more importantly, is the increase of confidence in the recognition that such reciprocal interests are the which should serve as direction and social control. This common interest, in Dewey's view, means the need for each individual to guide their activities in view of the actions of others, and take into account these behaviors to guide and direct their own.

The second criterion of a democratic society that of cooperative interaction and reciprocity with other groups, makes freer cooperation between social groups possible. Therefore, it is possible to develop social habits necessary for the process of continuous adaptation, bearing in mind the need to adjust to the new problematic situations created by the exchanges. Along the same lines, Dewey considers that a democratic society will only be efficient if the associated life of fellow citizens is an experience where meanings are constructed and communicated in joint action. Hence, "democracy is a principle that, as a way of life, must completely affect the human being" (Idem).

The conception that Honneth develops in his most recent book, The Idea of Lucius C, et al. [4], a necessary dream, starts from there, due to the persistence of the ideal socialist legislation. However, unlike Habermas, he makes a real project of society, the delineation of a "way of life". It is from the political work developed by Hegel that he draws the lesson that freedom is articulated in three different ways, that is, not only in the two classic conceptions of negative and positive freedom, but also in a third essential way, which was expounded by Hegel in the third part of the philosophy of law and constitutes the cornerstone of his ethical doctrine. Honneth calls "social freedom", a freedom that we acquire only in relation to others: in private relationships, in social relationships of exchange of goods and arrangements for political participation.

Furthermore, for Honneth, the institutionalization of procedures capable of underpinning the normative expectations of identity demands would be insufficient to ensure effective social justice and, therefore, incapable of encompassing the moral substrate inherent in inter subjective struggles for recognition: the experience of disrespect. According to Axel H, et al. [5], Dewey sees the presupposition for a revitalization of democratic publics located in the pre-political sphere of the division of labor.

This takes on special relevance in Honneth, as it "must be regulated in a reasonable and fair way so that each member of society can see themselves as an active participant in a cooperative enterprise, because without such awareness of shared responsibility and cooperation, the individual will never it will be able to turn democratic procedures into the means for solving common problems" [5].

Similarly, Severino NE, et al. [6] defends the idea that, "Democracy and the system of representation should pose the problem of assumptions. We must focus our efforts on the condition of democracy: the socio-cultural dimension. Democracy will require, as a preliminary condition, an action conceived from the authentic realities of our indigenous communities, apprehended from the interior" Severino NE, et al. [7]. Furthermore, democracy must respect three fundamental principles: tolerance, separation of powers, justice. This means that a democracy worthy of the name cannot be content with being a formal democracy, blind to material inequalities between members of society, but must aim for a concrete objective: social justice. However, what is clear is that its realization presupposes, at least, "the creation of mechanisms capable of preventing the development of too great inequalities within the community".

In theoretical terms, the question of cooperation could make one think of the famous orbis comunitas, but it is not in this sense that we intend to defend that what the people want is true communion. It refers to this concept in the deepest sense. This is, cum munia, sharing of goods Severino NE, et al. [7]. When speaking of goods, the concept cannot be reduced to a simply material dimension. Goods are material, but they are also immaterial. It is everything that contributes to the realization of social ties. The issue behind the cooperative model is linked to the sharing of munias; it is not primarily linked to wealth, to much. It is the gestures, the attitudes, the little things that are the strong signs of this cooperative need or communion that gives color to life.

Communion cannot save material munias, even if they are few and may even seem insignificant. What can cause conflict in a family or a community is not just the lack of sharing of material munitions, but they are also an important part of the life of communities. In fact, almost biblically, the more we share the poor munias or our poverty, the more they gain meaning and dimension as signs of communion Severino NE, et al. [6].

The way in which the problem of communion (cooperation) was dealt with in the RSA[1] for example is very interesting. Biblically, favored the return of the prodigal son, through a process of reconciliation. But the question

---

1   RSA- República Sul Africana.

that remains, and which is at bottom the historical-political drama of Mandela and the ANC[2], is the quid of sharing the munias? The reconciliation commissions were an important moment for sharing the sufferings that both suffered or caused to suffer; it was an important moment of forgiveness, of recognition of the wrongs suffered and committed.

