

NESTAN LOMAIA

Doctor of Philosophy, Professor of Sukhumi State University (Georgia)

PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS OF AUTHORITARIANISM

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52340/isj.2024.28.02>

The system of governance of social processes plays an important role in the formation of the social structure and is one of its components. The problem of the influence of the governance system on the change of social institutions and structures is especially relevant during the period of social transformations. The systems approach assumes that the social structures of society generate a certain nature of governance, and it, in turn, affects the course of social processes and the formation of new institutions. The social structure is not static, it has its own dynamics, and the vector of its development largely depends on the system of governance and power, which can take various forms, where tendencies towards the emergence of autocratic structures for managing social processes are often manifested.

Basically, authoritarianism (from the Latin *auctor* - initiator, founder, creator, maker and *auctoritas* - judgment, opinion, view, decision, power, law) - is presented as a characteristic and type of management structure in a social system. Interest in authoritarianism as the most important category of social sciences has especially increased in recent years. The range of varieties of authoritarianism in the modern world is very wide: one-party and multi-party regimes, constitutional monarchies, etc. Such a variety of forms of manifestation of authoritarianism in the structure of management of social processes, most likely, indicates that they are of a transitional nature. Historical experience shows that authoritarianism arises, as a rule, in countries where there is a change in the social system, accompanied by a sharp polarization of political forces; in countries where there are long-term economic and political

crises, overcoming which by democratic means becomes impossible. It seems relevant not only to identify the main aspects of the phenomenon of authoritarianism, but also to consider the consequences of the influence of one or another variant of its development on the social structure of society.

Authoritarianism in the conditions of socio-economic and political crisis at a certain historical stage, as the experience of many countries shows, can ensure a certain growth of economic development, the formation of political stability in society, the formation of social structures and strata with a new worldview. In these conditions, the authorities manage to organize anti-government and opposition protests, resolve ethnic and religious conflicts, pursue a fairly moderate social policy, regulate market relations, while maintaining the multi-structure of the economy and promoting its development. This creates favorable conditions for the formation of effective social structures, the transition from authoritarian regimes to civil society and the rule of law through the democratization of socio-political life.

Due to the fact that in the development of the world community there is a constant evolution of political forms, in many countries mixed and hybrid systems of governance arise, which can be considered within the framework of authoritarianism and its influence on the formation of social institutions and structures. This is currently a complex, multifaceted and not fully explored problem of sociology.

Peculiarities of the principle of separation of powers, distribution and redistribution of national income, economic and political instability, criminalization of society, corruption,

strengthening of nationalistic tendencies - all this required in the conditions of development of the socio-political situation in the countries of a sufficiently strong presidential power with rather strict methods of governing society, without which it is probably impossible to achieve economic and political stability of the social structure.

Thus, we consider it necessary to consider authoritarianism as a specific form of governing society, which in the process of democratic transformations and reforms would provide for a strong power with elements of political pluralism and democracy.

Social and structural processes of the last decade of the past century, which occurred in the countries of Eastern Europe, associated with changes in the existing system in them, attracted the attention of scientists working in different fields of knowledge. As the field of conducted research expanded, the methods of sociological science began to be used more and more actively.

Sociology, like political science, actively joined the study of political processes and phenomena, using its methods and its approach to the phenomena studied. The task of sociology is not only to study the social structure and subsystems of management, but also to comparatively analyze the processes of their influence on social development. One of the common methods of analysis is typology. This approach allows to create an analytical basis for comparative study of various communities and their social institutions. Typology can be considered as a conscious simplification of socio-political reality, which allows to systematize and most significantly combine the obtained knowledge about the social structure of society.

Considering authoritarianism as part of the social structure of society, it can be noted that the first analysis of the problem of socio-political structure was undertaken by Aristotle and Plato. Aristotle (IV century BC) gives two criteria by which it is possible to classify political structures of governance: 1) by who

holds the power; 2) by how this power is used. He identifies the «correct forms» of the state: monarchy, aristocracy, polity; «incorrect forms» - tyranny, oligarchy and democracy.

