

RUSSIAN DEMOCRACY IN THE VACUUM OF CIVIL SOCIETY

Lubov S. Sysoyeva

Tomsk State Pedagogical University, Komsomol Avenue 75, Tomsk, Russia

E-mail: sysojeva@mail.ru

In the article by L. S. Sysoyeva it is shown how disastrous status of majority of Russian people, lack of national idea and transparent democratic politics, as well as national industry and agriculture is concealed by the Russian government or it is feigned that the situation stabilized in the country during V. Putin's government. In fact the matter is different: the differentiation of population on the rich and the poor has a tendency to increase, in conditions of high inflation the level of life of majority becomes low. There is necessity to save people as every year the amount of population decreases. In the article we discuss a problem of creating social institutes of civil society that would from the bottom introduce national idea of social state, control over the distribution of national property and thus of liquidation of amoral elite that illegally appeared due to the robbery of the country, and that is quite disinterested in patriotic reinforcement of national economics, agriculture and well-being of people in Russia.

Keywords: civil society, lawful/jural state, social institutes of control, civil protest, saving of people, social polarization of society, national idea, energy of people, labor meaning of life activity, original values of democracy.

DOI: 10.3846/1822-430X.2009.17.1.41-49

Introduction

Difficulties of a modern Russian life are such that having declared a democratic way of development, Russia cannot and, maybe, the Russian government does not want, there to be a genuine democracy. Values of democracy are carried out only in a civil society where the main task is not the selection of governors, i.e. not eternal Russian refrain: "Who will rule us?"; but a question: "How can we tame them?" (Поннеп 1992a, b). If the most correct form of a society is democracy, it assumes the control over the state by the controllable and that shows the power of a civil society and the created institutes of the democratic control over economic authority which simultaneously would

be the institutes of protection of citizens from economic exploitation.

From the point of view of a civil society the state cannot be given more power than it is required for the protection of freedom. Hence, political intervention into economy, moral factors, and social technology of the designing of social institutes – this is the way which a democratic society should take.

As in Russian mentality representations about a civil society are not generated yet, they are still predominated by authoritativeness and desire of profit. It has also lost the feeling of safety for the socially-egoistical orientation as well as the feeling of the responsibility for the

future generations; the state and society were put on service to the interests with no resistance of citizens. The creation of the society of democracy that is protected by a civil society directly depends on the revival of intelligence that is capable to feel the responsibility for occurring changes and to create comprehensible to Russian mentality models of a way out from the created crisis. In conditions of absence of civil society technologies, the population is not capable to put the ruling elite in such a position in which its interests would coincide with socially focused and national interests. Only in conditions of their concurrence won by a civil society it is possible to talk about mental identification of Russian culture with a democratic society, instead of talking about the next series of oligarchic reforms in the space deprived of institutional, political, legal restrictions.

The cult of success in business has displaced the belief in principles, in basic values, therefore the ground under such society is shaking, criteria of good and bad, fair and unfair are lost, and there were record-breaking social disproportions. If the inequality becomes intolerable, there can be appeals to totalitarian modes. The alternative, which is full absorption of unkept "murdered" Russia by "the senior western brother", world corporacracy, is not less tragic.

The presidential elections in Russia showed that everything was solved by one operating president as other political forces and figures have not been presented or presented as decoration. This campaign can be named the campaign of national bewilderment, immaturity of Russian political system in which people can be imposed anything that was decided by a single subject. The new president has been simply presented to Russian people; there was no need to participate in political debates, as everything was whatsoever clear. With no civil society people still keep silence, it is openly ignored. The language of democracy values is not created; democracy and permissiveness, patriotism and allegiance, etc. are not differentiated.

Civil society as the ideal of a jural state

The modern idea of western conception of a civil society is given by Jin L. Coen and Andrew Arato (Коэн, Арато 2003: 7), where civil society is understood as the scope of social communication between economics, culture and state, in which voluntary associations, families, groups of the social movements and different forms of the public intercourse participate. The modern civil society is created with the help of specific forms of self-constitution and self-organization. The authors note the important role of laws and, especially, human rights that stabilize social differentiation.