For Severino NE, et al. [6] "it is imperative that we understand our territories, the nature of our relationships, real and mythical, in order to weave the threads of constant dialogue, those that can, over time, give space policy to nurture democracy around shared values". What is lacking in the democratic model is a utopia around the target community, which can only be achieved with a continuous vision of sharing material and immaterial goods. Community dreams in a democratic society presuppose that one goes beyond conflicting ethics to embrace logic of dialogue ethics. From this is inferred, in turn, the recognition of differences in opinions and even values, both founded and coherent, but not necessarily incompatible.

According to Severino NE, et al. [5] "engagement in political actions also has the direct function for those involved in pulling them out of the paralyzing situation of passively tolerated abasement and, therefore, providing them with a new and positive self-relationship". At this point, individual engagement in political struggle restores to the individual some of his lost self-respect, as he demonstrates in public exactly the property whose disrespect is experienced as oppression. However, with this reinforcement, the experience of recognizing that solidarity within the political group provides, enabling members to reach a kind of mutual esteem.

According to Severino NE, et al. [7], "cooperative democracy must comprise two specific parts: an axiological one and an institutional one. The axiological dimension (values) essentially rests on the principle of equality in law conceived as an abstraction to correct natural inequalities. It imposes, in an apodictic and non-negotiable way, respect for human rights, equality between citizens and respect for the dignity of people".

However, if values are not negotiable, institutions, on the contrary, have never known, in the history of democracies, a unique form. If values have a universal vocation, the institutional dimension of democracy reveals history, societies and cultures. Therefore, institutions, better, institutional models of democracy can and must change, can and must be acculturated, draw their legitimacy from collective imaginations, people's languages, the way or way

they conceive their social and collective life.

In this context, the different political and social forces that a given State has are necessary, so that they are the main interlocutors of each other that have a sense of the deep meaning of the "word" in terms of listening, dialogue, space for reconciliation. Therefore, political parties must consider themselves adversaries and not enemies. They must revitalize one another not from ethnic or regional affiliations, friendships and international support, but from political programs aimed at increasing national freedoms, democratic spaces, the participation of cultures in civil debate, the standard of living of the citizens [7].

In short, the idea of liquid-cooperative democracy aims at greater inclusion in all economic, social, political and cultural spheres.

How to Give Power to Citizens in the Context of Contemporary Democracies?

For more than two centuries, modern democracies have founded their legitimacy on a well-defined combination, one in which the consent of the people to be governed by representatives is freely assigned in elections. This mechanism came to embody the essence of democracy. But on the other hand, this mechanism is weakened by its own success, and confronted by serious criticism of principle, increasingly to the palpable dissatisfaction of citizens, who deviate from the ballot box, abandon political parties, condemn their elites and speak out against a system that, between two scrutiny, offers them little opportunity to act on public affairs.

According to Jean-Jacques R, et al. [8]. "Popular referendums, votes, citizens' deliberations, initiatives multiply to give power to citizens". In turn, Joshua Cohen and Archon Fung apud Journet state that "radicalizing democracy" is the ambition of all those activists or specialists who seek the means to give citizens the power to exercise the most frequent choices. Thus, they conceive other means such as the election of representatives to achieve without, therefore, disturbing the structure of modern societies, where citizens participate in groups that are broader than the times of antiquity when direct democracy reigned.

When you want to know the general will, Jean-Jacques R, et al. [8] recommended, "the best thing is to address the citizen directly: what is called a referendum, popular consultation is the superlative or superior democratic medium". However, most modern democracies resort sparingly: change of Constitution, independence, adherence to International Treaties, etc. In turn, the citizen accepts or rejects a complex adhesion that is submitted to him in order

---

2   NC- African National Congress. It is a South African political party and movement.

to answer a simple question: Yes and No. Can it be examined further? Yes, argue Elisa Lewis and Romain Slitine, but on condition of changing the priority rules and the tools in use: The people must be able to ask questions and not only give their proper answers.

However, the cooperative democratic model is the form of government that presents itself as the most adequate to the social complexity, which presupposes trust, self-limitation, consideration for others and a perspective of at least the medium term. Furthermore, cooperation is only possible when social actors are able to reflect and are able to act in a cooperative manner [9].