Modern development of the problem of the functioning of political subsystems in the structure of society is associated with the names of G. Almond, R. Aron, K. Deutsch, M. Duverger, D. Easton, T. Parsons, D. Powell and others. A feature of their approach is the study of society from the point of view of system analysis and the identification of certain variables underlying the classification. In the work of one of the leading representatives of the Frankfurt school of sociology T. Adorno «Authoritarian Personality» (1950), the concept of authoritarianism in the social structure of relations is revealed with the help of a socio-psychological analysis of the corresponding type of personality. According to T. Adorno, every personality is authoritarian: authoritarianism is expressed not only under certain established social conditions; it is a line of behavior conditioned by a constant characteristic of the personality. In the 20th century, through the efforts of such scientists as K. Friedrich, Z. Brzezinski, H. Arendt, R. Tucker, I. Ilyin, K. Gadzhiev and others, an analytical concept of totalitarianism and its role in the structure of society's governance appeared. Research in this direction was continued by M. Djilas, M. Voslensky, A. Golovatenko and others. Later, along with totalitarian regimes, post-totalitarian regimes of governance began to be distinguished (for example, in the territory of the former USSR). A great contribution to the development of these problems was made by R. Bart, R. Dahl, R. Pantham, G. Golosov, D. Dolenko, V. Zamkovoy, Yu. Shevchenko and others. In the 50-60s of the 20th century, numerous «hybrid countries» appeared, in which it was difficult to clearly define the system of governance. Researchers noted that the dichotomy «totalitarianism - democracy» does not fully reflect the essence of governance in the social structure of society. At the suggestion of the

American sociologist and political scientist H. Linz, all closed, non-democratic regimes began to be divided into two main types: totalitarian and authoritarian. The issues of typology of authoritarian structures and definition of their main features were analyzed in the works of E. Vyatra, E. Shils, C. Endrain, I. Ilyin, V. Ilyin, Yu. Sumbatyan and others.

In general, in modern sociology it is recognized that the category of «authoritarianism» has an important theoretical significance in the analysis of social structures and management of modern communities.

Like authoritarian, democratic management structures differ significantly from each other in many parameters. However, the concept of «democracy» is very difficult to interpret unambiguously. This problem attracted the attention of both ancient representatives of science (Plato, Aristotle, Cicero), and our contemporaries: G. Weinstein, R. Dahl, J. Schumpeter, C. Endrain, G. Golosov, V. Sergeev and others. An attempt to find an optimal model of modern democracy was undertaken, for example, by A. Lijphart.

For modern researchers, the issues of transitional social structures are quite significant. The problems of transitional societies were studied by such scientists as L. Bollen, T. Vanhanen, R. Jackman, S. Lipset, M. Olsen, F. Fukuyama, S. Huntington and others. They are characterized by the identification of socio-economic, political and cultural prerequisites for the transition to democracy. Among domestic researchers, we can name A. Achkasov, A. Smorgunov, A. Sukharev, A. Tsygankov, O. Shkaratan and others. A comparative analysis of theoretical constructs of the socio-political structure allows us to record the expansion of the problematic field of research due to the inclusion of various aspects of the manifestation of this phenomenon. The study of authoritarianism in different historical eras was characterized by several trends that determined its perception within the framework of socio-philosophical and political science discourse. The first is

the perception of authoritarianism as, first of all, a type of political power; the second is its analysis as a form of power that is temporary during the period of transition of the state from totalitarianism to democracy. However, the political realities of the modern global world convincingly demonstrate that authoritarianism can exist as an independent form of power, without being opposed to democracy and even using some of its features and practices. Such a perception of authoritarianism is possible and productive within the framework of its study, provided that it is analyzed not only as a political, but also as a socio-cultural phenomenon. Culture is considered as one of the factors determining the formation and development of authoritarianism; in this case, it is understood as a specific form of organization of human and social life, which has a decisive influence on the nature of spiritual and moral values, the system of social rules and norms affecting the peculiarities of relations between the individual, society and the state. Taking into account the cultural factor allows not only to conceptualize a new dimension in the study of authoritarianism, but also to consider the predisposition of democratic states to its manifestations. Authoritarianism is traditionally considered within the framework of the conceptual triad «totalitarianism-authoritarianism-democracy», or, going beyond it, researchers most often turn to the dichotomy «authoritarian-democratic». This is justified by the fact that in the conditions of the modern global world, the genesis of classical totalitarianism of the twentieth century is practically impossible. But this overly simple scheme has one significant flaw: given the complexity of the processes occurring in the world, it seems difficult to single out a «pure» form of democracy or authoritarianism. In addition, modern forms of authoritarianism often do not imply strict total control over the existence of society. The opinion of K. Clement is fair, according to which «the social reality of modern authoritarianism is characterized by the fact that specific forms of order, stability,

