

UNDEMOCRATIC REGIMES

Flavius-Cristian MĂRCĂU

Researcher Assist., „Constantin Brancusi” University of Targu-Jiu

Ph.D. Student, „Babes-Bolyai” University of Cluj-Napoca

flaviusmarcau@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

IN THE PRESENT STUDY WE WISH TO DESCRIBE THE TYPES OF NON-DEMOCRATIC REGIMES THAT HAVE EXISTED UNTIL NOW MAKING A COMPARISON BETWEEN THEM AND DEMOCRACY. WE DESCRIBE HOW THESE TYPES OF REGIMES ARE CHARACTERIZED BY THE TOTAL CONTROL EXERCISED OVER THE STATE AND THROUGH EXCESSIVE VIOLENCE. BASICALLY, THIS STUDY IS INTENDED TO HIGHLIGHT HOW THE UNDEMOCRATIC REGIMES FUNCTIONED OVER TIME.

KEYWORDS: *TOTALITARIANISM, AUTHORITARIANISM, SULTANISM, POST-TOTALITARIANISM*

Democracy comes from the Greek δημοκρατία - Demokratia and literally translates to "leading by the people" (demos which means people + kratos meaning power). Democracy is defined as a form of organization and political leadership of the society taking into account the will of the citizens, their interests and aspirations. It is government by the people, and people returning supreme power is exercised directly by them or by elected representatives under an electoral system[1].

Given the above said understand in large what is democracy, and in continuation of our exposure we try to present what it is not, going on the assumption that for a better understanding of the term *democracy* disclosure is required of the opposite. Thus, *a contrario* definition is the one we still use considering that this is a common method to define the concept, showing its contrast and that this type of definition is very easy. For example *What is evil? The opposite of good!* The problem is simply to find - in an attempt to delineate a concept - *right opposite*[2].

What is the opposite of the democratic system? The simple answer is *undemocratic regime*. In 1996, Linz and Stepan propose a new classification of undemocratic regimes, they were divided as follows: authoritarian, totalitarian, sultanic and post-totalitarian.

1. AUTHORITARIAN REGIMES

In terms of authority, it has been used since ancient times, and every society has experienced some form of authority: the authority of parents over children, teachers on students, political leaders on the population. Referring to the last example, authoritarianism was felt in countries which were shown to have a democratic tradition. Starting from the name of this *authoritarian* regime, we understand that he derives from *authority*. Appealing to history we can say that over time the term of authority, contrary to the fact

that today is a negative term since it is an excess of abuse and authority, was positive. The name originates from *authoritarianism* with fascism meant to be a laudatory term to bring dictatorial rule favorably authority associations. Giovanni Sartori believes *"that discrimination occurs when the question is: what is the true authority or how much authority is not too much authority?"*. [3] Given the aforesaid, we can say that all arrangements have formalized a power structure and therefore all have a structure of *authority* but we can not categorize all as authoritarian regimes. We can not fit everything in this pattern and we have to make a distinction, so as not to create any confusion between the authority and the authority of the authoritarian regime that supports democracy - authoritative (undemocratic) and the power of the (democratic). Until the '20s freedom was correlated with authority and given this authority accepts mention that true freedom and true authority recognizes freedom but authority does not recognize freedom is true authoritarianism. By analyzing authoritarianism in relation to freedom we understand that authoritarianism denies authority since the authority defines freedom, and the lack of authority in an authoritarian world is inevitably moving towards the establishment of an authoritarian regime. [4]

Bringing into question the differences, Pasquino says that their presence is important given that the ideology of authoritarian regimes is not rigorous, so it dezo voltat some comparative aspects in the analysis of authoritarian regimes: *"however, in generally authoritarian regimes, even in their variety differs just resistance of totalitarian regimes (ideological), and their inability (of the organizational) to mobilize large masses. Once established, an authoritarian regime gives grandiose meetings, unpoliticized masses, maintain, deliberately low levels of political intervention in society, promotes and encourages sometimes escaping privacy. On the contrary, totalitarian regimes require continuous employment require frequent mobilization, strong and intense, delete the boundaries between public and private. Schemes aim to mobilize, in every sense of the word. And fear of low blood their supporters in general population, although sometimes you have to adjust to events purely formal consensus and rituals."* [5] Today, the authoritarian model is best presented and we can say that it's suffering (due to his internal contradictions and fragility) from instability since it is in a stall counts worldwide. [6]

Juan Linz, reporting is originally from Spain and later expanding its sphere of interest to other forms of authoritarianism, has developed a definition of authoritarian regimes making a correlation between political pluralism and the limit imposed by the regime, so that they are systems with pluralism limited political, the political class is not held accountable for the actions that are not based on clearly articulated ideology, but are characterized by specific mentality, where no political mobilization and large-scale basis, except for some moments in the development them, and in which a leader or occasionally a small group exercises power in weak limits defined formally, but actually rather predictable [7].

