

The multiform eternal enemy of democracy: despotism

PhD Anila Kashnjeti

Abstract

Since the early antiquity individuals and people have gained the consciousness of their value and strength against tyranny. People have an instinctive, violent, unrestricted hatred towards the tyrant. Every revolution demolishes one tyranny, and it crushes the structure of its supporters, "soldiers". Main objective of this manuscript is the analysis of despotism in a comparative philosophical manner towards democracy.

Keywords: Democracy, despotism, democracy, enemy.

Introduction

Tyranny is the eternal enemy of democracy, as long as it denies its main principles of freedom and independence. It can be generally judged tyrant or despot that authoritarian individual who imposes on those who surround him, his arbitrary will, that does not accept objections, extremes or replicas. The tyrant commands; others are not allowed to do something else except to obey. The justification of the order, its legitimization, lies only in the arbitrariness of the despot. But Tocqueville (1936) observes that it is not enough to act arbitrarily to be tyrannical, as often the order can be used in a useful way in favor of the people and to preserve their freedom. It is always the arbiter that brings and supports the revolutions. There is nothing more arbitrary than a political revolution that accepts freedom, independence, and equality of a people, yet there is nothing more righteous and sacred in the face of God and in the face of men. But it is not necessary to be deceived by the words. Often, under the lies of a "revolution" can hide the fiery tyranny and the blindest tyranny. Revolution and freedom are two words that must stand apart in history. For example, in France, the revolutionary dictatorship, which has been the most hostile to freedom among all dictatorships, vanquished as much as the people of thought did; almost everything that existed from the philosophical school of antiquity of the eighteenth century. The same would happen to Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau if they were alive. For their good fortune they had already died.... However, we must always distinguish arbitrariness from tyranny: "Tyranny can be practiced through the law itself, and then it is not arbitrary at all; arbitrariness can be exercised in the interest of citizens and then it is not tyrannical. Tyranny generally serves arbitrariness but can do without it". Tyranny appears more often in the laws that oppress the people, as long as they are expressions of a will, which may be arbitrary, denying respect for the fundamental rights of their humanity: political freedom and independence. Whoever obstructs the will of the people by the law of his will, and sneaks in some way to the breathing of a people, this is a tyrant.

However, tyranny always flourishes again by its own grace and resurfaces with different looks; and its new forms are more invisible and appealing, fascinates its

sacrifices and seduces them into a fatal and eternal circle. When people understand lies, it is too late: every possibility of rebellion is impossible, because all the energies from their hearts are torn away and nerve centers are no longer responsive to brain stimuli as they are neutralized by a nearly narcotic and deafening action. The brain activity itself is paralyzed and the individual is moved to new, stationary and sleepy slavery.

Despotism (Caesar or Bonaparte) is therefore the most dangerous enemy that fascinates the life of democracy, and precisely as a result of its multifaceted nature and its diabolical art, disorients and corrupts human nature. Against it we must constantly observe; and it is not uncommon for a people who are pretending to have ruined the tyranny, when it has done nothing but changed the old master with a young, perhaps more oppressive and despotic than the previous one.

In fact, the anarchy that follows closely and often accompanies a revolution that has liberated people from an absolute sovereign or an adventurous tyrant is again a violent and arbitrary regime at the same time and perhaps worse than the other because of the different forms of tyranny.

For these people to be protected from this evil and to take the measures in due time, they must find the cause. Tocqueville (1936) finds the cause of the general state of apathy that often involves the whole nation when individuals who are concerned only for their own personal interest lose entirely the interest of the State. It cannot be said in an absolute and general way, he explains that the biggest danger in our day is status or tyranny, anarchy or despotism. As one or the other are all to be afraid and can all derive from the same cause that is the general apathy of the fruit of individualism. And this apathy makes it possible when the executive power collects some power to exert its oppressive power and the next day a party can assemble in its camp 30 people and may play the same oppressive role. But since neither one nor the other can create a lifelong power, what allows them to achieve their purpose easily prevents them from reaching it for a long time. They can easily climb into power as no one hinders but falls back easily because no one supports them. What we have to fight most from all is apathy rather than despotism and anarchy that causes both of these". (Even dictatorships are forms of popular government. Being popular is the condition of their existence) It represents their strength, but also their weakness, because similar regimes have to promote all the appetites of the mass. The dictator is a man who instinctively recognizes the feelings of the crowd and with his word seduces the supporters. But the main cause of dictatorship is always the apathy of the nations. In the agony of the first French republic Constant wrote to Ms. De Nassau: "The nation has spent all its physical and moral strength." The two fighting is considered a "false tragedy". Elections are viewed with maximum indifference. "Nobody seems to have the least capacity to destroy the yoke under which it is located. This apathy favors radical parties. The anarchists seem to be creating a party so strong that they can attract the majority of other "weak, desperate, disoriented, divided" MPs into their politics (Madelin, 1934).