the presence of rules, the restoration of national sovereignty, a strong government are few and rarely infringe on political freedoms and the rights of ordinary people.» The European researcher is echoed by V. Ya. Gelman, who argues that «... authoritarian regimes do not always resort to mass repression, while using some institutions inherent in democracies for their own purposes.» The above points of view demonstrate that modern authoritarianism is not always based exclusively on coercive practices, but can also attract supporters due to a developed economy and a high level of scientific and technological development, an example of which is modern China. The actualization of authoritarianism in modern political discourse, among other things, is associated with some crisis aspects in the development of European or American democracies, the consequence of which is a global authoritarian rollback as a phenomenon denoting the decline and collapse of democracies around the world. Even if we agree with the overly categorical formulation of the author, it can be noted that the actualization of authoritarianism is a logical stage in the evolution of the world political system, associated with a gradual departure from totalitarianism; also, with such initial conditions, authoritarianism acts as a kind of guarantor of the impossibility of reproducing totalitarianism in the modern world. In favor of this statement, we can cite the point of view of S. Ringen, according to whom democracies and autocratic states are often not a model of effective governance, but contribute to the containment of totalitarian intentions. According to the author, this is achieved through the «restrained use of power», which S. Ringen interprets as achieving obedience as recognition of the legitimacy of a particular subject of power or political system. Although, of course, individual elements of total control over society are possible in the context of the need to confront existential threats, for example, the recent covid pandemic.

Authoritarianism can be defined as a socio-cultural and political phenomenon, conditioned

by the ontological situation and including political practices and the mechanism of the world's assumption by the ruling subject, allowing authoritarianism to be included in both democratic forms of government and independent existence. In the conditions of both normal development of the state and in the situation of an existential challenge, authoritarianism is capable of acting not as an intermediate, but as a middle form of political power between totalitarianism and democracy. The middle nature of authoritarianism is analyzed in more detail by E.A. Lazarev, using the concept of authoritarian equilibrium. With this concept, the author describes a situation in which democratic institutions are subject to authoritarian adaptation, meaning their transformation taking into account the peculiarities of the cultural, economic and political conditions of the existence of authoritarianism. The middle nature of authoritarianism as a form of political power is considered in more detail by F.S. Antonov. Within the framework of his theory of parademocratic authoritarianism, he believes that it is possible to use individual elements of democracy as a superstructure to an authoritarian governing basis. But, speaking about the middle nature of authoritarianism, it is also important to note the predisposition of democracies to its manifestations. A number of theories of both domestic and Western researchers are devoted to this aspect of the problem. An example of the former is the study by E.A. Lukyanova and I.G. Shablinsky, according to which modern authoritarian regimes massively mimic democracy by imitating democratic institutions and procedures. For an example of the latter, one can turn to the theories of illiberal democracy by F. Zakaria and liberal fascism by J. Goldberg. Despite some conceptual differences, the key idea of both concepts is as follows: Western democracies are largely predisposed to manifestations of authoritarianism, which is due not only to political and institutional, but also to socio-cultural factors. All of the above creates the prerequisites for the formation of

a conceptual block called the «philosophy of authoritarianism», understood as an applied form of research into authoritarianism not only as a type of political power, but also as a cultural phenomenon, the value-normative and ideological dominants of which determine the forms and methods of manifestation of the practices of the ruling subject. The analysis of culture allows us to identify the essential, existential grounds for the existence of authoritarianism. «The philosophy of authoritarianism» includes several theoretical sections. The first of them - «post-totalitarian» is expressed in the understanding of the formation of modern modifications of authoritarianism as a reaction to the disappearance of totalitarianism in modern political discourse. Authoritarianism in this case is perceived primarily as a restraining factor, due to which the reproduction of a totalitarian project in modern conditions is practically impossible, or only partially possible. The next section of the philosophy of authoritarianism – the “crisis” section – includes theories according to which authoritarianism is constituted as a phenomenon, the condition for the development of which is the crisis of democracy not only as a form of government, but also as a political concept (idea). It is in the situation of a crisis of democratic government that its predisposition to manifestations of authoritarianism is most clearly manifested. A. Magun pays much attention to the analysis of this aspect of the problem, using the concept of the predeterminedness of authoritarianism. Revealing its meaning, the author not only speaks of a predisposition to ..., but also of the existence in a democratic society of an existential demand for the introduction, use and - possibly - subsequent preservation of authoritarian practices of control and management. Within the framework of the “crisis” block, it is also necessary to mention E. Vyatra, who claimed that the new authoritarianism as a phenomenon of the 21st century is formed and supported due to those processes that destructively affect liberal democracy and are the cause of