A feature of the authoritarian regime is that it is strictly related to the founder. We make this claim by appealing to recent history has shown us that in Portugal, for example, after the death of António de Oliveira Salazar regime to pursue six years (1968-1974) [8]. This peculiarity, which can be *dependent on the founder* makes it difficult, but not impossible, to maintain the system after the disappearance of the leader. When we refer to the fact that it is still impossible for the regime to be maintained for a longer period of time, we consider that overcoming a crisis of succession, albeit with difficulty, can be made when the leader is the product of an organization, such as military leaders or

religious type (Islamic fundamentalism is the best example) to assure strength and within which a new leader to be named. In this case, the leader has maintained its ability to exploit strengths and virtues (and the luck).

Returning to Juan Linz and its analysis of authoritarian regimes retain essential difference compared with totalitarianism. While a totalitarian regime is based on a rigorously articulated ideology, authoritarianism is characterized by specific mentalities. Making a comparison between ideology and mentality, we understand that the first is nothing less than a system of rigid thinking is based on a compelling logic thinking and the second spans a flexible set of beliefs and an interpretative ambiguity, without oracles invested with a specific role[9].

Appealing to the comparison between the totalitarian and authoritarian regime, first resistance is distinguished by the nature of ideological and organizational inability to mobilize large masses. Once it was established, the authoritarian regime give up meeting grandiose unpoliticized masses and deliberately maintained a low political intervention in society, favoring and often encouraging, sheltering in private life[10]. Thus, is trying maintaining power through control by using manipulation, resorting to the following definition: "*A has power over B as far as it can make it do what you would not do at all.*"[11] In definition of here A represents the authoritarian regime and the people are represented by point B. We observe that Dahl has described very well the mechanisms of action of authoritarianism highlighting the *need for manipulation and control* but omitting to include in the definition *method of constraining, the obligativity*, because in this case we talk about a totalitarian regime, not authoritarian, and Dahl in his book *Dilemmas of Pluralis Democracy: Autonomy vs. Control* defines control as "*a relationship between actors, such that preferences, desires or intentions of one or more actors reactions they cause other actors to comply or predisposition to such actions.*" [12]

In conclusion, we realize that authoritarianism is a political system that leaves no freedom and is the best term / political regime which best defines the democracy *a contrario*.

2. TOTALITARIAN REGIMES

The totalitarianism is redundant totality and not only to convey the idea of something that encompasses everything. The term "totalitarianism" was first published in 1925 and such authoritarianism was invented by fascism. For Mussolini, "total state" sounds impressive[13]; Fascism in Italy was a clear case of authoritarian dictatorship - more than a dictatorship, but much less than a totalitarian state. The situation is different if Hitler's Germany, when we talk about Nazism refer to the totalitarian state.

The totalitarian regime has made possible the despotic leadership, where as a result the *force of law* has been replaced by the *law of force* which proved to be vital for the survival of the regime. As an example we take the Nazi regime, which after coming to power Hitler enacted a law that suppresses the fundamental rights and freedoms in a democracy: freedom of assembly and association, the inviolability of the home, secrecy of correspondence, etc.. Hitler should not be considered as a law promotar suppression of rights and freedoms because at that time there was already a precedent that we have as initiator Lenin. The genocide (especially violence and cruelty) was invented by totalitarian regimes, but these regimes have pushed to paroxysm, that radicalized him in ways unprecedented in history[14]. Asserting the primacy of doctrine promoted to the rank of universal criteria, and its realization promoted to the rank of universal purpose: "*National*

Socialist doctrine is not the maid of political interests of the Confederate States; it must be one day the queen and lady of German nation. She has to led and reorganized the life of a nation "[15] We understand that National Socialism was conceived as a thinking mistress who hunted the potential enemies would suspect that they want the death of civilization.

The totalitarian regime was founded on an ideology which was a concept that was intended to be science (racism in case of Nazi Germany) but as a belief (like religion) claiming that the practice of politics, society will be radically changed.

