

Chapter 1 : Democracy Vs. Dictatorship: Political Opposites

Robert Amerson (SAIS Bologna '61), a retired Foreign Service Officer and former professor at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, tells us in his book, How Democracy Triumphed over Dictatorship. The book covers the years when the author served as press officer at the American Embassy in Caracas, Venezuela.

Political Opposites May 29, by jessicaheichel When comparing political philosophies, two types of government which are often at odds with one another are democracy and dictatorship. Why would these two terms come up together so often? It is probably because one could argue that they are exact opposites of one another. Where a democracy is based upon allowing the people to govern the land via majority rules voting, a dictatorship takes any and all influence away of the general population, and instead places it all in the hands of a single, absolute ruler. When researching any type of government, or political philosophy, it is important to remember that the way these ideals read on paper is sometimes different than the way they ultimately play out in practice – sometimes considerably so. People are living, thinking beings with needs, wants, tendencies and feelings. Therefore, it is somewhat expected that they will behave in ways the philosophers and law makers did not anticipate. How the government reacts to these unexpected changes, and whether or not they bend to the will of the people has a lot to do with those in power at the time. Regardless, there are recognizable core values and beliefs at play in both a democracy and a dictatorship. Even though they may not exactly align with their written origins, there are still plenty of differences to explore between the two. Are you looking to be a leader? Learn how to lead and manage in not only governments, but in business and other organizations. What Is a Democracy? Ideally, the power in a democratic government comes from the people. Elections are held wherein citizens of a given location be it country, state, province, town, city, etc. Therefore, the main principle behind democracy is that of representation. Even though the people themselves are not able to create and enforce laws, there is an expectation that the elected representatives will act on their behalf. Naturally, this means there are necessarily people who are under represented in their district, assuming their preferred candidate was not elected. This can lead to a bit of a backlash, and if there is enough of a groundswell of support for a new candidate, the current official may not win re-election. Of course, there are also cases where the elected official fails to come through on their promises to the people who voted for them, making it unlikely, or at least less likely that they will win re-election either. What Are the Benefits of a Democracy? Democracy is sometimes said to be the best form of government. Namely because it derives its power from all of the people, and not just a small group. This is also part of the reason democracy is thought to be a safeguard against a revolution. Considering the people in charge were put there by the people themselves, there is less of a need to overthrow the government violently. Instead, the people can simply elect someone else if they feel they are being under served. Freedom is also a huge aspect of democracy. Freedom of thought, worship, speech and action assuming it is peaceful and within the limits of established laws are often the backbone on which the rest of the government is built. These freedoms enable individuals to grow and pursue their personal dreams and goals. Democracies foster growth in the arts, sciences, literature, invention, and innovations of every kind. When the people are free to work as they see fit, they will have more opportunity to make overall improvements to all of society. What Are the Drawbacks of a Democracy? Many would argue that the very thing that gives a democracy its greatest strength, might also become its biggest weakness: An often cited fear is that if the population is ignorant of certain issues, or just generally not well educated, they may make errors when casting votes. If they do not fully understand the implications of their votes, it could allow for an unscrupulous person to gain power, and thus, begin to reverse some of the inherent freedoms in a democracy. Democracy is also remarkably inefficient and slow. When it comes to change, there must be votes on the matter, and the voting process can take quite some time. First, there is campaigning to consider, and public awareness initiatives to help keep voters apprised of the situation. Otherwise, there is a bill drafted and revised as many times as necessary. This may lead to other forms of government appearing to be more progressive, and more eager to embrace new things. What is a Dictatorship? A dictatorship is a form of government where the majority, if not all of the power is granted to one individual. The people being