In turn, a democratic cooperative seamstress model, part of the justice of a seamstress who, with tenacious work and a lot of patience, sews the different parts in order to build a unique piece. For Severino NE, et al. [7] "the need to choose a reconciliation commission and not the establishment of a special court to punish the evils and crimes committed against humanity, clearly showed that the way to go to go beyond the human wrongs to human rights subordinated traditional punitive justice to reconciliation". That is, public acknowledgment of wrongdoing, repentance, the willingness to reintegrate the community with a new relational attitude.

Therefore, the premise behind this restorative justice aims between justices conceived as the intervention of a third person and justice understood as an encounter between the guilty and the victim whose objective is not the punishment of the guilty, but the composition of the controversial thanks to the recognition of the wrong done, forgiveness and, consequently, reconciliation and peace. The purpose of this democratic model is inclusion; it is to rebuild social relations.

The centrality of the pre-political sphere of the social division of labor assumes special relevance for Honneth, as this, […]. It must be reasonably and fairly regulated so that each member of society can see themselves as an active participant in a cooperative enterprise, for without such awareness of shared responsibility and cooperation - which Dewey correctly assumes the individual will never be able to make democratic procedures the means for solving common problems [5].

Engaging in collectively organized struggles removes individuals from a "paralyzing situation of abasement" and provides for an overcoming of the reduction in the sense of self-respect, opening up for the individual an innovative experience of moral self-understanding about himself resulting from the expansion of relations of recognition. As he himself defends, "individual engagement in political struggle restores to the individual some of his lost self-respect, since he demonstrates in public exactly the property whose disrespect is experienced as a vexation" [5].

In turn, Thomas Kesselring, in his works Ethics, politics and human development: justice in the era of globalization (2007), in its ninth chapter emphasizes the relevance of cooperation, since "the isolated individual cannot do much: by example, erecting heavy beams to build a roof. When it is fully focused on itself, it does not build bridges, dikes or cathedrals. Without cooperation, culture would never have emerged" [10]. However, in a more comprehensive way it can be said that, in Habermas, the complementary and problematic connection of "communicative power" and "administrative power" stands out. For this reason, communicative power manifests itself in democratic procedures for the formation of the state's will, which, in addition to including the electoral and legislative process, encompasses discourse at different levels of the public sphere.

The current situation of democracy can be explained as follows: "democracy presupposes the belief that political institutions and the law can be such that they fundamentally embody human nature". On the other hand, democracy must allow and promote a freer action of human nature than any other non-democratic institutions. This necessarily involves analyzing the methods of self-government, in order to better preserve democratic belief, revive and maintain in full force the original conviction of the intrinsic moral nature of democracy [11].

Within the cooperative democratic model, the idea of tolerance is fundamental, as it "is the basis of a harmonious society, which throughout history has never and not been a greater excess of tolerance, but has always been followed by the slightest dissent. Tolerance in Voltaire's perspective never caused civil war, while intolerance covered the land with slaughter. However, the Enlightenment philosopher clearly shows that the exercise of tolerance is perfectly possible, that is, that it is not religious diversity and plurality of ideas that are responsible for wars, but intolerance to this diversity".

Democracy today demands respect for the difference of ideas, opinions and cultures, the consequent equality in difference and respect for institutions, in a legitimate power. However, for all the minimally lucid consciences, today a greater participation of cultures in the democratic debate is necessary. In other words: a legitimation of power and even of national politics based on cultures. The question is to know what level of participation should be left to cultures, so that a right and a policy can be forged that have a cultural reality as well as their theoretical and practical foundations.

It must be conceived and seen not as a consultation regime, but as a system that articulates different criteria:

Tendai Chingore T. The Delegated-Cooperative Democracy as an Alternative to the Crisis of Contemporary Democratic Policies. Ann Bioethics Clin App 2021, 4(3): 000198.

Copyright© Tendai Chingore T.

good citizen participation, the quality of the deliberations produced, cooperation and transparency in decisions and in the exercise of our responsibilities. For him, "within this democratic model, a kind of contract between the subgroups and the State is necessary, so that each one has a moral and legal obligation on their actions. Therefore, the State must have to answer for its activities, but also the different groups must have to answer for its actions".

Thus, political power and governments must provide cultures with the necessary means for their development. If the government has to create conditions for development, it has to create societal projects that depart from their cultures, or else from individuals more endowed with those same cultures, and not from NGO[3], co operations, donors, the IMF[4] or the WB[5]. Society projects must be inspired by people's values and dreams, and they must subscribe to their abilities to carry out these same projects.

