

## WHY DEMOCRACY IS BETTER THAN DICTATORSHIP

**Flavius-Cristian MĂRCĂU**  
**Ph.D. Student**  
**„Babes-Bolyai” University of Cluj-Napoca**  
**flaviusmarcau@yahoo.com**

**Mihaela Andreea CIOREI**  
**Student**  
**„Constantin Brâncuși” University of Târgu-Jiu**  
**Mihaela\_ciorei@yahoo.com**

### ABSTRACT

*The principals anti-democratic regime of the XXcentury- communism, fascism, nazism- them was disappeared between the ruins of the war or once with the collapse from the inside of Soviet Union. About the democracy was still discussion of 2500 years, enough time to collect one ordered set of ideas, to whom, eachone, ore almost eachone, could be agree. the fact, himself that the democracy are an history so long, it was contributed at confusion and disagree, because “the democracy” meant differing things for long interspace from the human history and for present better what is the democracy, we must know firstly what it isn't.*

**KEYWORDS:** Democracy, communism, tyranny, freedom, governance

*“Democracy is a political system badly, but the best of those that mankind has invented so far” -  
Winston Churchill*

Modern democracy conceived in the eighteenth century, very partially applied in very few countries in the nineteenth century, ought to perish murdered in the twentieth century. Saved at the last moment from the blows of Nazism, and defended hard against communism, she continued to be, after 1945, less vulnerable and despised. Then, suddenly, by the mid-80s, things turned in her favor, both in idea and in fact, in terms of sensitivity popular as the theorists views and intentions of political leaders displayed [1].

*Democracy* can be understood as an ideology, a concept or a theory. It is an ideology[2] to the extent that embodies a set of political ideas that details the best possible form of social organization[3]. Shortly, democracy can be considered a way of making decisions on binding corporate rules and policies over which they exercise control population and the democratic arrangement exists where all community members enjoy equal rights to participate directly effective to such decisions, that an arrangement that meets the highest possible principles of popular control and equality in its exercise.

But the definition does not mean to give reasons. We reach a perfect understanding of democracy and democracy still not convince us [4]. Based on the above definition, we discuss the issue of justification and, ultimately, bringing evidence - what helps democracy.

Why we support democracy? Specifically, why should we support democracy in the governance of the state?

Democracy makes desirable consequences: avoiding tyranny essential rights, general freedom, self-determination, moral autonomy, human development, protection of essential personal interests, political equality. In addition, modern democracies guarantee: favorable attitude of peace and prosperity.[5]

By extension, a theory of democracy is empirically true where it is based on inductive and as far as all his factual assertions are checked.[6] In a broader sense, a theory is true when democracy fails in its application, when its practical operation is comprehensive theoretical predictions and expectations. Finally, true democracy is that democracy can be successfully implemented and operated as a viable political system[7].

*Democracy is a good alternative against infamous leaders.* The tyrants of state leadership, as totalitarianism, causing immense human cost, as that caused by pestilence, war, famine, etc. Fundamental problem of politics is to avoid driving a state by autocrats. Throughout history[8], even today, various leaders pushed by anger, paranoia, interests, have exploited the extraordinary capacity of state coercion and violence to serve their own purposes. Consider the negative examples of the last century: Joseph Stalin, leader of the Soviet Union (1929-1953), was guilty of the death of over 20 million people after forced peasants to work in state farms, and millions of people were jailed for various political reasons often invented. Why say invented for political reasons? For Stalin suffered from a paranoid fear with the impression that everyone is against him. Another example, Adolf Hitler, Nazi Germany's autocratic leader (1933-1945). Without taking into account the millions of dead during the Second World War, he is directly responsible for the death of 6 million Hebrew in concentration camps. Conscious, deliberate and very clear in 1922 Benito Mussolini created totalitarian: the concept first, then reality[9]. The existence of totalitarianism in the twentieth century perverted the way of putting the question of democracy but democracy requires the preservation of freedom obtained by regaining confidence in the ability of both well known, and, within historical conditions and imperfect character of his will[10].

