

# Fascism and democratization

Daze Putina

Researcher

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6865942>

Published Date: 20-July-2022

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Fascism arises when workers' militancy falls, it takes place in countries of late industrialization where the demands on the state are very strong. In Italy landowners played a very important role. The bourgeoisie plays a very important role in the unification of the state, but not in the fascist movements of democracy. In these countries, especially in Austria and Germany, liberalism is anticlerical and undemocratic, very conservative in nature. The bourgeoisie facilitates the rise of fascism to power. After the IGM, Europe is divided into two blocs: democratic and non-democratic. In the countries where the interwar crisis went better, democracies were established for a longer time, their cultural traditions, the commitment of the parties to democracy and the functioning of the institutions were much better. These institutions persist in the transition from one regime to another, authoritarian regimes turn to the right. There are 4 modes:

- Semi-institutional: certain civil rights (Romania, Hungary and Spain)
- Military authoritarianism: abolishes the constitution, restricts civil rights, supports the armed forces and the church and demobilizes the masses, orthodox in economic policy.
- Corporate Status: features of fascism for a time. It demobilizes the masses and intervenes in the economy.
- Fascism: active ideology, in different areas of society, repression of the left, politicians take precedence over capitalism.

The 4 have in common: very strong role of the state, hierarchical organization of society.

The corporate state is an alternative between capitalism and socialism. All components of society are integrated, much influence on the Franco regime. These types respond to 2 conditions: economic system in crisis and a system of domination also in crisis. The industry is very dependent on the big banks, this explains the weakness of the bourgeoisie in these countries, the answer is: protection, economic interventionism and very strong economic expansionism. There is an industrialization from above.

Who supports these forces? The first to analyze this was Lipset, the main support was from the middle classes in reaction to a strong capitalism and a growing labor movement. In Italy the middle classes and smallholders, in Germany for the middle classes and the collapse of the center parties, the other source of growth are the federalist and regionalist parties that pass en masse to the Nazi party. There are 5 key institutions in the development of fascist regimes:

- STATE CHURCHES: Support totalitarian solutions.
- MILITARY: Army veterans.
- THE STATE: Officials were overrepresented in fascist parties
- INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION: Universities become centers of the far right.
- EXISTENCE OF NATIONALISTS IN PERIPHERAL TERRITORIES: Linked to the central state and q see it threatened in the places where they live.

## 2. POLITICS AND ECONOMICS IN COMMUNIST SYSTEMS

The political economy of communism understood that in these there was no production that would respond to the market, supply and demand and the disappearance of the market would lead to the death of surplus value. Production mechanisms were no longer based on the market but also on secondary distribution. There is only a primary distribution, no taxes. The economic viability of the state depended on the solvency of the companies. It is a directed economy. Great importance for rapid industrialization, priorities:

- emphasize + the production of capital goods q of consumption
- cater + heavy industry q lightly
- + importance to industry and agriculture.

This creates new inequalities. Policies have different twists:

- 1917/1921: phase of socialist revolution. Great nationalizations. Context of counter-revolutionary resistance and civil war. The ideological slogans in the slogan of the implantation of the dictatorship of the proletariat + the argument d q persisted a strong differentiation of classes. Private ownership of land that is now controlled by the Soviets is abolished. In 1918 the socialization of the land follows the format of agricultural communes from lands that have been attributed to farmers and the creation of state farms. Nationalization of banking and industry. Inflation is very high between 1917 and 1920, difficulty and supply of urban centers causes the abandonment of cities.
- 1921/1927: NEP, directed by Lenin. Rationalization> d resources, some restoration of capitalism in industry. Bolshevik administration. In the 25th industrial production is very high and in the 27th there is a rapid economic recovery. It was made possible by the introduction of capitalist elements, private enterprises could exist if the number of workers did not exceed 20. There is a state capitalism, increase the efficiency of public enterprises.
- 1927/1935: intense socialist industrialization. Succession of five-year plans. And nationalizations increase. The B of the state is created in the 27. Increase of the egalitarian policies.
- 1936/1956: phase of the 2nd Stalin and the beginning of his succession. Development of non-antagonistic theory, criterion for introducing better productivity> performance based on differentiated rewards.
- 1957: Khrushchev. Drastic turn. Economic development achieves good results and returns to egalitarian policies. A minimum wage is introduced, reforms in the financing of public spending, improvements in working conditions. A decentralization of the economy is intended x 2 ways: territorial decentralization and decentralization based on the branches of industry. And it reduces bureaucracy but increases party power. The goal of decentralization is to increase the efficiency of the economy, which is better to produce goods, reduce production costs and alter the relationship between consumer goods and capital goods.