If a dialogue aimed at increasing the presence of cultures in political legitimacy is to take place, it must start from the already existing local tradition. It is not, therefore, even for the law and for state policy, to throw out the dirty water with the baby, but, on the contrary, to transform this dialogue of strength and submission of rights into a dialogue of reconciliation. Therefore, the recognition of equal rights for all who live within a given border inevitably involves recognition and respect for the different cultural reference points of all individuals and the guarantees of growth of individuals and cultures within national borders.

At the end of the 1960s, the State's bankruptcy in the performance of its public tasks was decreed by several instances. The so-called "ungovernability" of society and the failed expectation of an increase in well-being meant that the tasks that the State could no longer perform satisfactorily were delegated to other instances, such as the private economy or civil society organizations.

Similarly, Severino NE, et al. [6] states that we have a bad habit of confusing and reducing democracy to competition between parties for the seizure of power. In fact, democracy is a process that regresses or progresses; essentially, depending on the role that citizenship plays in the political system, and in the welding between the political system and other social systems, and between all these systems and the set of institutions and powers gathered in the State. Therefore, for him, citizenship is not just universal suffrage, but comprises a series of civil rights (right to freedom), political rights (participation), economic and social rights (enjoying the

goods in life) and corresponding duties. Here, it is a question of rebuilding a moral center that has moved from solidarity towards accumulation and unlimited selfishness, and return to the social virtues of wisdom, prudence, friendship, charity and dialogue [6].

Citizenship, as coordinator of duties and rights, should have its verification principles. It is at this point where we should change the relationship of submission in relation to union, in the transition from subordinates to citizens. In short, it is at this point where democracy finds its full meaning. It is true that democracy requires continued work to correct representation and establish a kind of regime of public opinion, among whose instruments popular consultation stands out. Consultation is a special symbolic value, which makes society as whole viable, sanctions or breaks a tie, but it is not a substitute for deliberative procedures.

The State must become cooperative, look for alternative ways to configure the social space, new forms of government. Nevertheless, the form of cooperative government differs both from the hierarchical model and from that which advocates delegation in the market and, precisely, because it does not reject decision, although it insists on doing it within a cooperative process.

For Daniel I, et al. [9], "the fundamental task of politics and the State in the knowledge society is the coordination and mediation of social systems, so complex, experienced and dynamic that they exclude authoritarian state command. Government, understood as "a multilateral coordination for the configuration of society oriented to the common good" is no longer simple: it has become an especially demanding task". However, a cooperative government is all the more important the more heterogeneous the society and the more contradictory the interests represented in it, the more pluralistic the determination of its common good.

The reconstruction of cooperative democratic theory emerges as an option. This is seen as a third option to the liberal model of politics and demonstrates how inappropriate the claim arguments of the two approaches to radical democracy are. Furthermore, the cooperative model of democracy is guided by social cooperation; that is, democracy is understood as a reflexive form of community cooperation, which combines rational deliberation on the one hand and democratic community on the other, both positions are crucial in the current debate on democracy.

The intensity of economic needs increases, rather than reducing the urgency of political freedoms" [12]. It is in this context that he proposes several ways that lead to the generic precedence of political rights and basic freedoms, namely: first, their direct importance for human life present

---

3   NGO-Non-governmental organizations.

4   IMF-International Monetary Fund.

5   BM-World Bank

Tendai Chingore T.   The Delegated-Cooperative Democracy as an Alternative to the Crisis of Contemporary Democratic Policies. Ann Bioethics Clin App 2021, 4(3): 000198.

Copyright© Tendai Chingore T.

in basic potentialities (this includes political and social participation); second, its instrumental role in reinforcing the hearing of people's voices when they express and defend their claims to the political class (includes the proclamation of economic needs), and, finally, its constitutive importance in the conceptualization of "needs" (includes the understanding of "economic needs" in a social context). Still on democracy, Sen asks: are the poor interested in democracy and political rights?.

The only way to verify this matter is to put it to the democratic test in free elections, with freedom of opposition and of expression, which is precisely what the defenders of authoritarianism do not allow to happen. "The devaluation of these rights and freedoms is part of the value system of heads of government in many developing countries, but to assume this as the opinion of the people is to take for granted what needs to be proved" [12].

