УДК 321

DEMOCRACY AND TOTALITARIANISM. COMPROMISE IN HONOR TO DEMOCRACY. AN IDEAL POLITICAL SYSTEM OR «BETWEEN TWO EVILS, YOU SHOULD CHOOSE THE LESSER ONE?»

ДЕМОКРАТІЯ ТА ТОТАЛІТАРИЗМ. КОМПРОМІС НА КОРИСТЬ ДЕМОКРАТІЇ. ІДЕАЛЬНИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ УСТРІЙ, АБО «З ДВОХ ЗОЛ ОБИРАЮТЬ НАЙМЕНШЕ?»

Kupriianova L.S.,
PhD in Medicine,
Associate Professor of the Department of Criminalistics and Judicial Expertology
Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs

Kupriianova D.S.,
Student on the Faculty of Law
National University of Opole
Opole, Poland

Today democracy and totalitarianism are two the most controversial political doctrines, that have been developing by couple of historic scientists around the world. Someone of them says, that these systems are totally different. Another group claims, that long time ago the totalitarianism was created on the background of main postulates of Plato's democracy. Where is the truth? How can we find it out after such couple of times and historical occasions, even after the most tragic ones? How could we keep the common sense under such incredible pressure of history and our common accountability in front of face of the World's peace?

In this article authors are going to disclose the whole process of creating of two the most controversial political doctrines as well as criticism against them, in the aim of making one great common conclusion, and answer the question: «Are we already have a democratic world? Does the best democracy of Plato really look like our modern world? Are we already on the edge of glory?».

Key words: democracy, totalitarianism, Hanna Arendt, Erich Fromm, Carl Popper, Socrates, Plato.

У даній статті було представлено ґенезу поняття «демократія», а також зв'язок даного політичного устрою із появою та розвитком доктрини тоталітаризму. Проведено дослідження головних постулатів вчення, з метою побудови перспектив розвитку проблематики демократії у сучасному світі.

Ключові слова: демократія, тоталітаризм, Ганна Арендт, Еріх Фромм, Карл Поппер, Сократ, Платон.

В данной статье представлен генезис понятия «демократия», а также связь данного политического строя с появлением и развитием доктрины тоталитаризма. Было проведено исследование главных постулатов учения с целью выработки концепции перспектив развития проблематики демократии в современном мире.

Ключевые слова: демократия, тоталитаризм, Анна Арендт, Эрих Фромм, Карл Поппер, Сократ, Платон.

Long times ago, after the end of the II World War, rulers of all countries, in the aim of prevent of repeating the most tragic occasion of last years; the rulers, who according to their personal experience knew, what is totalitarianism, dictators and where such political systems lean to; unanimously decided, that from those times, the whole world is going to live in peace and calmness. The World of New Generation is going to respect freedom, equality, justice and, what is more, this World is going to create absolutely new political system, which will be grown on these postulates [1]. There were going to create a democracy. And till today, an incredible number of people around the world are blindly believe in this political phenomenon. But, when something will going on not in right way, we could everything explain very fast as well. «You see, we have not got already a perfect democracy in our state! What do you want from this political system? Our democracy will be probably reached only at the times of our children' generation….». And, because of the fact, that during almost a century after the decision of create a democratic world, we still have problems in functioning of our policy, our governmental presenters from time to time have always a great number of postulates, how to reach finally and ideal democracy and change the world forever. After people created a nimbus of this imaginary political postulate in their minds, politics around the world got a perfect possibility to manipulate this people and make their positive influence to results of ballots [1].

Years are going by, we still have great couple of problems with our political system, but are there a lot of people who ask themselves honestly: «if the democracy is truly such a good solution for our society? If this is such an ideal political system, which we are imaging in our minds and which we are going to reach? If our dream about prosperity of our nation looks like democracy?». But nobody want to understand or just to assume, that all minuses or problems with our political systems nowadays, which we have in our developed countries, are existing not because of the fact, that our politics do not really know, how to build a successful democracy. Oppositely, it is because of the fact, that probably this political doctrine combines a great number of minuses and unforgiving shortcomings within. And, finally, it is possible to disclose of personal doubt according to a well-known thought, that is we had not a tragic experience of the II World War, or experience of having dictators or evil authorities in the head of our countries, we could turn to postulate of democracy today. But, as far as all of us perfectly know, history does not know the world «if not».

