

DOMINATION OF CAPITAL AND EMERGENCE OF DEMOCRACY; THERBORN

Pēteris Balodis

Researcher

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6860129>

Published Date: 19-July-2022

1. INTRODUCTION

In this text, the author proposes an analysis of how developed countries have acceded to a democratic regime during the twentieth century, proposing the resolution of two paradoxes traditionally posed by Marxism and classical economists, namely how it is possible what:

- Liberal-bourgeois regimes have come to the quasi-axiomatic thesis that capitalism is only comprehensible within a full democracy, when the classical theses of liberalism came to say the opposite, that is, that a mass democracy was contrary to maintenance of the capitalist system.
- The labor movement in its mobilization has given rise to a mass democracy which is nevertheless ruled by a tiny bourgeois class, when the extension of the right to vote to all citizens without exception was to be expected to have led to a class government. worker. However, this bourgeois democracy is considered a fundamental advance by the workers' forces.

To elucidate this issue, Therborn starts from a historical analysis of the implementation of democracy in developed countries in order to examine the variables common to the processes examined and determine what have been the synergies that have led to this result. The author uses Marxist terminology (classes, structure, emancipation, exploitation ...) and at the same time makes an interesting empirical abstraction in the form of determining variables that allow us to reach scientifically reliable conclusions.

First, the variables dependent on various concepts are determined:

- Democracy: 1) Popular representation, 2) Universal suffrage, 3) Equal suffrage and 4) Free suffrage, in addition to a series of formal freedoms that are considered as prerequisites for democracy.
- Bourgeois democracy: 1) State apparatus composed of people belonging to the bourgeois class, 2) State power as a superstructure of a capitalist production system.
- Secondly, it determines the political space to be studied, that is, the developed countries operated through the seventeen then OECD member states with an already established democracy, thus excluding cases such as Spain or Turkey.
- Next, it is necessary to determine when democracy appears in each of the states analyzed, that is, at what historical moment the four variables mentioned above are verified. The combination of variables made by the author (on which we omit to dwell) gives rise to six logically possible cases, from which are excluded those that have not existed in practice, so that it is a typology of four political regimes: democratic state, dictatorial state, exclusivist authoritarian state and exclusivist democratic state. There are cases in which the poetic change has led to a dictatorship, but the most striking are those assumptions in which the democratic system has not become implanted due to the exclusion of certain groups due to a) class, b) sex, c) race and d) opinion. We will dwell on this issue later.

- Examining the historical evolution of each of the states as individualized cases, a series of generic statements can be abstracted about the factors that have contributed to the democratization process. The first two are that democracy has not come at the hands of any of the bourgeois revolutions and that it has not followed peaceful processes in line with the economic and social progress brought about by industrial society. In that case, what are the factors of democratization? • The military defeat of the state in question in one of the two world wars. However, democracy was not the *casus belli* in any of the disputes, but according to the author these took place by the clash of imperialism prevailing in capitalist societies, the result of one of the contradictions of capitalism (Marxist thesis where there are) .
- • The counterpart to the need for national mobilization, either as a national liberation movement or as a preparation for war.
- • Bourgeois internal factors of pressure, the independent force of the petty and middle bourgeoisie, industrial and agricultural, and the division between the holders of capital derived from its own division, another of the contradictions of capitalism.
- • Internal factor of the labor movement, which at all times raised the demand for universal suffrage, equal and free.
- • For the author, none of these factors was sufficient and only one can be predicted to be necessary for its presence in all processes, with more or less force: the labor movement. It had to ally with the bourgeois internal factors and, where appropriate, with one of the external factors.

2. MAIN ARGUMENT

An interesting note appears in the text that should be developed, and this is the historical role of the Second International: the author claims as a legacy of this the democratization of political systems, and this is an effect that could be said to be collateral or unwanted as the first preference for this movement. In effect, World War I was seen as the great failure of the Socialist International, since the call for the unity of the working masses against national capitalism was not heard in any of the contending countries. In the Great War, the workers supported with their military effort the interest of the states, understood as the interest of the capital of the states that faced in a framework of clash between imperialisms. The national sacred union prevailed over universal class solidarity. Thus, Isidro Sepúlveda ("History of Nationalism", Ed. Santillana, Madrid, 1997) understands much of the nationalist phenomena as an expression of a dynamic of creation of a capitalist system structured within national borders. The role of the Second International is a sign of international-list and nationalist Marxism: Marx supported Polish independence, but this was a prelude to the democratization of the country, as well as Irish nationalism as a way to the emancipation of Ireland (cf. .op.cit.). Thus, democratization was an undisguised goal of the labor movement, and was probably the quintessential achievement of the historically insulted II International.