In order to develop and fortify a strong liquid-cooperative democratic system, it is necessary to build an essential component of the development process, where the importance of democracy will consist of three fundamental virtues: first, its intrinsic importance; second, its instrumental contribution and, third, its constitutive role in the creation of values and norms.

In their turn, Axel H, et al. [5], in their work Cooperative Democracy: selected political writings by John Dewey, argue that in this type of cooperative democracy, "one cannot intend to replace the procedures and rules of political systems representative democratic institutions through political innovations inspired by radical democratic conceptions".

The political activity of citizens cannot be restricted to the control of regulating the state apparatus (with the aim of ensuring that the state guarantees individual freedoms). Here, the individual's freedom depends, in a way, on communicative relationships "each citizen can only achieve personal autonomy in association with others", but the individual only achieves freedom when he acts communicatively to solve a collective problem, which necessarily requires strong, cooperation (voluntary). There is, therefore, an internal connection between freedom, democracy and cooperation Axel H, et al. [5].

Similarly, one of the things that should guarantee and fortify cooperative democracy should not only be the mere transposition of the characteristics of civil society to political society, it is not a mere expression of the social, but a space of creation, which is not it is achieved without effort and mediation. As Innerarity defends, "politics becomes an impossible task when the absolute requirement to transfer to the political system the schematism of civil society groups" [9].

As Rawls argues, the notion of social cooperation within a democratic state is always aimed at mutual benefit and this implies that it involves two fundamental elements: the first resides in a shared notion of fair terms of cooperation, which each participant can reasonably be expected to accept. as long as everyone accepts them equally. Here, the just terms of cooperation articulate a reciprocity and mutuality: where all those who cooperate have to benefit, or share the burden, in some appropriate and adequate way the benchmark for comparison. The second concerns the rational advantage of each participant: what the participants, as citizens, seek to promote. The unity of democratic cooperation rests on people agreeing with its notion of fair terms [13].

The "Spirit" of Liquid-Cooperative Democracy: A Credible Alternative to Democracies in the 21st Century

It is commonly accepted that globalization has radically changed the social, economic and political structures of all countries on the planet. This process, dominated by a neoliberal ideology, ensures the emergence of new types of capitalism that are characterized by financial expansion and an increasing concentration of capital in the hands of a few people. The idea of salvation through the market seems to triumph. The State is gradually stripped of its main attributes when it is not an accomplice in the ongoing processes; while peoples are deprived of their sovereignty, given that the true power is confiscated by planetary economic groups and by global companies, whose strength in the world's problems is growing even in an immeasurable way [6].

If we put the history of modern democracies and their functionality from the most developed countries to those of the 3rd World or underdeveloped countries, in the case of Mozambique, we will clearly see that the democratic ideal has not responded to the people's desires and let us be led by the spirit not democratic. In that context, if we are to be guided by the spirit of democracy, in this case liquid or cooperative democracy, it means first of all that we have to recognize the simple fact that we all call for democracy; and this democracy lives or dwells in our minds. "It is impregnated deep, deep in our souls" [14]. Second, this democratic spirit is based on a basic agreement we have as a people: "that we constantly need a democratic Constitution to live in cooperation or together".

The big question we can ask is this: What's wrong with democracy today? What causes in democratic states there is more and more, a minority group of people with more things and the majority with less or increasingly poorer? Or on the other hand, to what extent is liquid democracy a credible alternative to today's democracy?.

If we analyze the situation in States that have applied representative democracies today, there are many problems that we can see, among them, we can summarize the main ones: First, all citizens are limited to voting for representatives of a restricted set of candidates who often do not share their ideological views or interests. Most of the population is forced to give up their personal preferences to cast their vote for the candidates with the greatest chances of being elected. This, in fact, leaves aside the minorities that end up losing the ability to have someone represent their opinions and views within the government. This is one of the main reasons why one of the younger generations today is so uninterested in politics.

Second, representatives are held vaguely responsible for their actions during their term of office. The promises that are made during the election period need not be kept and are little more than bait to attract voters. This leads to an "election political cycle", in which elected representatives only try to convince the population or voters before their election about someone's competence by introducing new proposals that are of interest to the community (but which are hardly implemented) , or even distributing gifts during pre-campaigns.