What causes more direct ideas and practices of democracy is evil caused by popular governments of living under their jurisdiction and who are obliged to obey their laws, but which are not granted the right to participate in government, although these people are governed, they does not govern[11]. Robert Dahl puts a great question about the disadvantages people by a company be it democratic or undemocratic: Does not the democratic governments of disadvantaged and minority citizens who have voting rights but who are overwhelmed by the majority? A very good question, the best answer is that it gives. Believes that complications arise because each law or public policy adopted by a majority or a minority or a dictator gentle oligarchic will certainly disadvantage some people. No democratic government can not meet such a requirement would be to draw a perfect law, to consult each city separately and even then would arise unhappy.

Perhaps the major problem - Pasquino notes when speaking about contemporary trends in American political science - will be embarking on a non-assessment incorrectly interpreted, which ended translates into an uncritical acceptance and a reaffirmation of the

American model democracy, minimized and no force to propel the contradictions between equality and freedom, of equality of opportunity and equality of outcome[12].

*Democracy is not only a system of government, it is a system of rights.* These rights are essential in the process of democratic governance. As we have seen, a non-democratic system can not allow this to its citizens. Democracy is a social status that transcends any individual and, by nature, is political dogma of the sovereignty of the people. P. Manent talks about the compatibility of the two definitions of democracy that appear by default in Alexis de Tocqueville's analysis: definition of social and political definition. To affirm that social status is democratic means to say that no citizen should obey another citizen - unless, of course, the latter is an agent of the "sovereignty of the people" - and that no citizen not "depend" other citizen, to say that sovereignty reigns here is to say that each listens only to himself or his representative. Negative social status defines the moment of democracy, popular sovereignty positive moment[13].

Citizens need certain standards of democracy: the right to vote, also the right to be correctly counted votes; shall have the right to examine alternatives, the right to participate in decisions on what will be included on the agenda, etc.[14]. The need for these rights is not so decisive as to be beyond the comprehension of citizens or political leaders. A great example given by R. Dahl in his book *About Democracy* is that ordinary Americans of the late eighteenth century it was evident that they could not have a democratic republic without freedom of expression. A democracy is endangered when people fail to understand that democracy requires certain fundamental rights. Democratic state has just designed to enable the development of personal freedom, which they set boundaries and not legal event as a recipe not prescribe the use[15].

*Democracy allow citizens more personal freedom than any possible alternative[16].* What the Greek statesman, Pericles, said about Athenian democracy in 431 BC apply the same measure and modern democracy: *"The freedom we enjoy in government extends into our daily lives"*[17]. The relationship between a democratic state and democratic culture that supports him is complex, with all the rights, freedoms and opportunities that are strictly necessary for a government to be democratic. A democracy could not survive long if its citizens had failed to create and maintain a favorable political culture. Tocqueville considered democracy as a social organization that eliminates aristocratic rank and privileges and provides opportunities for ordinary people, but has attracted attention to the danger that is created by emphasizing equality to democracy: threat of mediocrity and despotism. Mediocrity flows from passion exerted on everyone to comply, each will avoid, for fear of being accused of vanity, to express an opinion different from that of other[18].

*Democracy helps people to protect their fundamental interests [19].* Every citizen wants some essential things: survival, food, shelter, health, love, respect, safety, family, friends, service satisfaction, leisure and others. Democracy protects the freedom and opportunities better than any other political system, namely freedom of choice, but those who have experienced a totalitarian or authoritarian hardly manage to think beyond constitutional-pluralist regimes clutter is hiding some almightiness[20], and sooner or later, you can narrow your freedoms to the manager.

*Only a democratic government can give people the maximum opportunity to exercise freedom of self-determination - to choose the laws by which to live [21].*

The association between people is beneficial to live a satisfactory life. How can you choose the rules that group bound to respect? Regarding the "political theory" assessments

analysts are diverse and there is, as noted Pasquino, a universally accepted view on what is and what should be "political theory"[22].

Because of the ability to strengthen the rule of law imposed by the State, and yet at the same time, selecting them, you will not be free to breach them? If we can not live in harmony with all human beings, we try to create a process to reach decisions on the rules and laws that satisfy certain reasonable criteria: the process will ensure that advance approval of a law, all citizens have the opportunity to make their views known, you will ensure opportunities for discussions, deliberations, negotiations and compromises in the best conditions, lead to a law that everyone considers to be satisfactory if they frequently will not get unanimously adopted the law will be the largest number of supporters [23].