It is a society of people of high economical, political, ecological, aesthetical and moral status, who create together with the state developed legal relations. The reality of civil society is defined by the correlation of the ideal, ideal project and the reached condition of society that really realizes their project. The development of civil society is in principle an endless process of improving society, power, politics and a person, it engulfs all, with no exception, sides of life, just as the processes of achieving liberty, equality, fairness and other social, political, moral, i.e. all cultural values.

In the second half of 20th century in fight against communist's regimes in countries of the socialist camp another understanding of civil society, which is independent from the state and which is capable to rouse and nourish resistance to totalitarian regime, raised. We suppose that in these two approaches there are no contradictions, and they mutually complement each other and are needed depending on the temper of political regime in society. Civil society must play the correcting role of the social associations in democratic managerial system, but at the same time the association of people is an important factor of the counterweight to the state in authoritarian managerial system.

Thereby, historical specifics assign limiting scales of the space of human liberty, formulate

their ideal of civil society and create corresponding prerequisites for its practical realization. So, it is possible to speak not only about the variety of its historical forms, but also about different degree of the practical implementation of each of them in one or another country. Civil society of any country depends on its historical way, on the level of social, economic, political and cultural development. Before reaching their developed forms and getting serious success in right warranty provision and liberties of people, it must take long and complicated way. Western concepts of civil society are generally inclined to optimism, as they assume people to have qualities like feeling of justice, independence, readiness for public work and interest to discuss important for the public questions.

The vacuum of a civil society in Russia

The Civil society seems problematic or badly functioning if it generates imperious monopolies, while the majority loses the labor meaning of the life, the population is getting more impoverished, a lot of human lives are 'damaged', the politics releases itself from any morals. At the same time our incomparably rich bowels are "stolen", women turn into the most exploited part of the population, health of the nation is undermined, medicine become inaccessible, education turns into fake education, helpless lawlessness is poured all over the country where many people have no normal conditions to live, population decreases, people suppress their sorrow and lawlessness in irrepressible drunkenness, and the state does not care of the savings of people, if to name the realities of Russian hopelessness with the help of Solzhenitsyn's language (Солженицын 1990).

Russian civil society is persistently criticized for peculiar to it weakness and dissociation. Basing on the facts of non-veiling of the civil protest in specified Russian conditions, it is quite possible to say that it does not exist here at all. Characteristic weakness of a civil society

in Russia and propensity of its citizens not to trust public organizations as well as to try to avoid contact to them is explained by historical and cultural factors, absence of civil traditions in the country should be highlighted. So, in the research "Weakness of a civil society in the post-communist Europe". Howard gives reason for this weakness: a heritage of communistic experience of compulsory participation in the organizations controlled by the state, widely developed private (but not public) nets and deep disappointment in the development of the countries after the crash of communism have imparted stability to the citizens of the post-communist states steady disgust for participation in public work. The author has carried out a comparative research based on the analysis of the data of the World research of values (World Value Survey) almost in 30 democratic and democratizing countries. Howard provides the data (that he received during his research in Russia) about the participation of citizens in voluntary organizations, including detailed interviews with ordinary citizens. This research shows that Eastern European countries, despite of seeming distinctions in development directions for the last 15 years, continue to show deep and constant mental affinity with former «elder brother», and that roots in general for them historical experience of dictatorship of nomenclature-party type (Howard 2003: 130–160).

Modern stages of transformed economic and imperious parities in internal development of Russia are officially presented in a view of mutually beneficial agreements that are based on democracy and partnership.

The basic argument is that successful modernization of Russia is possible only on the way of democratization; however, the reality of people's hostile attitudes to authority in conditions of society polarization according to the level and quality of a life is forgotten. Is the idea of successfully functioning Russian civil society in the beginning of XXI century chimerical, as many authors write about it? Or it is only the postponed protest, or a mental