Finally, representative democratic models can lead to corruption due to the concentration of power. If we verify, for example, in some countries from the United States the so-called model of democracy to our Mozambican reality, we clearly see sufficient proof that representative democracies are indeed fertile ground for corruption and conflicts of interest. These act without any sense of sensitivity or if we want responsibility towards their voters, in the interests of those who invest more money, it is easier than acting in the interest of the population.

According to Jean-Jacques R, et al. [8] liquid-cooperative democracy is therefore based on a network of trust and on the principle of provisional delegation of power. Finally, and less than a revolution, it is certain that before becoming a legitimate instrument of decision, "liquid or cooperative democracy" will have, first of all, to convince the political elites of the interest it presents for them as well. And within the purpose or spirit of liquid or cooperative democracy, the important thing is to participate. Other means of bringing citizens closer to the centers of exercise of power are considered. This is the case of the practices that philosophers, activists and today those elected under the name of "participatory or representative democracy" have defended since 1960. It does not rely on recourse to the assembly of representatives whose first quality is to be ordinary citizens and not professionals in politics, specialist, or even militants separated from collective action.

To this end, its missions and powers may be varied, but in all cases its designation must escape through the electoral mechanism, its allied dynamics, at its exorbitant costs. Jean-Jacques R, et al. [8] states that there are few alternatives to the principle of elections: selection for money, merit or choice by chance. Let us forget the first, which is not at all democratic, and the second, which does not exclude the formation of a closed social class. The choice is left by chance.

The spirit of liquid democracy emerges as a powerful model of governance, in which voting is done with a view to building collective decisions in large communities. It will be a union or combination of the advantages of direct democracy with representative democracy, thus creating a true democratic system. This, in turn, aims to respect the principles that help create a clean political game and respect the precepts of the Constitution. But, for this, there needs to be a strong platform that more effectively allows the participation of the people so that they can discuss, lend and bring other ideas into the debate and help improve people's lives [15].

Above all, "liquid-cooperative democracy retains great potential to not only serve as a basis for the development of decisions in virtual communities, but also for local communities and governments as a whole". In this context, liquid democracy is a new way of making collective decisions that gives citizens complete decision-making control. Voters can vote directly on issues or can delegate their voting power to delegates (representatives) who vote in their place. Delegation can be in specific areas, which means that voters can delegate their voting power to different experts in different areas of specialization.

The novelty brought by liquid-cooperative democracy in relation to voting power is that voters can either vote directly on issues, or they can delegate their vote to representatives who have more specialized knowledge about the issue or simply more time to be informed. This means that delegates can even delegate other delegates to vote in their place, just like all previous voters this time joining a strong current. Therefore, this vote transitivity guarantees according to Dominick S, et al. [15] that "experts can delegate the credibility they have accumulated to other delegates in certain matters about which they have less knowledge and depth".

Looking at the presuppositions and spirit that guides liquid democracy, we can consider this to be a true democracy. Here voters or citizens have the opportunity to choose and vote in person or delegate their vote to someone else. This is in fact a stark contrast to today's democracies, in which citizens are limited to either constantly voting for themselves,

or voting for one representative every two or four years. The population is not included enough in the decision-making process with the government. Liquid democracy "gives citizens the freedom to decide their level of involvement, while becoming able to change it at any time. This means that a country's decision-making process is directly in the hands of the entire population".

However, liquid democracy is cooperation rather than competition. In representative democracies today, competition during the race or election campaign is dominated by futile and unnecessary campaign spending, attempts to expose political competitors, and purposeful lies to win elections. Often, many political parties and their candidates put more effort into creating political campaigns by spending a lot of money and public goods to win the competition, rather than actually focusing their attention on the supposed political programs of governing a country. In liquid democracy, citizens cannot be deceived, but a person's merit, willingness and ability to improve the country mean everything.

We believe liquid democracy must provide a mutual construction of the community of destiny in which the social fabric that the seamstress has begun to sew with courage and selflessness needs a lot of thread and a lot of embroidery so that it doesn't tear at the first awkward movement. In other words, constant and collective work is needed to give reason to citizens who want to defend living together. All history depends on a philosophy of history. That is, the future that one wants to build. Therefore, it is necessary to create a union that is linked to our future history.