*Only government can provide the maximum opportunity for the exercise of moral responsibility[24].* What it means the exercise of moral responsibility? Means adopt moral principles and take decisions according to them only after going through a process of thinking to reflect, deliberate analysis and song choices and their consequences[25]. If you do not obey the collective decisions and that the democratic process will maximize the opportunity to live under laws at our choice, then the process will allow you to act as a morally responsible person, to an extent that can not be offered by any undemocratic alternative . So democracy brings into focus the state apparatus. States with a minimum of technical capabilities will not be able to cope with population pressures, or move out reforms [26].

*Democracy encourages human evolution more than any possible alternative[27].* Robert Dahl believes that at birth most human beings possess the potential to form these qualities, but this depends on the nature of the political system in which they live. Only democratic systems provide the conditions in which those qualities can fully form. All other regimes play limits where adults can act to assume responsibility for important decisions or to engage freely with others looking for the most suitable decision.

*Only a democratic government can maintain a relatively high degree of political equality[28].* A totalitarian or authoritarian government would only destroy this political equality, to erase the human rights and to resemble the social anarchy.

*Modern representative democracies do not fight against each other.* Of the 34 international wars of the years 1945 to 1989, none occurred between democracies. There was no preparation for a war between them. The reasons are not clear, perhaps higher levels of international trade of modern democracies further predispose them to relations of friendship than to war[29].

Alexis de Tocqueville is amazed by two contrasting ways in which to present democracy: a social movement full of seizures, such as France and harmonious habits and institutions, in America[30]. The root of this contrast is the very essence of democracy understood primarily as a social condition characterized by equality of conditions and not as a set of political institutions. Therefore, from a social state with the same features, people can reach political consequences, "extraordinary" different. But the origin of the social state is different from Americans who "were born and have become equal"[31].

*Countries with democratic governments tend to be more prosperous than countries with democratic governance.* From the second half of the twentieth century began to be obvious the relationship between prosperity and democracy. By the end of the twentieth century all countries with democratic political systems were market economies but not all the countries with market economy were democratic[32]. How equal social status has different origins, although the institutions are a consequence of this state, of different

origins stemming different influences on political institutions.[33] Manent explains terms developed by Alexis de Tocqueville in this issue: "This contradiction or this difficulty fade if we consider that, on the one hand, democratic social state rigorously determine what \_ can not be the institutions - they can not be aristocratic - and, on the other hand, she doesn't explains, and then leaving it that people can discernment them: bullied or free.[34]

### Conclusions

To recap the original position, we made a distinction between the question: "Is genuine democracy itself?" And the question "Is possible that \_ the option for democracy to be guaranteed rational?". Based on this distinction, my conclusion is that political systems pose any option; choice involves the comparison between "better" and "worse" (not between "good" and "true" or between "bad" and "false" in the absolute sense ), and the relativism of values requires just assessing their relative (comparative). Therefore, it is perfectly possible to ensure preferences. Policy options allow rational argumentation and political alternatives subject even when linked and focused on value - guaranteed recommendation. It is not possible in the strictest sense, to "prove democracy", but I think that we can convincingly argues that democracy is preferable[35].