This explains the different behavior that despotism had in ancient times compared to what it is nowadays. Today, who wants to reign and act despicably, it must first form and spread, in the majority of the people, an egotist, individualist, and apathetic

mentality, not to worry about nothing but his well-being and of his closest family and social nucleus and in principle not to be interested in the government of the State. To achieve this effect, the despot “does not break the will but weakens and kneels and directs it; it rarely promotes action, always opposes anyone who would like to react, does not destroy at all, but prevents birth; it does not tyrannize at all, but subdues, blocks, weakens, strain, disorients, and in the end makes it a nation that is nothing but a cluttered and exploited animal flock for which the government is the shepherd” (Tocqueville, 1936, 521).

Unfortunately, this mentality thrives and is almost spontaneously accepted in the masses, by nature it promotes selfishness and orientation of people to the fullest possible enjoyment of the material goods they possess. The most convenient times to form such a mentality are those that come immediately after a revolution. “There is no revolution that does not promise more than it really can hold, and it is rare that the most indispensable and glorious revolutions do not leave in the spirit of those who have run it and have benefited from it more anger than joy ... The generation that sees a great revolution is always troubled, unhappy and sad ...” (Tocqueville, 1936).

So it flows and quickly spreads to dissatisfaction and disinterest for political life and social problems. After every revolution, “a feeling of weakness, selfishness, and incomprehensibility often subordinates honest and timid spirits, and leads good citizens to shut themselves and to wait for their destiny ...”. One Typical and meaningful example was given to us by France at the end of the eighteenth century. “The revolution, advancing in its path, ended up destroying everything. She could not do anything. The mess and the weakness were everywhere. No one knew nor commanded nor obeyed, and it seemed as if the last social body breathing was gathering ... Napoleon appears at this supreme moment”.

So what we can define as despotic art is nothing more than knowing to accurately identify and use efficiently those kinds of manifestations of the people that might favor the establishment of dictatorship better. How unrivaled art, for example, Napoleon has revealed to the most demagogic creations of the revolution all that was a distinctive feature of despotism and he succeeded in acquiring it.” (Without having to change the mechanisms deeply, Napoleon managed to adapt to the necessity of an absolute government the enormous car that was conceived to be built for freedom. “How did this make it possible? Where the constitutional assembly had an electoral board, Napoleon replaced him with an agent, dependent and accountable to him, where the constitutional assembly had given power to the voters, he gave the president the right to elect, and finally, abolishing the administration of the control of citizens laid down his ministers and the minor agents (prefects) inviolable and untouchable by the ordinary courts (a brave rule which at any time has been attempted to be practiced by absolute monarchies, but that no despot had achieved to codify it, and that no people of the world had accepted it as a general principle”) (Tocqueville, 1936, 63).

The technique of despotism in this way is complicated but at the same time humanized, as long as it abandons physical violence and material constraints. The action of ancient tyrants was violent but limited: Machiavellism is the doctrine that taught the science of the limited use of violence by the State; the action of modern tyrants especially

in the democratic nations of our days “would have three other characteristics: there would be much greater scope but it would be sweeter and would achieve to degrade and humiliate people without being tortured “ (Tocqueville, 1936, 518).

To achieve better and more safely his purpose, despotism appears to the peoples “as the regulator of all evil; is the supporter of righteousness, the supporter of the oppressed, and the one who rules the rule. The peoples sleep in the midst of this momentous prosperity that it creates, and when they wake up feel miserable “It is a fact that always through the order and discipline that all peoples have come to tyranny; this is a fact. But according to Tocqueville, it does not come as we should despise public serenity, but only that we should not only be enjoyed by this. A nation that does not require anything other than government to keep public order is already a slave to the heart; is a slave to his well-being and the man who has to cling to it with chains may appear from moment to moment. Not worrying about anything other than public order means to “love” slavery, and “when a people absolutely desires to become a slave, you cannot stop it from happening” (Tocqueville, 1936, 51).