feature of fantastic Russian patience, servility, so-called Firs syndrome (Ермаков 2008: 13). Or "The cult of personality by a mangle of terror has stamped people into faceless weight and now it entirely is in dependence on the will of a leader. In fact, it is not casual abbreviation VKP(b) (victims of the regime deciphered it as the second serfdom (of Bolsheviks) (Ермаков 2008: 13). Is civil society now able and has an opportunity to realize social, religious and political validity? First of all, on the basis of its effective interaction with the Russian state, on the basis of a role of mass formation and free press in protection of new civil values. On the assumption of the collisions of the chaos which reigns in Russia since the times of restructuring (Perestroika), is it possible to say that human efforts to construct civil society whose values would be formulated in concepts of the social and lawful state, a moral or orthodox society appear and would be somehow registered in the Constitution. Certainly, the intelligence formulates in press the recommendations on creation of post-communist understanding of freedom, moral behavior and the unlimited right to the information in arising spheres of the legislation, the free market and civil society. But, probably, the offered prospects are mythical as recently the Russian people collide with the increasing bureaucratic obstacles in creation of any institutes of a civil society. The matter is, not only all non-governmental, charitable, religious or other public organizations and their foreign partners have to pass burdensome procedures of registration and periodic re-registration by the federal authorities. Amendments offered now to clauses 23 and 25 of the Tax codes of the Russian Federation complicate procedures of registration and financing of the non-governmental organizations (HPO). Their realization would mean the approach of the next critical period created by formation of a civil society in Russia. The civil organizations in Russia do not implement expectations, generated by the images from books and articles about the

force of international norms in the field of human rights. During last seventeen (since 1991) years the way of the Russian democratization was rather disturbing. The practice of abusing of administrative, financial authority and other elites, lack of equal rights and equality of opportunities, an intensifying authoritarianism, "non-civil" civil society and even mistrust to it... All this, as a rule, is considered as failure of democratization. Although civil organizations are present in a real life, they are absent in the structure of the ideas which have formed in mass consciousness. The history of antagonism between the state and citizens in the post-soviet conditions has not ended; it proceeds in the new form: there is the transition from the "Institute of Violence" to the "Institute of ignoring" which displaces a civil society from a public stage. Now it remains not clear whether Russian НПО really lay new channels of civil participation, and how exactly their activity will neutralize the governmental bureaucratic actions which are slowing down the development of the Russian third sector (average and small business). Nevertheless, the civil initiative has declared itself on behalf of opposition "Fair Russia", which means to resist barbarous oligarchic capitalism by redistribution of incomes by means of the taxation – introduction of progressive surtax, the tax on luxury and the general rate of the uniform social tax. It is declared (meanwhile it is only declared), that conscience, validity and solidarity become program guidelines of a civic stand (Сепреев 2008: 2). If civil movement appears to somewhere active, independent and successful, it happens in the field of human rights owing to a wide spectrum of "local" works on rendering legal aid and consultations to the population: from prisoners, refugees and homeless up to the soldiers and their relatives, but this work is done not by supporters of party in power, but, as it was observed, by the persecuted and those with no place of their own in municipal space supporters of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation.

Social foundation for the necessity of a civil society in Russia

Participation of the population in economical growth, presence of, first of all, so-called middle class – some kind of the indicator of the condition of a civil society. For example, in historical plan, it is the third class in France that contributed to the defeat of absolutism and the formation of the republican regime.

In Russia during the years of reforms the so-called middle class of owners was not formed. On the contrary, a process of rapid social exfoliation (on the standard of living, income, educational opportunities, etc.) and the polarization of the population took place, when at one pole was the main part of it, which was on the edge of or below the poverty line, but on the other – a small layer of super-rich citizens. According to the magazine “ECO”, in the end of 90s 15 percent of Russians owned 92 percent of national wealth, while half of the population was below the poverty line; only in 1999 in Russia the number of the poor has doubled in comparison to 1997. Average wages in the country were 10 thousand rub., in the extractive industries – 30–40 thousand and over 50 thousand – in a number of state companies (Девятова, Купцов 2007: 18), not to mention the salary of state officeholders, “honest” judges, who have the same pension.

In Russia, qualified worker exchanges his/her work on goods and services, prices of which are close to the world prices or exceed them, and receives many times smaller salary: by early 1997 – 3–4 times, and after the default of 1998 (the year-end), 15–20 times (Львов 2002: 64) less. The extreme degree of social inequality poses threat on national security: lumpenization of general population serves as the basis for the emergence and growth of marginalized groups (for example, skinheads, the movement “Russian National Unity”, (RNE) and criminal associations), depression, feelings of powerlessness, permanent opposition which turns into

apathy. Such socioeconomic and psychological factors undermine the foundations of economic security of Russia and complicate real movement towards the goal of a just democratic society.

