

METHODOLOGICAL SCHOOLS: POLITICAL SYSTEMS

Stefano Viimsi

Researcher

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6850276>

Published Date: 17-July-2022

INTRODUCTION

- Lack of knowledge and information.
- The existence of a stable mechanism that governs behavior without the intervention of other factors of rationality.
- A poorly rational citizen.
- A defense of the vote not as a control mechanism, but as a mechanism for the expression of primary identities.
- The political world is hardly given importance, as the citizen is immune to it due to lack of information and capacity.

In the last two models (issues and rational-spatial) a more positive view prevails because:

- The citizen is given the ability to have basic information on those matters that really affect and concern him.
- Not so much importance is given to the elements that give stability to the behavior.
- A greater degree of rationality is granted to the citizen.
- A citizenship is conceived that exercises a greater control of the political power without fear to the stability and the supposed ignorance of the citizen.
- The political world is given a prominent role: political parties, leaders, actors, their speech, the format of the competition, etc.

Therefore, when talking about citizenship and voting, it is very important to distinguish the importance given to the stable and unstable elements of voting.

But it is still much more relevant to know how the stable elements have been formed. The presence of stable elements is not something desirable but something rational (it helps to reduce political information and the cost of obtaining it and making a decision). That is why it is normal for citizens to tend to form stable elements. The question is how they formed them. Two approaches predominate:

- From bottom to top. Traditional conception.
- From top to bottom. Much more rationalist conception and in line with the positive vision of the citizen.

In Europe there are some stable elements of the vote. This is not desirable, but it is logical. The important thing is how it was formed. Central idea: It has formed from top to bottom.

From the Second World War onwards, there was a turn in the theory of democracy. Sartori says that misconceptions about democracies cause democracies to fail. These ideas are developed + in Schumpeter, this one talks about democracy as a competition, democracy is just a procedure that coincides in the way of selecting the representatives from a set of candidates.

Control over representatives among a set of candidates. Control over the representatives is not everyday, it is only given in the substitution in the elections: change of elite. Two elements: voting and competition. Dahl and his polyarchies because democracy is a very strong administrative term.

Another conception is the difference between regime and state. With the change of regime, the structures of access to power, its maintenance and its use change, the change of state means more apolitical changes.

Another definition of democracy is: political regime characterized by uncertainty, where no one's interests are guaranteed. Democracies are characterized because they are sets of institutions that limit uncertainties, guarantee a number of rights.

Friedrich talks about the law of anticipated reactions, anticipating the interests of citizens and acting.

Traditions of current democracy: • theory of democracy in Greece

- The MS, the borders of the polis are opened. The prince has power and legitimacy. There is no concept of re-election. Hobbes
- Principle of the majority, the search for consensus was the foundation of democracies. The elected was the representative of the majority and the minority. Locke
- Idea of the individual in front of the community: people were fully so when they lived within the polis. Strong theory of political participation. The contribution of the Church in the Renaissance is that of natural law. Kant
- Liberal constitutionalism, the goal of how to impose limits on state abuses. Montesquieu, Tocqueville, the Federalists and Stuart Mill. Constitution protected by judges, was introduced as an anti-democratic mechanism. Democracy precedes liberalism, but modernism is later
- Political parties, are seen in negative terms, because they are seen as a faction. Burke elaborates a theory of parties as a fundamental mechanism of representative democracy. Democracy becomes related to diversity
- Competitive theory of democracy: the people are the holder of power, the exercise corresponds to the representatives.

NON-DEMOCRATIC REGIMES

DICTATORSHIP: It represents 3 things: non-democratic government, unconstitutional government and non-consensual government. The analysis of totalitarianism is more frequent than that of dictatorships. The dictatorship was not negative in its origins (that of Rome). There are several types of dictatorship: commissioner, commission for a short period of time. Sovereign, discretionary power, does not answer to anyone.

DESPTISM: Before in civilizations that were outside the West. But he is recognized by Montesquieu in political regimes. Tb. Enlightened despotism is a particular form of non-tyrannical government, without negative connotations. These arise with the RF.

ABSOLUTISM: The exercise of power without limits, the equivalent of what dictatorships are in the republic.

DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT: Marx. Something transitory that arises after the revolution.

At first it was in case of emergency it appears in the Weimar Constitution and in the government of emergency concentration in the IIGM in GB. There are personalized and collegiate dictatorships.

TOTALITY REGIMES:

- There is no social or political or economic pluralism.
- Official ideology that permeates the various spheres of society.
- Mobilization linked to the state through which a total expansion of society is sought. Membership is mandatory.
- Leadership is personal and unlimited.

AUTHORITY REGIMES:

- Socio-economic pluralism and non-existence of political pluralism, there is no opposition which does not mean that there is no pluralism within power.