From the IIGM (Eastern countries), they have differences with the USSR:

- Nationalizations are gradual and develop over time.
- The PC shares power with other parties until 1948.

The differences between countries were very marked, the historical background had been very different. The economy was much more decentralized. The problems:

- From planners at the central level, managers provided biased information.
- Prices could not reflect production shortages or demands.
- Companies were very insensitive about the price of costs.
- Loose budget limits.

Langue tried to develop the idea of market socialism by attributing 1 role to prices. It was discussed whether prices could be introduced without private property. They proposed to create a consumer market and that production decisions were derived from the market and investment would be controlled by planners, prices would play a central role and a consumer market would be created. The companies were to have management autonomy and the reforms varied from country to country. In Hungary there is a very drastic reform, the reform + drastic is carried out. Experiment that ends the Soviet touches and the execution of its president.

Problems of communist regimes:

- \* the bureaucracy has + weight q the market
- \* the monopoly is very high
- \* Attempts to break this monopoly were difficult. Everything responded to political criteria
- \* Loose budget indices and with this the state controlled its own public accounts and the companies felt supported x the state.
- \* Excess demand, there are no alternatives to the products. Wage growth was allowed much higher than in previous times, economic growth plummeted.

The first critical voices appear within the regime itself. Tensions between party and state officials. Evolution of the situation:

- A sharp decline in the agricultural population. There are big differences between countries.
- Expanded in relative terms + q in Western countries, non-manual workers to promote rapid industrialization and led to an increase in technical education in universities.
- Higher mobility in communist societies, very active policies and schooling. Mobility processes vary by country and period and rigid mobility was introduced.
- The 1973 crisis exacerbated inequality.

Communist regimes have 4 elements: economic, state, cohesion and ideology. Ideological cohesion enters a progressive crisis with the death of Stalin. In all regimes there are 3 fundamental changes: in the political regime, economic change and change of state.

### 3. THE CONDITIONS OF POLITICAL STABILITY

The important thing is how political strategies are developed, the + interesting thing is the relationship between legitimacy, effectiveness and effectiveness. Linz discusses 5 issues:

- The political agenda: there is no need to overload it. In the new regimes expectations are multiplied, this brings problems of effectiveness and efficiency. In the face of the accumulation of problems, politicians attribute responsibility to the previous regime. Another problem is initiating policies of resentment with the previous regime. These are examples of overloaded agendas. There is a lot to calculate the timing of the reforms
- Party system: the legitimacy and the task of democratic leadership. Linz takes Sartori's theory, the number of parties determines the stability or instability of 1 regime, as well as its polarization. Bipartisan systems are, for him, the most stable, but there are some in some countries that do not work. The majority system is preferable in countries with certain characteristics. The system of polarized pluralism was a major concern in the transition.
- Opposition strategies: unfair oppositions that reject the political system. They practice the delegitimization of the system. Linz is obsessed with nationalist parties because they question the unity of the state. Tb. The semi-disloyal opposition q make secret pacts with the disloyal opposition, for Linz the key strategy is to approach this opposition, for this there is q to incorporate those who were outside the new regime and draft procedural constitutions.
- Nationalisms: Dahl had said that in cultural / heterogeneous societies it is difficult to establish a democracy. The problem stems from a reflection of political theory, democracy is subsequent to the definition of the limits of the state. How to accommodate nationalisms in democracy has to do with time.
- Presidential or parliamentary formation of regime: it is an institutional factor. Parliamentary democracies were thought to be unstable and presidential democracies stable. It is recommended to design parliamentary constitutions, because presidentialism is characterized by traits that make it inflexible and a crisis of government becomes a crisis of government becomes a crisis of the regime. The presidential: fixed term, zero-sum game, the president has great discretion when choosing positions. Parliamentarism, divides the powers, the losers have their place, the replacement of the prime minister is relative / easy, they last + in time and they generate a greater economic yield.