The true liquid or cooperative (seamstress) democracy is one that presupposes what we want and can build together, and consequently, what can mobilize our collective consciences so that we can continue together, to build together a less tragic and less dramatic future, to us and for our children [6].

In liquid democracy, the basis for cooperation always has something that brings people together. Here, the different opinions are constructed and debated in common. In other words, we left the dialectical confrontation for a dynamic in which people interact in a more practical conception. Political parties are no longer unique and essential elements; but yes, they become more cooperative, they cooperate and must feel obliged to participate. Those at the top must leave or make room for others to participate and cooperate as equals.

A democratic cooperative sewing state must create a school that, living with others means that we have to transmit, above all, the sense of belonging, the sense of community to the youngest. The school must transmit the spirit of solidarity,

cooperation and team play. It is a democratic model in which the school teaches that democracy is not just a simple system of voting every five years, but a system that puts each individual in a position to make a contribution to the country. It is about "preparing people to enjoy their talents to the best of their ability, to make autonomous choices in society and in the world of work in which they are inserted" [6].

The new democracy cannot be based on the debate of ideologies, but becomes a democracy in which the fundamental questions are the values of the communities. From small communities we can create and build political, economic, social and cultural mechanisms, which will be felt in the universal or macro dimension if we want. Or, on the other hand, micro decisions can be made valid in the broader or macro sense. The living together that is intended has to be nurtured by mobilizing collective spirits, everyone's imagination, everyone's freedom, everyone's interests, and everyone's participation. In other words, "it is almost more a story of affection, falling in love, mobilizing the history of the past, common, even suffering, but in no way can it make the economy of sharing material munias" [6].

For this democratic model to materialize in its fullness[6] states that "we must have a Constitution recognized by all and rigorously applied so that, when there are differences between the parties, the method of resolution is the constitutionally foreseen dialogue and not the force of arms". However, the author also argues that, what drives people to conflict may seem to be ideological issues, the men and women of our land have political, economic, social, material and immaterial needs. If these problems are not resolved, even though there are no weapons, people are still in conflict".

As long as we live in states where we have great social discrepancies, that is, there are few with many things and there are many who have nothing, this state of affairs leads to kind of confrontational conflicts. What seems pertinent to us in the spirit of liquid democracy is that in fact there is peace between the States, but that this peace has to be negative, putting the weapons to silence and then making a springboard, jumping to the positive, but not being positive it means solving the problems of a certain political party only, but it means solving the problems of all the citizens that make up that state.

Answering the questions previously announced on the theoretical bases that underlie the cooperative or liquid democratic model, we believe that in relation to the first question, its materialization will only be possible with

---

6   Cf. Interview given to Jornal Savana on 02/24/2017, entitled: Political juggling always ends badly: the Mozambican philosopher draws attention to the Mozambican government and RENAMO, the largest political party of the Opposition to achieve lasting peace.

the maturation and strengthening of the mechanisms of deliberation of the citizens, involving them more and more in the decision-making; second, the minimization of problems would be possible through the collective use of concerted individual forces, integrating cooperation, freedom and democracy. The model of liquid-cooperative democracy can be an alternative, as long as a ritual pattern of permanent public hearings and consultations is applied, the creation and application of clear legislation accessible to the majority of citizens, in accordance with the sense of communication and recognition of critical theory, which recommends the emancipation of citizens and the reduction of the democratic deficit. In summary, it can be said that liquid democracy is a credible and possible model of democracy for its implementation in current societies. We already have the technological means, what we are left with is just a greater effort and involvement of all in working with a view to implementing them in practice, bringing concrete and applicable methods for the real governance of a country.

Final Considerations

At the end of this presentation, once we have gone through the main issues related to the subject under analysis, we seek to defend the hypothesis that there are some insufficiencies in the procedural deliberative democratic model, hence the need to institute a liquid-cooperative democracy that aims to "redeem" power in the hands of citizens as a whole. Far from reaching the exhaustion of the theme of our research, we want to present the findings made between the concepts that guided the article, looking at the asymmetric relationships that exist in order to synthesize the arguments developed throughout the text.