Starting from similarity to religion, the doctrine was meant to be above all, must be mastered everywhere - submit blind and confident in herself. To better understand the seriousness of the totalitarian regime, we present a quote from the book *Mein Kampf*: "*The task of establishing a program of action is not to determine the various ways to achieve something, but to clarify the work, presenting it as achievable, namely to worry less means than the end. What you decide in these circumstances is the fairness of an idea in principle they do it's not the difficulty of achievement.*" [16]. Skipping the Hitler's cruelty, we want to bring a logical explanation to this abuse of power, appealing to the example of Felix Oppenheim: "*If we make the distinction between the exercise of power and holding power, we can say that P exert power over R, for it to act in mode x, if and only if P influences the R or coerce him to take action x or punishes R for failing to do the x*" [17]. We mention that this abuse of power works in the sense that R can be constrained by P that it does not do what P wants - this practice is found quite often in politics.

Carl Joachim Friedrich, in his work entitled *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy* [18], explained that a system is totalitarian if six conditions are met: 1) has an official ideology; 2) in politics there is only one party controlled by an oligarchy - monopartidism; 3) the party is defended by a terrorist police - it is to destroy any opposition party or leader; 4) The government monopoly of weapons; 5) control of the media; 6) an economy directed from the center. We mention that the sixth condition is not mandatory for a totalitarian system to exist. We make this statement starting from the comparison between Nazism and Communism: directed economy can be found in the Soviet regime but is absent in that of Hitler.

Raymond Aron considers totalitarian regime as a "phenomenon" and like other social phenomena it lends itself to numerous definitions, depending on the look that you retain observer. If the six requirements are found Friedrich, Aaron talks about the top five as principal and believes in reality make three fundamental issues of totalitarianism: 1) to what extent it is a singular phenomenon in terms of historical or repetition of historical phenomena already known?; 2) to what extent Soviet totalitarianism is compatible or not with the other regimes, particularly that of the National Socialist regime?; 3) The extent to which the one-party regime or total planning is intended to totalitarianism? [19].

Based on these basic requirements noted by Friedrich and Brzezinski on one side and Raymond Aron on the other hand, mention that perhaps the most significant of these, in terms of managing psycho affective emotions is represented by the absolute control of the media. Why consider this to be Relevant? Because it can easily require thinking model developed at the party. Such a imposition was retrieved in the early 90s in Romania, while still both reaping the model type of collectivism thinking.

In order for a regime to be considered totalitarian it must simultaneously fulfill five essential requirements, except the sixth which refers to the centralized economy. We say this because we tend to consider a one-party state as totalitarian but this is untrue considering that in the twentieth century there were one-party regimes that have not

become totalitarian regimes but who had no single party but were totalitarian. Aron believes there are situations evolving towards totalitarianism, where it is found in an industrial society. The best example is Fascist Italy leadership which was a single party. What makes it is not totalitarian? The fact that there has been no ideological or a capture was totalitar proliferation compared to what happened in the Soviet Union or Nazi regime in recent years[20].

3. SULTANIC REGIMES

Sultanism category emerges from the description of patrimonialism. With regard to these regimes Sultanic insists Pasquino[21] with weberian analysis. The category of sultanism was long regarded as "marginal relevance"[22] is important not only from a historical perspective but having actuality relevance. *"the sultanic form of patrimonialism is not objectively streamlined, but the development wing of the sphere of free choice and discretionary power. By this, it is distinguished from all forms of traditional power"*[23].

Regarding the characteristics of this type of system, we can say that there is no coherent and well-developed ideology and the only ideas that define the limits of acceptability are those developed by the leader, being the only ones who represent the political positions of the regime.

Unlike totalitarian regimes, sultanism is distinguished by the following: 1) does not require any type of mass mobilization; 2) destroy any existing pluralism before the power to be taken; 3) regime collaborators are at the whims of the leader; 4) The difference between public and private is removed when it comes to scope and ownership of the leader; 5) consists of family political elite "Sultan" and close[24].

According to Pasquino, sultanism not offer any possibility to achieve democracy because this type of duty ends in the death of the leader: natural or assassination - conspiracy at the palace. Another possibility is a military coup. This is possible only when the state's armed forces are stronger (and compact) than personal militia "sultan" We emphasize that the peculiarities of the system is strictly related to the figure of the leader but also the context in which power was obtained[25].