governed have no say in the way they are governed, and are unable to make any changes to the political system. Whereas democracy thrives on freedom, a dictatorship thrives on oppression. There are no competitive elections held, so therefore no chance of unseating the dictator. There are often human rights issues involved with dictatorships, making them considerably more difficult to live in than a democracy. What are the Benefits of a Dictatorship? As referenced earlier, elections are imperfect things. While the majority of a population is represented, there is always going to be a portion of the population that is not. Society is a large and unwieldy thing, and some would argue that trying to apply something as potentially volatile as elections to it is a recipe for disaster. Instead, by giving all of the power to one person, the government can move quickly, and more like a machine. A dictator is a leader who possesses exceptional talent in the fields of organization, and administration, and is also able to act decisively and without fear of dissenting opinions. If a country were to find itself in a situation which required a quick but firm decision in order to keep its people safe, a dictator is able to act in that manner. A dictator has little else to do but concentrate completely and utterly on the betterment and advancement of their own country, and can often achieve great success in this way. What are the Drawbacks of a Dictatorship? All this decisive action without fear of retribution can and does lead to ruthlessness. Since there are no laws voted on by the people, all law making, and law enforcement must often become brutal and violent. Dissenters to the dictator are considered direct threats, and so dictators often make use of dubious prison sentences, intimidation and ultimately execution in order to prove their power over potential upstarts. Censorship, propaganda and media blackouts are often cited as problematic issues in dictatorships, because it is important that the people living under the government not get too many ideas from sources that contradict their leader. There is no freedom in a dictatorship, and that extends all the way down to basic freedoms like thought and speech. People can and do get into trouble for speaking out against the government. It goes without saying that there is no allowance for political diversity, and often no allowance for individual expression or creativity. This can lead to extremely unhappy people, and often, violent revolutions.

Chapter 2 : Dictatorship - Wikipedia

*How Democracy Triumphed Over Dictatorship: Public Diplomacy in Venezuela [Robert Amerson] on www.nxgvision.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. Amerson uses his analysis of developments in Venezuela to develop and bolster his case for America's use of public diplomacy in the encouragement and nurturing of democracy.*

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Public Diplomacy in Venezuela. The American University Press, The book covers the years 1959 when the author served as press officer at the American Embassy in Caracas, Venezuela. Amerson writes about the whisperings of secret police activity, including torture and imprisonment of political opponents, which made knowledgeable Embassy officials nervous. Could such a charming man lead an organization with such an unsavory reputation? With a gripping sense for story-telling, Amerson reveals a world of complex and diverse characters, at the same time probing themes such as Cold War foreign relations, the role of the individual diplomat in shaping foreign policy, and the tensions between freedom, anarchy, and repression. He also offers frequent insights into life in the Foreign Service. For example, when the new Ambassador—an Eisenhower Republican businessman with a penchant for entertaining guests by balancing on a bongo board—“butchers the local language, sees foreign policy in black-and-white Cold War terms, and cozies up to the charming head of the secret police, what can an Embassy person do? Cringe and bear it—and maintain contacts with the full Venezuelan political spectrum in the meantime. Angry mobs attacked the headquarters of the Seguridad Nacional, where citizens discovered haggard and emaciated prisoners and hideous instruments of torture. Anarchy threatened until the underground opposition, now openly revealed as the Junta Patriótica, assumed control. The leader of the underground, a young journalist that Amerson knew named Fabricio Ojeda, became an important member of the new government. And indeed—“unlike its Caribbean island neighbor, Cuba—“Venezuela escaped mass bloodshed and the swing from a dictatorship of the right to one of the left. Amerson contrasts the Cuban revolution with that of Venezuela, where a broad coalition of forces, rather than any single personality united to throw off the dictatorship. He also credits the skill of President Romulo Betancourt, elected in the aftermath of the revolution, in mediating the forces of the right and left. Not, however, without grave challenges. When the Nixon entourage arrived at the airport, they were greeted not only by the usual honor guards and public officials but also by a jeering crowd, which had forced its way on to the airport balcony. While the band played the Venezuelan national anthem, a cloud of white flecks—“spit Then, as the motorcade proceeded downtown, the crowds lining the streets turned violent. Amerson credits Nixon for quick thinking that saved lives—“for Nixon himself instructed the driver to abandon the supposedly protected route and shoot