According to the official statistics, in 2003 incomes of the richest 10 percent of Russians exceeded income of the poorest by 14 times, and now in 15 times. Thus, the social polarization has a tendency to grow further. But those facts are averaged statistics. As a matter of fact, the growth of average income means the growth of incomes of most well-off layers. Calculations show that the growth of GDP for one ruble increases the income of this part of Russian population by 3 rubles. Income of the poor grow by only 15 kopecks, therefore the task of doubling GDP is not affiliated with the task of overcoming poverty. This problem is not solved by monetization of privileges as well. The size of subsistence-level rises along with inflation every day, and its level is already 30%, according to budget surveys. A great evil to the Russian economy continues to be the so-called “shadow economy”, as well as its criminalization, that clearly does not fit into the notion of a civilized market economy. Thus, peculiarities of market economy, reflected in redistribution of property, when most of workers are alienated from the means of production, from protecting manufacturers, which is focuses on the development of medium and small businesses, undermine economic foundations for the movement towards civil society.

On the other hand, along with the estrangement of most workers from property in the country, the crisis of political system is not overcome: there is no full-fledged political party (practically, there is one party of power), there is no clear separation of powers, control of power by society, contradictory certain provisions of the Constitution and that causes numerous appeals to the Constitutional Court. All this, of course, does not help jural State and civil society to form. As a principle, this was long

ago shown by S. L. Frank: “and when democracy minority dominates”, and V. V. Rozanov: “Democracy is when well-organized minority manages unorganized majority” (Солженицын 1990: 46). Moreover, in these conditions “the electorate ceases to feel a real political discourse, ‘rolled up’ into more and more becoming empty bureaucratic formulas of programs, concepts and doctrines” (Якунин 2007: 32). Moreover, V. I. Yakunin emphasizes, for Russian political practices absence of the transparent mechanism of their formation and distinct forms of expression is characteristic. Their maintenance in the obvious form is inaccessible to citizens, voters; it is not a point of issue in a wide political process. «It [practice] is in no way shown in the state ideology on which the constitutional interdiction is imposed, in a legislative file, it is not seen in a daily administrative practice. An international observer or a partner has no opportunity to reliably judge the intentions of the country (Якунин 2007: 33). For a civil society “in conditions of democratic construction and a lawful state it should receive a much greater degree of an embodiment in legal forms... Unfortunately, now it does not occur. The state politics is not always clear, internally inconsistent, inefficient, and sometimes there is an impression of its absence” (Якунин 2007: 33).

National idea for Russia as a method of civil society activization

For the civil society to be created the absence of national idea has negative moral-psychic meaning, as the possibility of mobilization of social support, economical and political initiative is getting lost, general idea-spiritual tone of society decreases. Distinctly from the preceding epoch, society does not know implemented national idea, reinforced by corresponding legislative act, resolutions of government, special political documents that are equally understood by everybody and coincide with practice,

something social organizations, having a dialog with government for value directions to realize, should be focused on. As in Russia there is no national idea, such condition damps energy of people, and only it can overcome corruption and conflict of interests.

Of course, when we assess the status, we cannot discard low political culture of population and legal nihilism. Without doubt, the power is evil, and at the same time it presents inescapable reality in our imperfect world. Thus power needs to be turned to that real necessary area, be converted into the moment of the world order which works until the limit that does not need to be exceeded. It is possible to remove evil characteristic of power only with the help of fight for making actions of law, certainly jural state. In conditions of legitimate law political freedom is set, and in conditions of freedom – ethics and morals.

This thought is not new, but it has not found embodiment in Russian reality yet. To consider Russia, this means fighting for a jural state. You need to implement general civilization idea of a just state with minimum bribe bureaucracy by the way of legitimate passing of actual and observed laws. Why is this idea not national for Russia that never was a jural state? There were autocracy, dictatorship of proletariat, totalitarian Stalin state which was building socialism, national state where the right was a faculty of unnecessary clothes, but there never was a jural just state and there is no now. A lawful state is a phenomenon of universal values of civilized development, which has possibility to take out from lawlessness of humiliation, unworthy level of life for a person, introduce a bible commandment “do not rob”. Contemporary post-reconstruction Russia and privatization, as well as oligarchism is all about oblivion of this principle, which now instead of a custom must be guarded by a law. And this is the way from that cultural ethical and economical wildness that a modern Russia is in at the moment, Russia of masses; this is a way of saving people.