Linz analyzes how the crisis is triggered, takes into account:

- the ability to solve problems of the regime: it depends on the balance between needs and resources. He may not be able to provide a solution due to social problems. Violence does not produce political instability, regime changes. The loss of legitimacy can be very strong, problems for governments: use the armed forces ?, How to control paramilitary groups
- the behavior of the opposition

When the crisis worsens:

- when governments remove political issues from the agenda
- when political life is extremely judicialized
- when it is > the weight of the head of state q the d government

#### 4. DEMOCRATIZATION PROCESSES

Traditionally, the view of the origins of democracy responds to two perspectives:

The Historical - Comparative: Moore and Lipset. The general conclusion of these studies is that democracy was preceded by economic development, the most developed are usually more democratic. Przewoski thinks otherwise, saying that the demo does not depend on preconditions. There is another explanation that says that adjustments must be made between subsystems. This has been criticized by Merton, who says that it is impossible to define a priori the needs of democracy, the requirements of subsystems. It is impossible to define the degrees of adjustment between the subsystems.

Functionalists: they pay much more attention to strategic actors, it means returning to a common point. The decisions of the actors are strategic. Two fundamental books Dahl's Polyarchy and Rustow's Transitions to Democracy says that what democracies require is a genetic explanation of the whole gradual process that leads to regime change. It questions determinism. Democratizations are fraught with uncertainty, and non-democratic regimes are a certainty. The results are not inevitable. The objective conditions qdan as a framework q offers opportunities and q at the same time restricts these restrictive conditions are dynamic, they are susceptible to change x the actors. It is a sequential approach with two stages:

- The difference is between liberalization and democratization. Between the two there are gray areas.
- The difference between transition and consolidation.

The first big element is when society begins to resurface under the dictatorship, it happens after a period of repression of political identities. This process is followed by a process of de-ideologization, of depoliticization. When this begins to occur, political / hitherto unknown identities slowly emerge. As resurgence occurs 1 education of the costs of political action, the mobilization begins to take place. The 2nd element is that sectors of the regime itself are beginning to see these divisions as dispensable to the regime itself: economic crises and military bankruptcy. If 1 liberalization process occurs, introduce exhaust valves. This fragmentation can be supported by society. It can be a very deep economic crisis that has lasted many years and is seen as a crisis that requires extensive social support. Contact the opposition, the strategy is liberalization. The problem lies with the opposition sectors. There is a game of preferences, founding pacts, with pacts on second preferences, opposition dilemma of three types: whether to enter into pacts soon (restrict the agenda and the number of participants), demobilize or mobilize (what 1° is one of the requirements to accept the pact), to demand or not responsibilities (serious when the armed forces are involved). Uncertainty is constant in the process of regime change.

#### 5. CONCLUSIONS

The results depend on several situations: strategic behaviors, the actors act according to their preferences. The actions they take are rational / instrumental to achieve 1 goal. They will choose the path that maximizes their interest. Liberalizer \* may or may not become a democratizer, if it happens you have 2 problems: how to leave behind the old regime and how to start a new regime.

A democracy from 1 dictatorship is complicated when there has been no military defeat.

When the military has been defeated: hard, reformers, moderates and radicals. 4 options: dictatorship, dictatorship with concessions, democracy without guarantees and demo with guarantees. Game between reformers and moderates. There is q make constitution, process q is characterized by negotiation. If the preferences are very polarized and the balanced forces there is a bad roll. When there is uncertainty it is better.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- [1] Caiani, A. A. (2017). Re-inventing the ancien regime in post-napoleonic Europe. *European History Quarterly*, 47(3), 437-460.
- [2] Isabella, M. (2009). *Risorgimento in exile: Italian émigrés and the liberal international in the post-Napoleonic era*. OUP Oxford.
- [3] Miller, B., & Kagan, K. (1997). The Great powers and regional conflicts: Eastern Europe and the Balkans from the post-napoleonic era to the post—cold war era. *International Studies Quarterly*, 41(1), 51-85.
- [4] Ramiro Troitiño, D. (2022). Helmut Kohl: The German Reunification and the Genesis of the European Union. In *The European Union and its Political Leaders* (pp. 219-231). Springer, Cham.
- [5] Ramiro Troitiño, D. (2022). Charles-Irénée Castel, Abbé de Saint-Pierre: The Role of Religion in the European Integration. In *The European Union and its Political Leaders* (pp. 17-27). Springer, Cham.
- [6] Ramiro Troitiño, D. (2022). Margaret Thatcher: British Strategy in the European Integration. In *The European Union and its Political Leaders* (pp. 207-218). Springer, Cham.
- [7] 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.
- [8] Van Kooy, D. (2016). *Shelley's Radical Stages: Performance and Cultural Memory in the Post-Napoleonic Era*. Routledge.