It is believed that liquid-cooperative democracy is a powerful model of governance, in which voting is done with a view to building collective decisions in large communities. It will be a union or combination of the advantages of direct democracy with representative democracy, thus creating a true democratic system. In turn, it aims to respect the principles that help to create a clean political game and respect the provisions of the Constitution. The novelty brought by liquid-cooperative democracy in relation to voting power is that voters can vote directly on specific issues and programs, or they can delegate their vote to representatives who have more specialized knowledge about the issue or simply more time to be informed. This means that delegates can even delegate other delegates to vote in their place, just like all previous voters this time joining a strong current. As Norberto Bobbio defends, in The Era of Rights (2004), "the recognition and protection of human rights are precisely the pillars of support of democratic constitutions, while at the same time, peace works as an essential prerequisite for the effectiveness of the protection of human rights not only in

each one's State, but also in the international system".

If we look at the presuppositions and spirit that guide liquid-cooperative democracy, we can consider that this is a true democracy or credible alternative to current democracies, as voters have the opportunity to choose and vote in person or delegate their vote to another people. This is in fact a stark contrast to current democracies, in which citizens are limited to either constantly voting for themselves, or voting for one representative every two or four years. The population is not included enough in the decision-making process by the government. Cooperative liquid democracy "gives citizens the freedom to decide their level of involvement, while being able to change it at any time. This model is based on greater inclusion and recognition among the parties within the State. In order for it to be fully realized, it goes through fortification, creation of democratic institutions with rights and duties proclaimed and carried out through fair ideal principles, with the constitution of credible legal institutes, where social cooperation is essential for democratic citizenship to be felt , and the balance between political, economic and social powers emerges, respecting the current Constitution.

In summary, it is pertinent to move towards a new perspective of thinking and making democracy, following the proposal of liquid-cooperative democracy that comes from the democracies in force today, thus recognizing the importance of democracy as the most applied form of government in several States in the topicality. Rebuilding and instituting this democratic paradigm is certainly one of our greatest challenges and an arduous task for contemporary political philosophy.

References

1. Eugenia Maria B (2009) Between reflexive cooperation and procedural democracy. Sequence Magazine 59: 141-159.

2. De Augusto F, Thamy P (2008) Cooperative Democracy: Political and Chosen Writings of John Dewey. Porto Alegre, EDIPUCRS.

3. (1999) Democracy as reflexive cooperation: John Dewey and the theory of it present democracy. Medellin, Journal of Political Studies 15.

4. Lucius C (2016) The normative path to socialism. Considerations on Axel Honneth's book "The idea of socialism".

5. Axel H (2003) Struggle for Recognition: the moral grammar of social conflicts. 2nd (Edn.), São Paulo: publisher 34.

Tendai Chingore T. The Delegated-Cooperative Democracy as an Alternative to the Crisis of Contemporary Democratic Policies. Ann Bioethics Clin App 2021, 4(3): 000198.

Copyright© Tendai Chingore T.

6. Severino NE (2015) Third question: What is the reading of the recent Presidential and Legislative elections?. Maputo, PubliFix.

7. Severino NE (2010) Ubuntu: New Glocal Justice Model?. *In:* Ngoenha SE, Castiano JP, et al. (Eds.), Engaged Thought: essays on African philosophy, education and political culture. Maputo, Educar, pp: 63-74.

8. Jean-Jacques R (1996) The social contract: Principle of political law. 3rd (Edn.), São Paulo, Martins Fontes.

9. Daniel I (2010) The new public space: "What meaning can a culture have today Common public?". Trans. Manuel Streets. Lisbon, Theorem.

10. Thomas K (2007) Ethics, politics and human development: justice in the age of Globalization. Southern Boxes.

11. John D (1970) Liberalism, freedom and culture. Trans. Anísio Teixeira. São Paulo, USP.

12. Amartya S (2003) Development as freedom. Trans. Joaquim Coelho Rosa. Lisbon, Gradiva.

13. John R (1997) Political liberalism. Trans. João Sedas Nunes. Lisbon, Presence.

14. Castiano JP (2010) The "spirit" of democracy. *In:* Ngoenha SE, Castiano JP, et al. (Eds.), Engaged Thinking: essays on African philosophy, education and political culture. Maputo, Educar, pp: 41-62.

15. Dominick S (2016) Liquid Democracy True 21st Century Democracy.