Chapter 3 : Revisiting democracy and dictatorship | Pambazuka News

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Alphonse Reinhardt Alphonse Reinhardt Dr. Revolutionary Terror and Conservative Liberalism With the end of the Cold War, democracy had once and for all triumphed over dictatorship, or so we are told. No fledging democracy can be ensured without some sort of terror being brought forth through the barrel of a gun or the blade of a guillotine. According to the dominant historiography, the French Revolution can be divided into an early , middle , and late period Wajda immediately presents the situation in Paris as dire, with the poor clamoring in bread lines about foreign agents and plots against the government, the guillotine looming erect over the center of town, and so on. The Committee thought the Republic needed a period of despotism. They agreed with Machiavelli: At that time, the Communist government of Poland, which was backed by the Soviet Union, was dealing with the mass protests of the Solidarity movement along with a general stagnation of the international communist movement. The goal of a worldwide revolution against the bourgeoisie seemed much more untenable now that China had, at this point, begun to introduce market reforms while the Soviet Union was embroiled in a seemingly unwinnable war in Afghanistan. In attempting to draw colligations between Communist Poland and the First French Republic, Wajda dramatized and took leniency with the historical relationship between Danton, Robespierre, and the greater political situation of the time. His film starts in early , five years after the beginning of the revolution, and the audience is given little backstory to place the images of suffering and dictatorship into context. After the calling of the Estates-General in , two main factions formed within the Third Estate: As the Revolution progressed and as France changed from a constitutional monarchy into a republic, the Jacobins began to execute more and more control over the government. By the beginning of the Terror, the Girondins had been completely liquidated from their positions of power. In a sense Danton was correct, insofar as the campaign brought against the Jacobins by the Girondins polarized the Jacobins enough to create a revolutionary fervor that would lead to the Terror, but the more important point exemplified by this quote is that even before there was a split between Danton and Robespierre, the political machinations which signaled the end of parliamentarianism and the necessity of revolutionary dictatorship were in place. When a contradiction between classes leads to the subjugation of one class through State violence, the only way to resolve that contradiction is through force. The differences between the Girondins and the Jacobins were not simply differences in opinion, but rather they reflected the opposing class interests which the political factions represented. Vestiges of feudal authority existed within the Girondin platform which made it impossible for the French bourgeoisie to gain full political representation, and therefore the Jacobins had to take a hard line republican stance to ensure that their class held political power. The Dantonists however did not share this view, and one of the more prominent Dantonists, Camille Desmoulins, said, "I shall die in the opinion, that to make France republican, happy and flourishing, a little ink would have sufficed, and only one guillotine". But as the historian R. The conflicting forces in French society were not to be resolved by the propagation of words. France could not be made a republic by ink, not even by ink plus one guillotine. This fact was apparent to Robespierre. Indeed, Robespierre was very aware of the political reality of the situation. When France abolished the monarchy, they found themselves the eire of almost every nation in Europe. Immediately the Republican government had to cope with not only with a civil war but with the incursions of foreign armies into French territory. The newly former Soviet Union would face a very similar situation after the overthrow of the Tsar over one hundred years later. This situation, in which a young and inexperienced government must protect itself from real foreign and domestic threats, is not the situation in which to express leniency. No democracy can be established until the State establishes a monopoly of violence over a given area. It is this situation which lead to the Terror. When Danton arrived back in Paris in November of , the Terror had gone into full effect. The combination of the two could not have been more ill timed, yet Danton was not immediately suspected of any crime against