But working on main questions of our topic, by developing and providing a historical research, dedicated to finding out all pluses and minuses of democracy, from the point of view of people, who live in society, where, from time to time, you could hear about ideal of democracy, the ideal political system, where all people will live in peace and happiness; it is incredibly difficult to destroy this pressure of common meaning and understand the fact, that, in point of fact, we are going nowhere; we are going to reach something, what we probably absolutely do not need.

Accurately according to everything, that we had been talking about, we are going to evaluate all pluses and minuses of this political postulate and make a final decision about rationality of our ways to this «ideal life» in general. We are going to provide a historical analysis of old documents, as well as doctrines of the most famous philosophers of the State and Law of all times and historical periods, and, summary, we are going to disclose all pluses and minuses of democracy, as well as of her «greatest opponent» totalitarianism. And, after that,

we are going to make one common conclusion dedicated to rational understanding the fact, if this postulate, of this political system, which we are going to reach is really such a good solution? Or long time ago it was just a political compromise after destroying an annoying apparatus of totalitarianism?

When we speak about democracy, and her the most famous postulated backgrounds, we should remember, that freedom, equality and justice we truly postulated parts of a great number of political doctrines of all times. But, the name of our «ideal system» was created in the Ancient Greece. In addition, there is a very small group of scientists around the world, who truly know, what was a real background of this doctrine, and how, according to ancients philosophers this doctrine should be turned into life.

The logic of modern times is practical and understandable, without doubts. Democracy – from the «demos» – which means «nation, people»; «cratio» – «rule». Consequently, democracy is a rule of nation, this is the rule of people. And this is a really logical opinion, despite on the fact, that people of an Ancient Greece understood a word «nation» in totally different way, unfortunately.

A famous philosopher, who created a name «democracy» and who presented it for the whole period of our future history, was Socrates. And his doctrine was grounded of a couple of main thoughts, among of which he said: «Democracy – is a rule of nation. But, as far as I understood, according to my great experience, this is the worst political system, which you can only imagine! Demos, which means, our nation – is nothing. These people are only foolish sheep, who could not never understand, how to make a rule in their country in successful and right way. Consequently, that must not do it, because they have lack of mind in this sphere. Democracy leads to anarchy, because of the fact, that, where you have rule of everyone, there are nobody, who really rules».

This radical point of view, was continued and researched later by the most famous Socrates' student – by philosopher Plato. Plato, to the point, created a great number of «Socrates' dialogues», where we still can find the most interesting and fabulous postulates of Socrates' doctrine, because of the fact, that Socrates personally did not leave not written documents with his thoughts.

Thus, by developing and improving a main doctrine of his teacher, Plato came to conclusion, that democracy is probably not such a bad political system. There is only one problem with it, which means, problem with understanding main words in this doctrine. And this words, which are created democracy's definition, according to Plato's point of view, should be concerned in absolutely different way, that we making today. Namely, «demos – is nation; nation – is a small group of people, of elite, who had been studying in the Academy of Plato during 25 years to get their political mandates. This was a democratic nation. Nation – is a political elite. Moreover, they should live absolutely separated from other people, in the aim of prevent a negative people of «foolish sheep» into nation». Consequently, we should say, that the most important, as you can see, there is a question of wrong understanding of main word in the famous definition. And, according to this lack of understanding, now, we can see such situation, as searching for something, what we can not even understand in right way.

Following to our thought in the sphere of understanding the definition, we should say, that here we also could find out a link between democracy in such state, in which it is gonna to be understood from the first meanings of ancients, and from the rule of authority from the other side, or even from the totalitarianism from opposite side. And such link we could find out, easily according to everything, that we had been talking about earlier. These main doctrines of our history, that seems to be totally different, have such a great number of similarities! The main difference between them could be valued only by concerning, how acute policy of the rule in such states could be. So now, there are gonna be no surprise, if someone will remember, how often those authorities, who tried to create a total rule in their countries, postulated an idea of democratic state. Consequently, were they such vial liars? And, what is more, according to the fact, that totalitarianism in general is not absolutely a separate doctrine, but a compilation of number of postulates, so, understanding of this idea gonna to destroy all our lack of confidence!