Creation of institutes of a civil society

It should be not formal democracy which is capable to degenerate and fraud. And here is an open space for creative mentality of Russian people. Only you need to struggle for it actively. Not to be silent! To show the protest. But our people, from ancient centuries, say nothing. It is necessary to participate in political actions as it is needed for the development of democratic ethos which we never had (let us not mention a brief period of the Novgorod Veche) and do not have now. A civil society can arise only on the basis of an organized protest, and the public atmosphere shows that the discontent with the situation in the country grows. There is a hope that in due course we will also have political movement of the citizens, capable to put forward the program to protect the human advantage. Many believe that the creation of the organized opposition movement in the country is only a matter of time as the scandalous social inequality and inadmissible low standards of life-support will put an end to national long-suffering. Having a fear of consolidation of “a party of the national protest”, the column “against all” was cancelled in ballots. It is impossible to consider opposition LDPR that goes after elections on the balance of the state and divides together with others at feeding authorities all elite advantages.

In conditions of dissociation of the Russian society, split of elites, social inequality, the idea of a civil society can become a saving anchor for Russia. As it was already said, familiarization with the idea of a civil society occurred in difficult times: during the Novgorod veche, during the struggle for unity of the country during the Polish yoke, (ideas of “rescue of Russia” by Minin and Pozharskiy), during the introduction by Lenin NEP (new economic politics) was some kind of a turn to a civil society. Democracy of small spaces for centuries existed in Russia. It was, through all centuries, Russian rural world, and in other times – city veche, the Cossack self-management. Since the

end of the last century one more form of it has done a considerable way: ZEMSTVO (rural and regional governance), unfortunately, only district and provincial, without a root of a regional zemstvo and without accomplishment of All-Russian (Солженицын 1990: 51). In revival of a zemstvo, as A. I. Solzhenitsyn sees, there is the rescue of values of national democracy, culture, a village, passionate people, meaning of labor life.

In a present situation, when there is a strengthening of a vertical of executive authority (“the centralized democracy”), development of a civil society should occur not on the basis of a consensus, in a direct antagonism of authority and opposition. Public organization “civil assistance” considers that the control over state structures is necessary but it is not enough to limit this control only by abilities of working Public Chamber (OII).

Shattering defeat of the right forces on parliamentary and presidential elections, absence of their representation in Duma makes an opposition to authority the main task which leads the country to nowhere, as Harry Kasparov defined the position. There was a new party of democrats “Fair Russia” which has declared the direct opposition to authority from socialist positions, but not yesterday.

In modern reforming post-resurrecting Russia, the ideas of an open society affirmation, of a lawful state and the civil society, created not by the methods of imposing from above but with the help of social engineering, as K. R. Popper offered, have not become outdated. The social engineering is the social technology on the basis of which public life institutes are reformed according to our understanding, not excluding trial and error. The gradual stage-by-stage social technology is based on understanding of public institutes as the means that serve certain their expedient purpose (Поппер 1992a: 15). Explaining the principles of social technology based on expedient human activity, Popper says that our public traditions and social institutes which appear to be such, arise not in

the direct way as precisely planned, designed and constructed. No, - Popper says, - the majority of them "have gradually grown". It is possible to explain their occurrence on the basis of human needs, motives and expectations. In an open society freedom of everyone **is protected by the law to which freedom of the state is limited**. In a lawful state nobody should live due to mercy of others, but everyone should have the right for protection by the state and that is why state regulation, the institute of protection economically weak from economically strong does not contradict to the principles of a civil society and social state. The power of such society is in creation of institutes of the democratic **control of** economic authority which simultaneously would be the institutes of the protection of citizens from economic operation.

From the point of view of principles of an open society, any authority, which is not limited to the law, is bad. The state cannot give more authority than it is required for protection of freedom. Popper fairly specifies that if we do not reasonably improve society (on technologies of non-violence), it would be insane to hope for irrational forces of history. Hence, political intervention into economy, moral factors, and social technology of designing of social institutes - that is the way on which an open civil society should be. History cannot be planned but public institutes can, and they are really planned. "Only by planning public institutes for protection of freedom, especially freedom from operation, step by step, we can hope to reach the best world" (Поппер 1992b: 168), K. Popper concludes. The method of social engineering is meant to develop technology of improvement of society without violence.