the nation or foreign sympathies. In the film *Danton*, we are to assume that, upon his immediate arrival to Paris, Robespierre and the secret police had a vendetta against Danton, and this is the furthest from the truth. The political program which Danton advocated for would not have been neither tenable nor desirable. This would also make the republic undesirable as the promise of equality would go unfulfilled for those who clamored most for it. Palmer makes a compelling argument that it was Robespierre, and not Danton, who truly attempted to create the Republic which they had claimed to strive for in The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen; It was Robespierre, however, who adopted the only method for creating the kind of Republic in which all the Mountaineers, whatever their conduct, professed to believe. By the methods of Desmoulins a Dantonist a kind of Thermidorian republic might be created, constantly in danger of relapsing into monarchy and reaction; but neither Desmoulins nor anyone else would admit that such an outcome was what he wanted. Wajda presented the Dantonist program as the truest representation of the democratic will, but in reality the only hope for a truly republican republic rested in the authority which Robespierre commanded in defense of the nation. To what end was the First French Republic founded? Who would not agree that France in February could well use a little more "virtue"? The First French Republic, before all else, was founded upon the principle of liberal democracy and republicanism. To ensure this, Danton strove for a legal equality which would moderate between classes and Robespierre strove to eliminate the threats from both the right and the left, from outside and inside the country, to ensure that there was French Republic and republicanism which would last. In the end, neither of these men accomplished their goals, but when we look back upon them and upon their struggle, we should not see them as two opposing forces of dictatorship and democracy. Rather, we should view them both as uncompromising idealists who were consumed by the untenability of a wholly bourgeois revolution. Danton, in committing himself to liberal ideals of moderation, overlooked the deep fractures that separated the different classes in France, and Robespierre, in committing to the liberal ideals of virtue and morality, became caught up in his own desire to save the nation from real and perceived threats. Both men were doomed to failure, but in Robespierre there exists the revolutionary spark which pushes the human race forward towards some kind of progress, whether it be tenable or not.

Chapter 4 : In Maldives, democracy has triumphed over attempts to subvert public opinion | Southasian Mo

*How Democracy Triumphed Over Dictatorship [Robert Amerson] on www.nxgvision.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. Amerson uses his analysis of developments in Venezuela to develop and bolster his case for America's use of 'public diplomacy' in the encouragement and nurturing of democracy.*

Both sides are idiots. Trump had virtually nothing to do with making the summit happen. The credit for that goes to South Korea. The two "exchanged their opinions" on among other things successfully carrying out a future US-North Korea summit, according to the statement. Unlike what Mother Jones is telling us, South Koreans overwhelmingly approve of the summit, by to The South Korean people then went on to give the pro-peace ruling party an overwhelming victory in local elections. So then the credit for the summit belongs to the South Korean government? The credit belongs to the South Korean people. And also I think another most important point we have to remember is the President Jae-in, who was elected from the, after the powerful democratic movement, called the candlelight movement. The Candlelight Revolution was one of the biggest victories for democracy in the world in generations. It got little coverage in the U. Just imagine if 1 in 3 Americans turned out into the streets to protest government corruption. How would the American press cover something like that? Naturally the NY Times said it was all about sexism. Fortunately, people in South Korea care more about corruption in their government than American sexism. Politicians across party lines acknowledged that it was the street protests throughout the country that compelled parliament to make a motion for impeachment. The people exercising democracy over their government and holding them accountable? No wonder the American media largely ignored this amazing event. The outcome of this peaceful democratic revolution was a government more responsive to the wishes of the people, and the people of South Korea wanted peace. Conservative Hong Joon-pyo took Moon favors strengthening ties with North Korea, which the Washington Post notes "could open a new and potentially difficult chapter in relations with the United States" as the Trump administration continues its saber-rattling with the hermit kingdom. Moon is the son of North Korean refugees and previously worked as a human rights lawyer. He has advocated for resuming dialogue with North Korea while maintaining pressure and sanctions, opposing Park, who cut off all ties with the nation. So you can see a clear line between the power and actions of the people in South Korea to the recent summit.