There is no more common, humiliated, and submissive people than a slave people. “The slave is a servant who does not discuss at all and submits to everything without protest. Sometimes he kills his master, but he never opposes that. Despotism ensures that order is true but corrupts souls by educating people with fear and cuddling with freedom.”Despotism corrupted more those who were subject to it than those who opposed it. In absolute monarchies the king often has high virtues but courtiers are always cowards” (Tocqueville, 1936, 156).

But tyranny is not always practiced by a single person, but also by a small number of people, but also by a group of people we define as a political party. “Political parties” despotism, highlights Tocqueville should not be taken less seriously than human beings. When the mass of citizens does not want to deal with anything other than private affairs, small party parties should not lose hope that they can become gentlemen of the state ... It is not a rare thing to look at the world scene as in our theaters, a large number of people represented by few people who speak on behalf of a nearly inexistent and disturbing crowd, they act only in the midst of universal instability, they possess almost all things, laws change and completely tyrannize customs, and it is a surprise how a great people can become the slave of a small number of weak and unworthy people”.

Often a political party exercises dictatorship in favor of the industry, when it is not the despotic lead industry that controls the economic life and political power of the state. Evil is completely modern and is a direct and immediate effect of the rationalization process of the industry. “To the extent that the principle of division of labor takes the fullest form from the point of view of implementation, the workshop becomes weaker, more limited and dependent ... thus illustrates Tocqueville this phenomenon. Intelligence in detail study, master of expands every day his vision into a wider community and his soul extends proportionately to the contraction of one’s soul. Soon the second will need only physical strength without the need for intelligence, need for science and genius to succeed. One is more and more like the administrator of a great kingdom, the other resembles a stable one” (Tocqueville, 1936).

Consequently it is very natural that the category of industrialists, satisfied with the

logic of facts, to be formed as an aristocracy or as a leading class and to use (or try to exploit) the privilege of power solely in their favor. "Friends of democracy should constantly keep their eyes on this side, if ever there was a permanent imbalance of conditions and a new tyranny to enter the world, we can anticipate that they will enter this gate." (Tocqueville, 1936, 262).

Industrial Class "keeps on its chest despotism, and despotism naturally increases in proportion to the development of the industrial class", so when it is organized in the party or buys or monopolizes the activity then we can see a priori the final outcome to which the common efforts converge on the political ground. As a result of this typical case, however, we can say that the dictatorship of a party in a democratic state is often created at a time of crisis when, by chance, it takes the rule of the state through the vote of the majority, or through aid, the political party immediately arrives to neutralize any opposition, and consolidates in its own hands an absolute rule system that instead of representing an exception becomes the rule. "Sometimes it happens to a people agitated by disagreements of opinions that by destroying the balance between the parties, one of them gains an irresistible advantage. It then ruptures all obstacles, defeats his opponent, and exploits society in his favor. The victors, excited for the moment by success, hide or silence. An immobilization and universal silence is created. The nation seems to be meeting in a single mind. The winning party stands up and says: I put the peace in place, now I deserve your gratitude"

And every time the scene is repeated, from time to time the people applaud and conform to the enthusiastic crowd" (Tocqueville, 1936, 361). This was written by Tocqueville more than a century ago and the experience of this century confirms it.

The dictatorship of a political party, or the tyranny exerted by it, is the most terrible thing that can happen to a democracy; is a deadly situation for the life of the State and for the tranquility and security of the citizens. "There is nothing more irresistible than a tyrannical power that commands in the name of people, because being clothed with the moral force that belongs to the will of the greatest number of people acts at the same time with the determination, insight and persistence that a single man possesses. And if this power is the result of a revolution that overthrew the moral and religious principles on which the entire social structure is based, then the political party turns into a bloody repression, can overthrow all its personal hatreds, can kill or imprison all his enemies, and at the same time, can justify and legitimize all this as an absolutely necessary action for the good of the community. "Since the common concepts of justice and morality can no longer explain and justify all the news that the revolution produces every day, then we are united with the principle of social utility, the dogma of political necessity is created, and we reach the point of sacrificing mercilessly special interests and crush individual rights, with the aim of achieving more quickly the main goal proposed to us " (Tocqueville, 1936, 535).