Closing this parenthesis, we continue with the development of Therborn's argument focusing on why democracy has appeared exclusively in capitalist regimes. Thus, the author analyzes what he calls the intrinsic tendencies of capitalism by virtue of which democracy is arrived at. Basically this has been the answer in the form of a bourgeois concession to resolve a potential social conflict with the working class, while the establishment of the demoliberal system leads to national unification and the final dismantling of the structures of the Old Regime. The author presents six defining notes:

- The workers' struggle is necessary to achieve the democratization of a country, then a developed and organized proletarian class is needed.
- Democratic participation must provide advantages to the bourgeoisie, which in the historical cases studied resulted in the involvement of the working classes in national mobilization and war.
- The nation-state provides the appropriate superstructure for the development of a national capitalism, with a national market and production and an overcoming of medieval structures.
- The development of production allows us not to fear that the redistributive tendencies of left-wing governments are traumatic for the bourgeois classes.
- Capitalism intrinsically links capital with the state, so that the bourgeoisie as a social class preserves its independence.
- Capitalist relations of production segment the bourgeois class in such a way that its disunity favors the realization of the demands of the labor movement.

In this way, in countries where these conditions do not exist, a full democracy is never established, and this is the case of the new states that have emerged from decolonization where, for example, the bourgeoisie is not disunited but homogeneous around to a single production and depends on an external center, or whose national independence has not been realized taking into account the popular classes that, in addition, are in pre-industrial stages.

In conclusion, this author emphasizes that the democratization we know today, which has surpassed the liberal predictions of bourgeois revolutions, is a result of the class struggle, of the contradictions between capital and labor. A theory that might seem deterministic but that emerges as a validly issued conclusion from this theoretical discourse. The aggregation of the workers' struggle with its unforeseen allies generated this model of participation that maintained and maintains capitalist structures avoiding social conflict and the collapse of the system. The next step after democratization will be, even if Therborn does not say so in his article, the welfare state.

3. CONCLUSIONS

Finally, the analysis closes by explaining the synergies of the exclusion of groups from the democratic state: Overcoming the classist criteria, curiously, the sexist and racist criteria have been the most irredentist and the most recent opinion. However, the dynamics have been the same in all of them and their inclusion in the system has depended on their ability to organize and put pressure on them. Consequently, the male working masses have been the first to gain suffrage. As for the female vote, it seems to depend on the strength and position of opponents of it. The racial suffers the same fate, but rather seems to be only when the group is not worrying ceases to be ex-closed (criterion of scarcity, in both cases in New Zealand the vote is given to women and aborigines), when it can destabilize it excludes it and its inclusion is only allowed when entering the system it avoids its collapse, as a valve for releasing social tension, as long as bridges are built from inside the system by sectors that grant their -interested- welcome.

Consequently, it could be stated that anti-system groups are excluded until their presence outside its borders begins to be unbearable (due to internal or external factors) so that it becomes necessary to open the door to their incorporation. This is the case of political forces excluded by reason of opinion, which in some cases are admitted and in others end up disappearing or being reduced to the merely testimonial.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Goran, T. (2020). The rule of capital and the rise of democracy. In *Classes and Elites in Democracy and Democratization* (pp. 134-141). Routledge.
- [2] Ramiro Troitiño, D. (2022). The Essence of Europe: Understanding Europe Through Its Designers. In *The European Union and its Political Leaders* (pp. 1-4). Springer, Cham.
- [3] Ramiro Troitiño, D. (2022). Jean Monnet: Neofunctionalism at Work in the European Integration. In *The European Union and its Political Leaders* (pp. 121-140). Springer, Cham.
- [4] Therborn, G. (1984). Classes and states welfare state developments, 1881–1981. *Studies in Political Economy*, 14(1), 7-41.
- [5] Therborn, G. (1979). The travail of Latin American democracy. *New left review*, 113(114), 71-109.
- [6] Therborn, G. (2016). *What does the ruling class do when it rules?: state apparatuses and state power under feudalism, capitalism and socialism*. Verso Books.
- [7] Troitino, D. R. (2013). *European integration: building Europe*. Nova Science Publishers.
- [8] Troitiño, D. R. (2021). La «Década Digital» de la Unión Europea: desarrollos e impactos sobre su ciudadanía y economía. *IDP: revista d'Internet, dret i política*, (34), 1-14.
- [9] Troitiño, D. R. (2021). Winston Churchill y el proceso de construcción europea. *Revista Notas Históricas y Geográficas*.