Chapter 5 : Essay on Dictatorship vs. Democracy

Robert Amerson (SAIS Bologna '61), a retired Foreign Service Officer and former professor at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, tells us in his book, How Democracy Triumphed over Dictatorship.

Democracy in its own way is a procedural system, in by which the people set the steps and the government enforces them. The criticism towards democracy dates back to pre-Christ times, where Aristotle viewed democracy as something that is not for the greater good but as a gateway to the poor who held majority to take away from the wealthy. Moreover, there has become a growing trend within nations worldwide, mainly from African and South American origin, here governments claim to hold a democratic system. Yet in most cases these nations can only really be considered as an elected dictatorship, is much different from a true democracy. However, the criticism of the democracy lacks to triumph over the much more evident advantages that are a result of this governmental system. While there are many sides to democracy, it is evident that democracy is the best choice to government rule. Democracy is the political system in which the power is within the citizens and they are allowed to elect the people they think are best to represent their views and beliefs. In a democracy, the youth are educated. From birth they are taught that their voice matters and their vote counts. These are rights they must fight to maintain and will rospers from. No, democracies are not free of flaws; some say that there is no way that something as simple as a popular vote could null the evils of unlawful power or social inequality. These woes are valid, but democracy can work. There are still consequences to right wrongs, and laws to help keep peace and balance. There is a difference between freedom and chaos. Also, it allows the most important have much power with the decision making. Policy and the decisions are made with the awareness of the citizens in order to make the process as fair as possible. There re many positives with democracy; it can provide changes in the government without the use of violence. It can allow power to be easily transferred from one party to another through elections. The citizens are the ones determining who the ruling authority is. If citizens are not happy with their government, they can easily use democratic decisions in order for them to remove the government without the resort of violence. Moreover, the government must compete against each other parties in order to gain authority due to the fact that most authorities are elected by the citizens. This is the best way to prevent any dictatorship authority where the citizens have no say. Such allows the citizens to feel obligated to be active with elections and with their nation. When an authority wins, they owe their winning to the citizens because they have chosen the best leader for their country. The citizens gain a sense f participation when choosing their government. They get the opportunity to voice their opinion by electoral votes. By providing political freedom, citizens can express their views, organize to influence the laws and policies of the government and have a free and informed choice of elections. They also feel the belongingness towards society which makes a more peaceful, and with much freedom society. Without democracy, society suffers. In dictatorships there is no such thing as freedom of thought or creativity. With only one opinion adhered to, the country will be at a standstill. Each decision made with no consideration for those affected, and when every time the system overlooks another citizen, every personal right stolen causes more suffering for society. With such dictatorship the citizens will explode in anger and they will revolt. This has happened many times in history. Our own country was built from this frustration and the fight for freedom. Without democracy, we lack progress in thought, technology, and polices; society is halted. While many can argue the ositives to a democratic system, there are still many that believe that democracy is ruling out the minority. Aristotle viewed democracy as something that is not looking for the common good but as a way for the poor who are the majority to take away from the rich. Democratic systems seems to be good when everything is alright but hen there are tough decisions dictatorship is needed. The common masses may not be aware of the political issues in society. This can result in people making the wrong choices when electing people. As the government is subject after every election term, the authorities may work with the short-term focus. Another disadvantage about democracy is that citizens can be easily influenced, making the majority. They can be compelled by the opinions of those around, a person may not use their own judgement when they are voting. Every form of government is bound to have some Popular Essays.