- There is no elaborate ideology.
- Political monopoly and seeks to demobilize society.
- There are no definite limits on the use of power, but the limits are predictable.

POST-TOTAL REGIMES:

- A certain pluralism centered on the economy. There is no political pluralism, but a margin for non-political organizations. No competition for political power.
- Mobilizations are routine and occasional.
- Leadership limited by autonomous power and technocracy. Fight between party and state.

SULTANIST REGIMES:

- Socio-economic pluralism and a despotic political interventionism.
- There was no rule of law there was no principle of legality, the public sphere merges with the private.
- Strictly personal power, is based on the glorification of the leader.
- There is no ideology
- Mobilization of para-state groups.
- The principles of succession have dynastic tendencies, it is intended that his successor be within the family.

THE HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF DICTATORSHIP AND DEMOCRACY BARRINGTON MOORE:

- Capitalist industrialization with a democratic political regime: its analysis focuses on what happens to agriculture and the peasantry and the time when the turn is made to industrial agriculture. The path of democracy and capitalism begins with the bourgeois revolution, the AR ends through the exercise of violence. He says that without bourgeois there is no democracy. It goes from feudalism to a landed aristocracy that goes to a commercial agriculture, due to the need to obtain + resources to finance its activities in the cities and to pay its taxes to the absolutist power. The turn generated a > community of interests in the cities and a lesser dependence on real power and expelled the large peasant masses from the lands. This gives rise to a pluralism of power between landowners and monarchy. Existence of violence as a precedent for democracies. It is directed against absolutism and against anti-democratic landowners. Right to vote, etc.
- Capitalist industrialization by revolution from above: combination that happens when there is already capitalist development in agriculture. Weak labor movement this class surrenders to the landowning aristocracy and the royal bureaucracy. The reaction consists in the authoritarian political establishment to extract, the surplus to the peasants, superiority of the class that later becomes racial. Militaristic ethics and total obedience to authority and discipline. This modality has 2 forms: new forms of submission or q agriculture remains intact. Fascism feeds on this background and tries to transform them into a populist movement, coincides with the end of the IGM. Fascism gains support in the lower middle classes, moments of political instability. Values of hierarchy, discipline and obedience. Strong militaristic policies in order to mobilize society on the basis of external conflicts. Economic and social organization and pluralism with estate framing formulas.
- Industrialization with a communist regime: analyzes the theory that explains the peasant revolutions in a period of economic collapse of agriculture x industrialization. Also the theory of landowner absenteeism, this theory can not explain the Russian revolution or the democracy of FR and GB. He studies the theory of peasants working on large estates, but this does not exist in China. Conditions: central bureaucracy that leads to the maintenance of the peasant class, the existence of weak ties between the peasants and the landowners, that the peasant maintains autonomous ties of solidarity. The development of capitalist trade weakens peasant society, for isolated peasant movements it is easier to destroy than to build.

Reviews Barrington Moore:

- Attempt to generalize based on dubious comparisons.
- The role of the bourgeoisie is an easy generalization.

- Uses vaporous concepts
- Excessive materialistic emphasis.
- Role of violence.
- It neglects democracies in Europe.
- Temporary and gigantic gaps.

It is studied whether their theses, the role of landowners and the forms of agricultural exploitation are true.

The crisis of democracy occurs when:

- Economic crisis.
- Radical social militancy

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Dow, S. C. (1990). Post-Keynesianism as political economy: a methodological discussion. *Review of Political Economy*, 2(3), 345-358.
- [2] Kalleberg, A. L. (1966). The logic of comparison: a methodological note on the comparative study of political systems. *World Politics*, 19(1), 69-82.
- [3] Khristenko, V. B., Reus, A. G., & Zinchenko, A. P. (2014). *Methodological School of Management*. A&C Black.
- [4] Shionoya, Y. (2006). *The soul of the German historical school: Methodological essays on Schmoller, Weber and Schumpeter* (Vol. 2). Springer Science & Business Media.
- [5] Troitiño, D. R. (2004). *La visión de la prensa semanal española de la Comunidad europea desde la muerte de Franco hasta el gobierno de Felipe González* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidad de Salamanca, Departamento de Historia Contemporánea).
- [6] Troitino, D. R. (2017). The European Union: The building of a nation. *MEST Journal*, 5, 119-134.
- [7] Troitiño, D. R. (2021). La comisión para el estudio de la Unión Europea. El sueño europeo del periodo de entreguerras. *Historia Actual Online*, (54), 17-34.
- [8] Troitiño, D. R. (2021). Winston Churchill y el proceso de construcción europea. *Revista Notas Históricas y Geográficas*.