its crisis. The author is right that the crisis of democracy contributes to the strengthening of authoritarianism. But, along with what J. Vyatr says, authoritarianism is also formed as a result of the normal development of the political system. This aspect of the problem is reflected in the theory of A. V. Zberovsky, who allows for the possibility of democracy developing towards tyranny and authoritarianism, respectively, highlighting, in particular, such a variety as democracy-dictatorship.

Another section of the philosophy of authoritarianism is the «pandemic» section, which defines the global pandemic of covid-19 as a factor in the evolution and transformation of modern modifications of authoritarianism. Within this block, covid-19 is considered by many researchers to be an existential threat, the overcoming of which can change the very essential foundations of the existence of authoritarianism. The condition for their cancellation is the restoration - in the terminology of J. Agabman - of the «state of normality», the right to determine which - as well as the introduction of a state of emergency - is reserved for the ruling subject. Within the framework of the theory of «anthropocentric authoritarianism» created by D. Chandler, he argues that «liberal freedoms in the current situation threaten the whole society, and therefore the state has to introduce emergency measures and powers everywhere, strengthening authoritarianism.» In this regard, the position of A.N. deserves attention. Kuryukina, who believes that the key problem is that COVID-19 can turn a democratic recession into a depression, which threatens to turn political systems towards authoritarianism. In general, within the framework of the pandemic block of studies of authoritarianism, it can be concluded that the global pandemic of covid 19 will either lead to an increase in the efficiency of modern autocracies, or will entail their deformation and destruction as a result of the inability to cope with the global existential challenge. On the other hand, the global pandemic has demonstrated the predisposition of many

democratic ruling entities to manifestations of both «soft» and «hard» forms of authoritarianism. In general, it can be stated that the intermediate result of the evolution of authoritarianism was its development towards a permanent, rather than temporary form of existence of political power. The analysis of this form, in addition to traditional political, economic and institutional

aspects, should also include the cultural factor. It is the understanding of the socio-cultural foundations of authoritarianism that contributes to the understanding of its existential essence as a type of political power capable of stable reproduction in the conditions of the modern global world.

References:

- [1]. Agamben J. *Homo Sacer. Sovereign Power and Naked Life*. Moscow: Europe, 2011.
- [2]. Antonov F. S. Institutional Reproduction of Parademocratic Authoritarianism: Causes and Consequences // *Economic and Social-Humanitarian Studies* No. 2 (18) 2018.
- [3]. Belov M. Return the State // *Sociological Review*. 2021. No. 1. pp. 302-318.
- Vyatr Y. I. New Authoritarianism: Crisis or the End of Liberal Democracy // *Bulletin of the Moscow University. Series 12. Political Sciences*. 2019. No. 1.
- [4]. Gelman V. *Authoritarian Russia. Escape from Freedom, or Why Democracy Doesn't Take Root Here*. Moscow: Howard Roark, 2021.
- [5]. Goldberg J. *Liberal Fascism. History of the Left from Mussolini to Obama*. Moscow: Reed Group, 2012.
- [6]. Zberovsky, A.V. The Phenomenon of Inverted Social Crises in Ancient and Modern Democracies / A.V. Zberovsky // *Bulletin of KRASGAU*. - 2008. No. 4.
- [7]. Clement K. What's Wrong with Authoritarianism? // *Emergency Reserve*. 2018. No. 121.
- [8]. Kuryukin A.V. *Covid-19 as a Challenge to the Economy, Society, and Politics*. M.: MIR 2020
- Lazarev E. A. Political corruption: explaining the nature of post-Soviet transformations // *Polis*. 2010. No. 2.
- [9]. Lukyanova, E. A., Shablinsky, I. G. *Authoritarianism and democracy* / E. A. Lukyanova, I. G. Shablinsky. - M.: Mysl, 2018.
- [10]. Ringen S. *The people of devils. Democratic leaders and the problems of obedience*. M.: Delo, 2016.
- [11]. Chandler D. Biopolitics and the rise of «anthropocentric authoritarianism» // *Russia in global politics*. 2020 No. 3 May / June. URL: https://globalaffairs.ru/articles/biopolitika-avtoritarizma/#_ftn20. Access date: 06/10/2020.
- [12]. Bermeo N. On democratic Backsliding // *Journal of Democracy* / 2016 vol.27 #1 http://1.cuni.cz/pluginfile.php/1207371/mod_resource/content/1/Bermeo_2016_Democratic-backsliding.pdf
- [13]. Zakaria F. *The Rise of Illiberal Democracy*. *Foreign Affairs*, 1997. Vol. 76.No. 6 (November/December).