Chapter 6 : Social Media's Effect on Democracy - New York Essays

Buy How Democracy Triumphed Over Dictatorship: Public Diplomacy in Venezuela: Public Diplomacy in Venezuela at www.nxgvision.com

Types of dictatorships[edit] Right after the end of World War II , with a more relaxed political and social climate, several studies regarding the classification of various forms of government have been conducted. Among these, has been intensely discussed by historians and political scientists the conceptualization and definition of the dictatorship form of government. Eventually, it has been concluded that dictatorship is a form of government in which the absolute power is concentrated in the hands of a leader commonly identified as a dictator , a "small clique", or a "government organization", and it aims the abolition of political pluralism and civilian mobilization. This form of government is characterized by the presence of a single political party and more specifically, by a powerful leader a real role model who imposes his personal and political prominence. The two fundamental aspects that contribute to the maintenance of the power are: Here, the government has "total control of mass communications and social and economic organizations". According to the political scientist Juan Linz , the distinction between an authoritarian regime and a totalitarian one is that while an authoritarian regime seeks to suffocate politics and political mobilization, totalitarianism seeks to control politics and political mobilization. In her study, she focused in how elite-leader and elite-mass relations influence authoritarian politics. Geddes typology identifies the key institutions that structure elite politics in dictatorships i. The study is based and directly related to factors like: According to Barbara Geddes, a dictatorial government may be classified in five typologies: Military dictatorship Military dictatorships are regimes in which a group of officers holds power, determines who will lead the country, and exercises influence over policy. High-level elites and a leader are the members of the military dictatorship. Military dictatorships are characterized by rule by a professionalized military as an institution. In military regimes, elites are referred to as junta members; they are typically senior officers and often other high-level officers in the military. One-party state Single-party dictatorships are regimes in which one party dominates politics. In single-party dictatorships, a single party has access to political posts and control over policy. Other parties may legally exist, compete in elections, and even hold legislative seats, yet true political power lies with the dominant party. In single-party dictatorships, party elites are typically members of the ruling body of the party, sometimes called the central committee , politburo , or secretariat. Personalist dictatorships differ from other forms of dictatorships in their access to key political positions, other fruits of office, and depend much more on the discretion of the personalist dictator. Personalist dictators may be members of the military or leaders of a political party. Yet, neither the military nor the party exercises power independent from the dictator. In personalist dictatorships, the elite corps is usually made up of close friends or family members of the dictator. These individuals are all typically handpicked to serve their posts by the dictator. Real political power must be exercised by the monarch for regimes to be classified as such. Elites in monarchies are typically members of the royal family. When regimes share characteristics of all three forms of dictatorships, they are referred to as triple threats. Most dictatorships are represented as darker shades of red. One of the tasks in political science is to measure and classify regimes as either dictatorships or democracies. The Democracy-Dictatorship Index is seen as an example of the minimalist approach, whereas the Polity data series , is more substantive. Constitutional, Communist nominally championing the " dictatorship of the proletariat " , Counterrevolutionary and Fascist. Since World War II , a broader range of dictatorships has been recognized, including Third World dictatorships, theocratic or religious dictatorships and dynastic or family-based dictatorships. Roman dictators were allocated absolute power during times of emergency. In execution, their power was originally neither arbitrary nor unaccountable, being subject to law and requiring retrospective justification. There were no such dictatorships after the beginning of the 2nd century BC and later dictators such as Sulla and the Roman Emperors exercised power much more personally and arbitrarily. As the Roman Emperor was a king in all but name, a concept that remained anathema to traditional Roman society, the institution was not carried forward into the Roman Empire. Such dictators have been also referred