So, political intervention into economy, moral factors, social technology of designing of social institutes (legal protection, control of courts, legislation) is a way of development of an open democratic and civil society.

Conclusions

In Russia in the beginning of 21st century there is no civil society as due to deep social reasons (long domination of the state above a society) and because they have not become real partners of the state, those who are capable to work together with it on one purpose - well-being of citizens, public opposing the structures asserting well-being and civil rights. But we all the same have prospect on the basis of development and promotions of national idea for a high-grade civil society to originate. At a level of problems there is a set of special directions, work on which requires participation of institutes of a civil society. This creation of institutes of the legal and social state, liquidation of poverty, protection of motherhood, creation of self-government institutions, charity, education, the free-of-charge medicine, new technologies, mass media, culture, all spectrum of humanitarian actions and the control of law enforcement bodies etc.

Our problem is the creation of conditions for the formation of the environment of a civil society in depth of Russia. Existing institutes of a civil society are very poorly focused inside Russia. "In healthy times local forces have big thirst for activity, and for it the widest space should be open. As L. Tikhomirov formulated: everywhere, where public forces are capable to support obligatory norms, actions of government agencies are needless and even harmful, as without need they weaken the ability of the nation to be independent. Everywhere, where direct actions of national forces is allowable, whether in the form of local self-management or activity of any separate public associations, the unions, this direct action should them be open. Besides, this public basis is irreplaceable for the control over the state bureaucratic system and makes any official serve fairly and be agile" (Солженицын 1990: 5).

References

- Howard, M. M. 2003. *The Weakness of Civil Society in Post-Communist Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 130–160.
- Девятова, С. В.; Купцов, В. И. 2007. «Россия в современном мире», *Социально-гуманитарные знания* 6: 3–30.
- Ермаков, Е. 2008. «Синдром Фирса», *Литературная газета* 8: 13.
- Коэн, Д. Л.; Арато, Э. 2003. *Гражданское общество и политическая теория*. Москва: Весь мир.
- Львов, Д. С. 2002. «Экономическая наука ищет своё лицо», *Эко*: 59–65.
- Поппер, К. Р. 1992а. *Открытое общество и его враги*. В 2-х т. Т. 1. Чары Платона. Москва: Международный фонд «Культурная инициатива», Soros Foundation (USA).
- Поппер, К. Р. 1992б. *Открытое общество и его враги*. В 2-х т. Т. 2. *Время лжепророков: Гегель, Маркс и другие оракулы*. Москва: Международный фонд «Культурная инициатива», Soros Foundation (USA).
- Сергеев, Г. 2008. «Партия с тремя «С», *Литературная газета* 18: 2–3.
- Солженицын, А. И. 1990. «Как нам обустроить Россию», *Специальный выпуск. Брошюра к газете «Комсомольская правда» от 18 сентября 1990 г.* Электронный ресурс: [ark\(#\)mksat.net](http://ark(#)mksat.net) 65 с.
- Якунин, В. И. 2007. «Актуальные проблемы формирования и реализации государственной политики как управленческой практики», *Социально-гуманитарные знания* 1: 23–51.

RUSIJOS DEMOKRATIJA PILIETINĖS VISUOMENĖS NEBUVIMO SĄLYGOMIS

Lubov S. Sysoyeva

Parodoma, koks pražūtingas rusų piliečių daugumos statusas, nacionalinės idėjos ir skaidrios demokratinės politikos nebuvimas, taip pat kaip tautinė žemės ūkio industrija daro įtaką Rusijos vyriausybei ir lemia V. Putino valdymo metais vykusią šalies stabilizaciją. Grindžiama mintis, kad visuomenės turtinė diferenciacija vis stiprėja, o didėjant infliacijai daugelio piliečių gyvenimo lygis smunka. Ryškėja būtinybė saugoti žmones, kurių kasmet mažėja. Straipsnyje nagrinėjamos pilietinės visuomenės socialinių institutų steigimo problemos, pateikiama nacionalinės kontrolės idėja. Nelegali veikla siejama su šalį skurdinančiu amoralioju elitu.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: pilietinė visuomenė, teisinė valstybė, kontrolės socialiniai institutai, pilietinis protestas, žmonių sauga.

Įteikta 2008-05-04; priimta 2008-11-17