

SOME ASPECTS ABOUT DEMOCRATIC REGIMES

Flavius-Cristian MĂRCĂU¹

ABSTRACT:

MODERN DEMOCRACY CONCEIVED IN THE XVIIIITH CENTURY, VERY PARTIALLY APPLIED IN VERY FEW COUNTRIES IN THE XIXTH CENTURY, WOULD HAVE TO PERISH ASSASSINATED IN THE XXTH CENTURY. SAVED AT THE LAST MINUTE 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 HAVE TURNED IN THEIR FAVOR, BOTH IN IDEA AND IN FACT, IN TERMS OF SENSITIVITY AND POPULAR AS THEORISTS VIEWS AND INTENTIONS OF POLITICAL LEADERS DISPLAYED.²

IN OUR APPROACH WE TRY TO SHOW THE BENEFITS OF SCIENTIFIC DEMOCRACY AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE CITIZENS OF A STATE STARTING FROM SEVERAL CRITERIA EVNUMERATE ROBERT DAHL THAT HAVE DEVELOPED THROUGHOUT THE ARTICLE.

KEY WORDS: DEMOCRACY, DEMOCRATIZATION, MODERN DEMOCRACY, TOTALITARIANISM

Fundamental definition of democracy is found in the following phrase: "*government by and for the people*" and, according to Robert Dahl, provides opportunities for: 1) Effective participation; 2) Equality to vote; 3) Acquiring an enlightened understanding ; 4) Exercising final control over the agenda; 5) Inclusion of the adults.³

On the five criteria listed above, Dahl offered an explanation for their choice by reference to the establishment of a democratic association⁴. The example was based on direct democracy (participative) given that all its members participate in decision making, agenda setting, etc. Can we support the direct participation can be implemented in the management of a state? Yes, we support this. Democracy can be implemented by the state, but it might not be functional. Take the example of Romania from 1990. There is no democratic constitution , laws from communist period were vague , and for certain sectors totally lacking. Legislative reform is required so that the state can work outside the totalitarian regime. At the exit from communism, Romania had about 23 million inhabitants. If you would be considered to be the direct participation generates fundamental law of the state,

¹ Research Assis, Research Institute of Development, University "Constantin Brancuși" of Târgu-Jiu, Romania; Phd. C., Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, flaviusmarcau@yahoo.com

² Jean-Francois Revel, *Revival of Democracy*, (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1995), 9;

³ Robert Dahl, *Despre Democratie*, (Iasi: institutul europea, 2003), 40

⁴ See Dahl, *Despre democratie*,. 40-45

probably at the moment we have learned from the debate on items that were to be introduced in the new democratic constitution.

The process would be very difficult and would inevitably lead to blockage followed by a civil war. Considering the large number of inhabitants and the impossibility of applying direct participation, representative democracy is the most affordable way. This is a limited and indirect form of democracy. We say that is limited because participation in government of the people is periodic and of short duration (the elections) and indirect given that exercise is manifested by the population and representatives. But this form of leadership is one democratically? Just able to create bonds of trust between those who govern (elected by the people through the electoral vote) and the governed (the people).

Demokratia is a term originated in the late sixth century BC and was linked to a century ago, in politics. Giovanni Sartori describes the association of democracy with the policy as a political democracy. Thus, today we talk about democracy without this strict revolve around policy, namely: social democracy, industrial and economic development. The first concept of *social democracy* is not new. This can be traced back to the period of Tocqueville, when democracy was regarded by him as a social structure and not a political one, all starting in 1831 when he visited the United States - during this visit, attention was drawn to the social prerequisites of America especially social equality. The second concept of *industrial democracy* was launched in the late XIXth century by Sidney and Beatrice Webb and does not represent anything other than democracy within industrial platforms. Even though this concept was based on the economic model was adapted from wrong and was placed in the industrial societies. Members of the political community (after the Greek model) was replaced by economic community member - workers. Last concept namely *economic democracy* can be easily confused with *industrial democracy*. Giovanni Sartori's definition can be considered complete: *"the term denotes a democracy whose political goal is wealth redistribution and equalization of opportunities and economic conditions. The concept of economic democracy can be considered an extension of political democracy, being used also and in one of the meanings of the concept of industrial democracy."*⁵