НЕСТАН ЛОМАИЯ

Доктор философских наук, профессор Сухумского государственного университета
(Грузия)

ФИЛОСОФСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ АВТОРИТАРИЗМА

Резюме

Система управления социальными процессами играет важную роль в формировании социальной структуры и является одним из ее компонентов. Проблема влияния системы управления на изменение социальных институтов и структур особенно актуальна в период социальных трансформаций. Системный подход предполагает, что социальные структуры общества порождают определенный характер управления, а он, в свою очередь, влияет на ход социальных процессов и формирование новых институтов. Социальная структура не статична, она имеет свою динамику, и вектор ее развития во многом зависит от системы управления и власти, которая может принимать различные формы, где часто проявляются тенденции к возникновению автократических структур управления социальными процессами.

В основном авторитаризм (от лат. *auctor* — инициатор, основатель, создатель, творец и *auctoritas* — суждение, мнение, взгляд, решение, власть, закон) — представлен как характеристика и тип структуры управления в социальной системе. Интерес к авторитаризму как важнейшей категории общественных наук особенно возрос в последние годы. Спектр разновидностей авторитаризма в современном мире весьма широк: однопартийные и многопартийные режимы, конституционные монархии и т. д. Такое многообразие форм проявления авторитаризма в структуре управления социальными процессами, скорее всего, свидетельствует о том, что они носят переходный характер. Исторический опыт показывает, что авторитаризм возникает, как правило, в странах, где происходит смена общественного строя, сопровождающаяся резкой поляризацией политических сил; в странах, где наблюдаются длительные экономические и политические кризисы, преодоление которых демократическим путем становится невозможным. Представляется актуальным не только выделить основные аспекты феномена авторитаризма, но и рассмотреть последствия влияния того или иного варианта его развития на социальную структуру общества.

Авторитаризм в условиях социально-экономического и политического кризиса на определенном историческом этапе, как показывает опыт многих стран, может обеспечить определенный рост экономического развития, формирование политической стабильности в обществе, формирование социальных структур и слоев с новым мировоззрением. В этих условиях власти удается организовывать антиправительственные и оппозиционные протесты, разрешать этнические и религиозные конфликты, проводить достаточно умеренную социальную политику, регулировать рыночные отношения, сохраняя при этом многоукладность экономики и способствуя ее развитию. Это создает благоприятные условия для формирования эффективных социальных структур, перехода от авторитарных режимов к гражданскому обществу и правовому государству через демократизацию общественно-политической жизни.

В связи с тем, что в развитии мирового сообщества происходит постоянная эволюция политических форм, во многих странах возникают смешанные и гибридные системы управления, которые можно рассматривать в рамках авторитаризма и его влияния на формирование социальных институтов и структур. Это в настоящее время сложная, многогранная и не до конца изученная проблема социологии.

Особенности принципа разделения властей, распределения и перераспределения национального дохода, экономическая и политическая нестабильность, криминализация общества, коррупция, усиление националистических тенденций — все это потребовало в условиях развития общественно-политической ситуации в странах достаточно сильной президентской власти с достаточно жесткими методами управления обществом, без чего, вероятно, невозможно добиться экономической и политической стабильности социальной структуры.