### References

- [1]. Jean-Francois Revel, *Revirimentul democratiei*, Bucuresti: Humanitas, 1995, p.9;
- [2]. Linz and Stepan consider, in the book "How to consolidate democracy", it is necessary to begin by saying a few words about three minimal conditions that must be fulfilled before there is an opportunity to talk about strengthening democracy. First, in a modern political system can not be free and to enjoy the authority may exercise their winners monopoly of legitimate force, and citizens can not benefit from effective protection of their rights through the rule of law than if there is a state. In some parts of the world, conflicts about authority and the polis and demos's identity and loyalty ditch in so intense that the state does not exist. Without state there can be no democracy.
- [3]. Jean Gruugel, *Democratizarea*, Bucuresti: Polirom, 2008;
- [4]. Giovanni Sartori, *Teoria democratiei reinterpretata*, Bucuresti: Polirom, 1999, p. 245;
- [5]. Robert Dahl, *Despre Democratie*, Iasi: institutul europea, 2003 , p.47;
- [6]. Giovanni Sartori, *op. cit.*, p. 246;
- [7]. *Ibidem*;
- [8]. For leaders who imposed terror in their own state, democracy was seen as a form of backward driving. Sartori argues that Mussolini, totalitarian state sounds impressive, important, and label totalitarian state have resonance for his vanity and rhetoric. But it was primarily rhetorical. Fascism in Italy, it was a clear case of authoritarian dictatorship - more than just a dictatorship, but less than a totalitarian state. The situation was different in Hitler's Germany. Indeed, the original authors who have been known to directly totalitarianism invariably made reference to what happened in Nazism era. Contrary, any Italian who lived experience of fascism and wrote a paper on this subject didn't treat it seriously as totalitarianism.
- [9]. Jean-Francois Revel, *Op. Cit.*, 1995, p. 37
- [10]. John H. Hallowell, *Temeiul moral al democratiei*, Bucuresti: ed. Paideia, p. 94
- [11]. Robert Dahl, *Op. Cit.*, p. 49;
- [12]. Adrian Gorun, *Introducere in stiinte politice*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitara Clujeana, 2003, p. 21;
- [13]. Adrian Gorun, *op. cit.*, p 137;
- [14]. A se vedea pe larg Larry Diamond, Yun-han Chu, Marc F. Plattner, Hung-mao Tien, *Cum se consolideaza democratia*, Iasi:Polirom, 2004, pp. 41-91
- [15]. Jean-Francois Revel, *Op. Cit.*, 1995, p. 41
- [16]. A se vedea Robert Dahl, *Democratia si criticii ei*, Bucuresti: Institutul European, 2002;
- [17]. Robert Dahl, *Despre Democratie*, Iasi: institutul europea, 2003, p. 52;

- [18]. Adrian Gorun, *op. cit.*, p. 149
- [19]. Robert Dahl, *op. cit.*, p. 53;
- [20]. Raymond Aron, *Democratia si totalitarism*, Bucuresti: All Educational, 2001 p. 196
- [21]. Robert Dahl, *op. cit.*, p.54;
- [22]. Adrian Gorun, *Puterea politica si regimurile politice*, Targoviste: Bibliotheca, 2006., p 24
- [23]. Richard Rose, William Mishler, Christian Haerpfer, *Democratia si alternativele ei*, Iasi: Institutul European, 2003, pp. 182-187
- [24]. Robert Dahl, *op. cit.*, p.56;
- [25]. *Ibidem.*, p. 57
- [26]. Jean Grugel, *Democratizarea*, Bucuresti: Polirom, 1999, p. 91
- [27]. Robert Dahl, *op. cit.*, 57
- [28]. *Ibidem*, p.58;
- [29]. *Ibidem*, p.59;
- [30]. Adrian Gorun, *Introducere in stiinte politice*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitara Clujeana, 2003., p 135;
- [31]. A se vedea Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, [http://www.gutenberg.org/catalog/world/readfile?fk\\_files=2378042](http://www.gutenberg.org/catalog/world/readfile?fk_files=2378042), accesat la 22.03.2012
- [32]. A se vedea R.D Putnam, *Cum functioneaza democratia?*, Iasi: Polirom, 2001, pp. 183-209 si Giovanni Sartori, *Teoria Democratiei Reinterpretate*, Iasi: Polirom, pp. 353-384
- [33]. Adrian Gorun, *Op. Cit.*, p. 135
- [34]. *Ibidem.*, p. 136;
- [35]. Giovanni Sartori, *op. cit.*, 251
- [36]. Aron, Raymond; *Democratia si Totalitarism*, Bucuresti: All, 2001;
- [37]. Dahl, Robert; *Democratia si criticii ei*, Bucuresti: Institutul European, 2002;
- [38]. Diamond, Larry; Chu, Yun-han.; Plattner, Marc F., Tien, Hung-mao; *Cum se consolideaza democratia*, Iasi:Polirom, 2004
- [39]. Grugel, Jean; *Democratizarea*, Iasi: Polirom, 2008;
- [40]. Hallowell, John H, *Temeiul moral al democratiei*, Bucuresti: ed. Paideia
- [41]. Putnam, R.D, *Cum functioneaza democratia?*, Iasi: Polirom, 2001
- [42]. Rose, Richard; Mishler, William; Haerpfer, Christian; *Democratia si Alternativele ei*, Iasi: institutul European, 2003;