Concluding, social democracy and the industrial part of the complex non-political (not related to the political regime) since it refers to some identifiable structure when economic democracy has his basis in the political line - *"At one extreme tooth, it means just a policy - of course, a policy implemented by a political democracy within its structures and the specific processes. At the other extreme, economic democracy is supposed to remove and replace political democracy - a concept that does not support making identifications."*⁶

We have shown previously, in large , which is the meaning of democracy in terms of a state policy. I understand that this is manifested by the will of the people or by their elected representatives. The latter have a moral duty to represent voters. The last statement generates a question: *"Who made the government and whose interests it must respond when people are in disagreement and have divergent preferences?"*⁷ Given the significance of the term democracy above, the answer is quite simple: most people starting from the fact that a majority response fits into the democratic ideal. Some person to put the question: *"Why would not take account of a minority?"*. Because , first, the minority tends to achieve their own goals and to pursue their interests. We make these statements with the common example. A minority there during that period. We're talking about the minority favoritazata by leaders and formed them, their families and relatives who acted strictly only for personal and not in the interest of the state population.

⁵ Giovanni Sartori, *Teoria democratiei reinterpretata*, (Iasi: Polirom, 1999), 35-37;

⁶ Sartori, *Teoria democratiei reinterpretata*, 37;

⁷ Aron Liphart, *Modele ale democratiei*, (Iasi: Polirom, 2000), 25;

Does a democratic government can not disfavor a minority? The answer is as simple as it is hard to argue. People are in general tend to be dissatisfied with certain laws or public policies implemented. Requirement to create a perfect bill that pleases everyone is framed in the ideal sphere. No government that has ever existed and will exist in the future will not be able to cope with such requirements: to create the ideal law. It means that every citizen be consulted in part and certainly it would appear an unhappy.

Why we prefer democracy? Why to support democratic governance? Winston Churchill said about democracy as "*a political system is stupid, at best, but, of those that mankind has invented yet.*" We previously described the totalitarian regimes, authoritarian and Sultanic and noticed the devastating effect they have produced over the years. Democracy, however, says a contrario desirable consequences undemocratic regimes: avoiding tyranny essential rights, general freedom, self-determination, autonomy moral, human development, protect essential personal interests, gender politics, favorable attitude of peace, prosperity⁸. Some of these consequences listed above we submit to continue.

Robert Dahl tells us that democracy helps to prevent the government from autocrats. Communist regimes, Nazi and Fascism were made responsible for bringing the management of state leaders in thinking that limit human costs we have caused indescribable. Such casualties were also found only during plagues, war, hunger. History has shown that these leaders tapped to serve their purposes, the ability of the criminal state coercion. Examples are found in the person of Stalin who was guilty of the death of over 20 million people (deportations, political prisoners, compulsory work, etc.). Hitler is directly responsible for the deaths of 6 million jews in concentration camps and millions of deaths during the Second World War.

Fundamental problem of politics is to avoid leadershiping a state by autocrats.

Democracy guarantees basic rights to citizens of the state. Democracy should not be viewed strictly as a system of government but as a generator and protector of rights. Totalitarian regimes have not been shown to be interested in the rights and freedoms of citizens. Were used strictly for the right to reach the desired result regardless of the methods chosen, relying on "*the end justifies the means.*"

Democracy is a social status that transcends any individual and, by nature, is political dogma of the sovereignty of the people. Manent talks about the compatibility of the two definitions of democracy that arise in the analysis of Alexis de Tocqueville: definition of social and political definition. "*To say that social condition is democratic, is 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 "dependent" of other citizens; to say that there reigns sovereignty of the people is to say that each listens only to himself or his representative. Negative social mood defines the moment of democracy, popular sovereignty positive time.*"⁹

Regarding the standards offered by democracy, citizens need: the right to vote and to be elected, the right to fair elections, the right to alternative, etc. *Democracy ensure freedom of its citizens.* The communist regime did not offer free citizens nor those in government. The leader was the one who had the last word on all matters of the country. Democracy offers freedom both citizens and those who govern. Tocqueville considered democracy as a social organization that eliminates aristocratic rank and privileges and provides opportunities for ordinary people, but drew attention to the danger that is