But there are many elements on the part of the citizens that facilitate the creation and enable the duration in the democracy of that peaceful, pacifist, absolute government that does not want to be called tyrannical, but is also humiliating, degrading and disheartening to the citizens. Tocqueville, as we have seen, it considers this form of government as a "modern" view of tyranny, a highly complex urbanized and refined despotism with its methods that hates violence and guarantees everyone peace that

does not affect but rather feeds them and saves them, but sows and kills them slowly, insignificantly and without anyone knowing their souls. It changes the form, but the content is always the same. Moral violence is not less oppressive than the physical one in its consequences. Man "who agrees to servile someone who is similar to him, who surrenders his will and puts his thoughts under someone else's rule" is thus placed below the animal's level; has voluntarily abandoned the reason, which is the only expression of his personality, namely his true freedom. In this way he does not deserve and cannot claim to live freely. It is the main cause, even indirectly, of tyranny; is the only cause of his duration. What drives the citizens almost suddenly into this immediate negation of humanity is, above all, as is already mentioned the love of material goods that fascinates and empowers the people before he has known and appreciated the value of freedom and have learned to use it in its true sense. "When taste of material goods, emphasizes Tocqueville, develops in democracy faster than habits and behaviors of freedom ... people being worried about anything else but to make fortune they cannot differentiate between the close relationship that unites the special fate of everyone with the prosperity of everyone "

Then they lose interest in politics, and "the exercise of political duties seems to them a kind of stumbling block to their crafts." Therefore, not worrying about anything other than for themselves and their economic situation, they want nothing but a strong government, and aspire to a dictatorial government. Again, this kind of man who has the passion for material goods quickly "finds that anxieties of freedom disturb his well-being before he finds out that it is precisely the freedom that serves to reach them ; and as they rest in the midst of the small pleasures of their private lives, they perceive the smallest noise of political unrest, wake up and worry, "and declare that they are willing to give up their freedom from fear of anarchy and love for public calm (Tocqueville, 1936, 229).

And the love for public tranquility, continues Tocqueville, is often the only political passion that keeps these peoples with degenerate democracies and it becomes more active and stronger at a time when passionate passions diminish and die.

This, of course, places the citizens in a position to pass their legitimate rights to man or party that is in government and they seem to be the only one who has the interest and the means to protect them from anarchy by defending themselves." And in this way to avoid a tyrant, throw with their hands the basics for a worst tyranny.

Yet this enemy is always on the alert, in the regime of democracy, and never the danger becomes so alive and quicker than when it is just emerging from a bloody revolution. "A nation is never more willing to increase central government duties (thus commences dictatorships) than when it has just emerged from a bloody and bloody revolution that, after having removed its material possessions from the hands of its holders previous, has overthrown any faith, and has filled the nation with rampant hatred, with opposite interests and opposing factions. The taste for public serenity then becomes a blind passion, and citizens are then lured by the disorderly love for the rule".

The man of the mass fears privilege, hates, and hates and envied his likes who can become privileged carriers. It is "immortal hatred that never fails, which sparks the democratic peoples against any kind of privilege, which favors in particular the

gradual concentration of all political rights in the hands of a single State representative. The Sovereign, the President of the State, being indisputable over all the citizens, does not promote the envy of anyone, and everyone believes that he can put aside all the privileges that he expects of equal ones" (Tocqueville, 1936, 483).

Conclusions

A modern, sneaky, refined despot, who wants more to be than to look tyrannical, finds, in consequence, a democratic taste for equality, and the envy that puts the citizens of his State one against another and makes it possible for them to be shut down and imprisoned in the sphere of private egoisms and special interests, wonderful allies. Intelligent tyrant develops these jars with patience with patience and method. The ignorant, uneducated people, enlightened slave, whom Tocqueville sets out as a secret and rebellious instinct, "removes skilled and intelligent persons from the direction of affairs" and believes that by acting in this way, freedom can be developed. Pleasured that he has managed to break his hatred; is delighted to have "eliminated" the best people who were distracted in their prospect of equality or enjoyed blaming their merits with slander and gossip, and do not know the wicked that they have done nothing but have added another chain link in the chain that will lock the hook sooner or later. On the other hand, a strong and powerful instinct also makes wise men stand out from the masses and stay away from political careers because they know that "it would not be possible for them to progress in politics without humiliation and humble its personality."

References

- Bire, E. (1936). "L'ascension de Bonoparte". Paris.
Madelin, L. (1934). La contre-revolution. Paris.
Tocqueville, A. (1936). "De la democratie en Amerique". Paris.