to as " personalismos ". The wave of military dictatorships in South America in the second half of the twentieth century left a particular mark on Latin American culture. In Latin American literature , the dictator novel challenging dictatorship and caudillismo is a significant genre. There are also many films depicting Latin American military dictatorships. Communism and Fascism in 20th-century dictatorships[edit] In the first half of the 20th century, Communist and Fascist dictatorships appeared in a variety of scientifically and technologically advanced countries, which are distinct from dictatorships in Latin America and post-colonial dictatorships in Africa and Asia. Leading examples of modern totalitarian dictatorship include: These constitutions often failed to work without a strong middle class or work against the preexisting autocratic rule. Some elected presidents and prime ministers captured power by suppressing the opposition and installing one-party rule and others established military dictatorships through their armies. Whatever their form, these dictatorships had an adverse impact on economic growth and the quality of political institutions. Theories of dictatorship[edit] You can help by adding to it. Mancur Olson suggests that the emergence of dictatorships can be linked to the concept of "roving bandits", individuals in an atomic system who move from place to place extracting wealth from individuals. These bandits provide a disincentive for investment and production. Olson states that a community of individuals would be better served if that bandit were to establish himself as a stationary bandit to monopolize theft in the form of taxes. Except from the community, the bandits themselves will be better served, according to Olson, by transforming themselves into "stationary bandits". By settling down and making themselves the rulers of a territory, they will be able to make more profits through taxes than they used to obtain through plunder. By maintaining order and providing protection to the community, the bandits will create a peaceful environment in which their people can maximize their surplus which means a greater taxable base. Thus a potential dictator will have a greater incentive to provide security to a given community from which he is extracting taxes and conversely, the people from whom he extracts the taxes are more likely to produce because they will be unconcerned with potential theft by other bandits. This is the rationality that bandits use in order to justify their transformation from "roving bandits" into "stationary bandits".

Chapter 7 : When democracy triumphed | caucus99percent

Whereas democracy thrives on freedom, a dictatorship thrives on oppression. There are no competitive elections held, so therefore no chance of unseating the dictator. There are often human rights issues involved with dictatorships, making them considerably more difficult to live in than a democracy.

Essay on Dictatorship vs. Democracy Rohit Agarwal Advertisements: Democracy in any country means the rule by elected representatives. It has been defined as the government "of the people, by the people, for the people". Democracy rests on the principle of representation. The people elect their representatives by vote in an election. These representatives attend the legislature and act on behalf of the citizens. If the citizens are not satisfied with their representatives, they may not re-elect them in the next elections. Democracy is said to be a better form of government. It is the government of the people as distinguished from the government of an individual or of a class of people. It makes all the citizens interested in the affairs of the country by sending their representatives in legislatures. Democracy is also a safeguard against revolution. Since people themselves elect the members of government, the need for a revolution does not arise. A democratic government guarantees freedom of thought, action and speech. This freedom has advantage as it enables the individual to grow freely. Democracy thus offers favourable atmosphere for development of human personality. But democracy has its weaknesses, the greatest of which is that it may be the rule of ignorance. The best men may thus fail to get elected. Elections are usually a matter of propaganda. However, the voters in countries like Britain and America have not proved so lacking in judgement as many of the opponents of democracy would have us believe, though it is true that in our own country the people being illiterates rarely give evidence of sound or independent judgement. Democracy is wanting in efficiency. For prompt and effective action, unity of action is essential. In a multitude of minds, much unprofitable discussion takes place whereas unity of control is needed for a vigorous national life. According to Newman, for example, the British Government cannot cope with the emergencies created by war as effectively as a dictator can. This criticism, however, is not very convincing because in times of war the British Prime Minister usually wields the powers of a dictator. A sounder criticism of democracy in times of war would be to say that secrecy in military affairs becomes difficult, if not impossible, and that the opposition usually lowers the morale of people by its loud condemnation of the actions of the cabinet. It was thought that the First World War had made the world safe for democracy, but this forecast proved to be wrong. While democracy worked quite well in France and the English-speaking countries, most other countries swung towards dictatorship. So successful and powerful did their dictatorships become that the days of democracy seemed to be almost over. Germany, Italy, Spain, Turkey, Japan, Russia-in all these countries dictatorship triumphed and flourished, till the outbreak of another World War, greater than the first, plunged the world into bloody strife the like of which had never been witnessed before in history. But dictatorship is certainly not without its merits. As Carlyle points out, society is an organism and not a machine. No mechanical system like the ballot-box can, therefore, prove satisfactory. This safer course is to give all power to a dictator. The dictator must, of course, be one who has an exceptional ability to organize, direct and administer. Parliamentary rule usually means government by cliques of politicians whose purview is strictly limited by their private interests. A dictator, on the other hand, can concentrate all his energies on the uplift and improvement of his country. This is borne out by the phenomenal success achieved by Hitler and Mussolini in their respective countries. Dictatorship employs force and violence to maintain itself. It resorts to physical compulsion, prisons, concentration camps, censorship, intimidation, purges and executions. Both in older Russia and Germany countless executions were ordered for the stability of dictatorship. A dictatorship cannot brook the slightest opposition. Thus there can be no freedom of thought or speech there. Dictatorship, therefore, by its very nature hampers the free development of the human personality. It does not allow for diversity of political opinion and belief but tends towards political regimentation or standardization of human beings. The greatest danger of dictatorship, however, is its partiality for war as an instrument of national aggrandizement. Practically every dictator preaches war, partly because he is actuated by personal ambition and partly because he suffers from an exaggerated nationalism.