⁸ Dahl, *Despre democratie*, p.47;

⁹ P. Manent, *Istoria intelectuală a liberalismului*, (București: Humanitas, 1992), 160; See Adrian Gorun, *Introducere in stiinta politica*, (Cluj-Napoca: Cluj University Press, 2003), 130-140

created by emphasizing equality to democracy: threat of mediocrity and despotism. Mediocrity comes from passion exerted on each to comply; each be avoided for fear of being accused of vanity, to express opinion different from that of others.¹⁰

Democracy helps to protect the interests

Every citizen wants some essential things: survival, food, shelter, health, love, respect, safety, family, friends, service satisfaction, leisure and more. Democracy protects the freedom and opportunities better than any other political system, namely freedom of choice.¹¹

Democracy insure the peace. One thing is certain: between 1945-1989 there were 34 international expansion wars but none of them took place between countries with democracy. Dahl argues that there was not even training in them. Generator is likely to be found friendship between countries in international trade. It was found, probably the most valuable is friendship (due to imports and exports) than war (which would close any communication between states).

*Only a democratic government can give people the maximum opportunity to exercise freedom of self-determination - to choose the laws by which to live.*¹²

If previously we discuss about people and claimed that no matter how good a law it is, will still find someone to be unhappy, now the problem is in the group: how to set up rules that group bound to respect? In a democracy, laws are drafted in favor and not against their citizens (whether arising dissatisfied). Assuming that the laws are not respected by the citizens, we conclude that in this case freedoms of others are violated. It is possible that by following the law, a person's freedom is not violated. JS Mill argued that "freedom of people stretches where the freedom of another is broken" and in this case in violation of the law arrive inevitably at violating freedoms. Who is responsible? State. If the democratic process is broken and laws are adopted without taking into account certain criteria, citizens tend to rebel against the decisions of policymakers. For such scenarios do not exist, we try to *create "a process to reach decisions on rules and laws that satisfy certain reasonable criteria: 1) the process will ensure that advance approval of a law, all citizens have the opportunity to make their views known; 2) you will ensure opportunities for discussions, deliberations, negotiations and compromises in the best conditions, lead to a law that everyone consider it satisfactory; 3) If they frequently will not get unanimously adopted the law will be the largest number of supporters."*¹³

¹⁰ Gorun, *Introducere In stiinta politica*, 149

¹¹ Dahl, *Despre democratie*, 53

¹² Dahl, *Despre democratie*, 54

¹³ Dahl, *Despre democratie*, 55;

REFERENCES

1. **Aron, Raymond**; *Democratie si Totalitarism*, Bucuresti: All, 2001;
2. **Berstein, Serge; Milza, Pierre**; *Istoria Europei*, Iasi: Institutul European, 1988;
3. **Bobbio, Norberto**; *Liberalism si democratie*, Bucuresti: Nemira, 2006;
4. **Dahl, Robert**; *Democratia si criticii ei*, Bucuresti: Institutul European, 2002;
5. **Dahl, Robert**; *Despre Democratie, Iasi: institutul europeana, 2003*;
6. **Duplan, Christian**; Vincent Ginet, *Viata in Rosu*, Bucuresti: Nemira, 2000;
7. **Ekiert, Grzegorz; Hanson, Stephen**; *Capitalism si democratie in Europa Centrala si de Est. Evaluarea mostenirii regimurilor comuniste*, Iasi: Polirom, 2010;
8. **Gorun, Adrian**; *Introducere in stiinta politica*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitara Clujeana, 2003;
9. **Grugel, Jean**; *Democratizarea*, Iasi: Polirom, 2008;
10. **Liphart, Aron**; *Modele ale democratiei*, Iasi: Polirom, 2000;
11. **Rose, Richard; Mishler, William; Haerpfer, Christian**; *Democratia si Alternativele ei*, Iasi: institutul European, 2003;
12. **Sartori, Giovanni**; *Teoria democratiei reinterpretata*, Iasi: Polirom, 1999;
13. **Thom, Francois**; *Sfarsitul comunismului*, Iasi: Polirom, 1996;
14. **Zakaria, Fareed**; *Lumea postamericana*, Iasi: Polirom, 2009.