So, by now, there is a next question: how we made a permission to ourselves to try to reach something, what could return us again to the rule of totalitarianism?

After end the II World War, after destroying the rule of total authorities around the world, the only one rule of authority was functioning for more than ten years from that times, the rule of Stalin. And his rule, after the end of war, continued its development, by claiming main ideas of equality and freedom. But, after the year of 1956th, the rule of real total authorities was destroyed forever. After this moment significantly was reincarnated the postulate of democracy for the first time. And it was logical for those times, easily because of the fact, that nobody knew a real definition and right way of understanding of this political system (ancient doctrines were under restriction for almost a century for those times, so nobody knew the doctrine of Plato), so, consequently, the whole world of Soviet Union science followed the doctrine, which they could not even understand in right way.

At the same time, scientists of Germany followed this postulate as well, but, oppositely to the Soviet Union, by understanding the main aim of policy.

Generally, at those times, it was incredibly easy to make people believe in such young «reincarnated» postulate of the «nation's rule», because of the strong association between the war and the name «totalitarianism». People were ready to follow every postulate and every fresh idea of the political system, if it was not called «totalitarianism». And, consequently, after couple of generations of fans of democracy rule, this idea was implemented into our minds in such hard way, that till now, a great number of people is still ready to blindly bow to this «ideal state».

But, at those times, when the idea of democratic rule was very young, there were a group of historical scientists, who became famous namely because of the fact, that the had created from unknown political postulate a doctrine of «great imagine».

Carl Popper, Hannah Arendt and Erich Fromm. These were three main personalities, who created a destructive criticism of totalitarianism and reincarnated a postulate of democracy for future generations.

Carl Popper claims, that totalitarianism destroyed a business mentality of people of those times. People were separated from free possibilities in the economical and trade sphere. And, according to the background of this negative points, Popper disclosed an idea of democracy for the first time. He divided a real democracy into two different. The first one – which was created according to Plato's doctrine, the second one – the democracy created on the background of Athens' experience (where really was claimed a postulate of rule of everyone). Popper said, that the Athens' experience is tragic one, so people should follow an experience of Greece. And returns to the postulate the rule of elite. It seems to be his psychical manipulation of other people in the aim of making them ready for the return of totalitarianism, but with another, but really dangerous name. The criticism of Popper tried to destroy the name of totalitarianism in minds of people, but did not want to destroy the main idea of elite's rule!

Hannah Arendt in her treatise «The origins of totalitarianism» disclosed only two main negative aspects of this rule: racism and antisemitism. And she claimed an idea of Plato's democracy again! She was not against the rule of elite, she was against discrimination! She was not against the rule of elite!

And, finally, Erich Fromm and his treatise «Escape from freedom». In this political novels, Fromm vehemently posed

all Germans as sadomasochists, because of the fact, that they make a permission to Hitler to get w whole rule in the country! And why? Because of the fact, that they need a ruler, who will control them very strictly. In his treatise he turned to idea of Plato's democracy in a really acute way, and he was never against the rule of elite, hew was totally against all types the rule, who could make from the whole nation only silent sheep. Such types of rule, that destroyed people's personalities and individualism. He was against killing a personality inside every person, he was not totally against Hitler though!

As you can see, after such a professional criticism, the idea of totalitarianism was killed in minds of people forever. And this criticism completed perfectly its main mission. Something should be associated with war, and this «something» it was necessary to create. It should exist something, which will could be in critical moment combined with all negative points and faults. Do you remember, what Hitler said about Jewish? So, you see!

To sum up, as you can see, the main postulates of the doctrine of Plato as well as the doctrine of totalitarianism are functioning till now among of us. So, if the doctrine of Plato about democratic rule is really the perfect solution for our society we could decide even now, by looking round. In the aim of conclusion, we would like to say only one more idea: it could be a paradox, but it is definitely true. As you see, the real historical democracy is already around us. Consequently, we did not should try to reach it already. For now we should think about one very important thing: maybe we have to try to realize not a famous doctrine of democracy, but only a postulate of such imaginary freedom, peace and justice?

REFERENCES

1. Chojnicka K. Historia doktryn politycznych i prawnych / K. Chojnicka, H. Olszewski. – Poznań, 2004.