Examples of countries with Sultanic regime are found in analyzes made by Linz and Stepan, and subsequently Chehabi and Linz. In Latin America we find that states Sultanic Dominican Republic, Haiti and Nicaragua; Central African Republic; Iran and the Philippines in Asia; In Europe it is found Romania (Ceausescu's dictatorship) and Milosevic's Serbia. Besides the above, we can also add Iraq under the leadership of Saddam Hussein, Uganda of Idi Amin Dada's leadership and Nicaragua under Somoza.

4. POST-TOTALITARIAN REGIMES

A special category of regimes is the post-totalitarian. Analyzing word itself derives from totalitarianism understand them and succeed it. According to Pasquino, *"totalitarianism may be the father of post-totalitarian regimes"* [26].

In his analysis of totalitarian regimes Linz and Stepan, post-totalitarian regimes are defined as a variety of them, and Adrian Gorun believes that *"although post-totalitarian regimes are considered variety of authoritarian regimes, they are not political events unrelated to their origin: totalitarianism"*[27].

Since the post-totalitarianism is continuation of totalitarian the evolution of the latter leads to three categories defined by Pasquino:

- *Initially post-totalitarianism*: it is defined as the first stage of the change process and is placed near the end of totalitarianism
- *Frozen post-totalitarianism* : as a continuation of the transition, it is found in the immediate post-totalitarianism initial sequence and requires "*tolerance of critical activities of civil society capable of organizing themselves in groups and organizations*"[28].
- *Mature post-totalitarianism*: this last category of post-totalitarian regimes are distinguished by the fact that with the installation of the various changes begin to occur in terms of baseline characteristics, and the transition to the democratic regime started to become viable competition with the acceptance of ruling party and political parties and social - competitive multiparty appearance.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Flavius Cristian Marcau, "What is Democracy" in volume publication "Student Research Day, University Constantin Brancusi", IVth Edition; International COMMUNICATION „Students Scientific Session; Academic Publishing Brancusi; 2011; pages 73-81
- [2]. See Giovanni Sartori, *Theory of Democracy Revisited*, Iasi: Polirom, 1999, p 177;
- [3]. *Ibidem*
- [4]. *Ibidem*
- [5]. Adrian Gorun, *Political Power and Political Regimes*, Targoviste: Bibliotheca, 2006, 78-79;
- [6]. See extensively Adrian Gorun , *Political Power and Political Regimes* ,Targoviste: Bibliotheca, 2006, p. 73;
- [7]. J. Linz, Autoritarisma, in Enciclopedia delle Scienze Sociali, Roma, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiano, 1991, vol I, p. 444
- [8]. See *A dictator forgotten – Salazar* , , http://www.historia.ro/exclusiv_web/portret/articol/un-dictator-uitat-salazar, accessed la 3.06.2014, ora 20:09
- [9]. Gianfranco Pasquino, *Course of Political Science*, European Institute, Iasi, 2002, p 278
- [10]. *Ibidem*, p 280
- [11]. Robert Dahl, *The concept of Power*, Behavioral Science, 2, 1957, p. 201
- [12]. See extensively Robert Dahl, *Polyarchy. Participation and Opposition*, European Institute, Iasi, 2000, pp. 6-14
- [13]. Giovanni Sartori, *op. cit.*, p 185
- [14]. Adrian Gorun , *Introduction to Political Science*, Cluj-Napoca: Cluj University Press, 2003, p 169;
- [15]. Chantal Millon-Delsol, *Political Ideas of the XX century*, New York: Polirom, 2002, p 88;
- [16]. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, Craiova: Beladi, 2007, vol. I, p. 209;
- [17]. Domenico Fisichella, *Political Science. Problems, concepts, theories*, Iasi, Polirom, 2007, p 64
- [18]. *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy: Second edition*, revised by Carl J. Friedrich, Harvard University Press, 1965
- [19]. Raymond Aron, *Democracy and Totalitarianism*, Bucharest: ALL Educational, 2001, p.214;
- [20]. See - Raymond Aron, *op. cit.*, and Giovanni Sartori, *op. cit.*,
- [21]. Gianfranco Pasquino, *op. cit.*,
- [22]. Adrian Gorun , *Political Power and Political Regimes* , p.83
- [23]. See Max Weber, *Economie et Societe*, Paris, Plon, 1974, vol. 2
- [24]. See E. Chehabi & J.J.Linz, *Sultanic Regimes*, London, 1998, pp. 12-21
- [25]. Gianfranco Pasquino, *op. cit.*, p.289
- [26]. *Ibidem*,p.289
- [27]. Adrian Gorun , *op. cit.*, p.84
- [28]. *Ibidem*, p.85