Chapter 8 : From Dictatorship to Democracy - Wikipedia

While democracy worked quite well in France and the English-speaking countries, most other countries swung towards dictatorship. So successful and powerful did their dictatorships become that the days of democracy seemed to be almost over.

Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist and one of the founding editors of The Intercept. Links Transcript This is a rush transcript. Copy may not be in its final form. This is Democracy Now! Voters in Brazil head to the polls Sunday in an election that could reshape the political landscape of South America. Bolsonaro has a long history of making racist, misogynistic, homophobic comments. He has encouraged police to kill suspected drug dealers. Most polls show Bolsonaro winning on Sunday but failing to win enough votes to avoid a runoff election on October 28th. He has risen to the polls since September 8th, when he was stabbed while campaigning. Lula remains in jail on what many consider trumped-up corruption charges to prevent him from becoming president. He represents hatred for our country, because he represents the loss of the few rights that the people he targets, such as the black people, the indigenous people and the LGBT community and women, have conquered so far. He represents a threat to democracy in our country, a democracy that we are still building. Glenn, welcome back to Democracy Now! Can you talk about the significance of what is happening right now in Brazil, and particularly on Sunday, the election? And can you talk more about just exactly what Bolsonaro represents, his homophobic comments, his anti-women comments, his support of the Brazilian military dictatorship? And you can go through the whole list of shocking comments. He once said in an interview that he would rather hear that his son died in a car accident than hear that his son is gay. But the much more worrying aspect are not these kind of comments, but the policies that he is explicitly endorsing. He believes in military rule. He regards it as something noble and wants to replicate it. And he has the entire top level of the Brazilian military supporting him and behind him. Speaking outside the prison after a visit, Noam Chomsky condemned the right-wing media in Brazil. We have just had the great privilege of spending an hour with Lula. And one of the points that he emphasized was that during his entire tenure in office, there was just a constant flood of attacks from all the media, constantly, thousands of attacks from every direction, which, of course, confuses and undermines public opinion. So the answer to your question is, something is needed to counter the concentrated power of right-wing media, which, particularly in Latin America, just overwhelms everything. So, that is Noam Chomsky. Glenn Greenwald, a couple questions about that. How is the media allowed to cover Noam Chomsky visiting Lula in prison? You have left-wing dictatorship or right-wing dictatorship, and both are equally bad. PT ran this country for 14 years, and whatever else you might want to say about it, whatever mistakes they made, you certainly had a very free and open press that constantly attacked it. They impeached one of their presidents and put the other one in prison. And so, Brazilian institutions, the Brazilian establishment bears a lot of blame, just like U. I spoke to him right before he went to jail, and he was talking about the presidential candidate Jair Bolsonaro. He was an Army captain in the Brazilian Army. The information that we have is that he was expelled from the Brazilian Army. And his behavior is far-right-wing, fascist. He is very much prejudiced against women, against blacks, against indigenous persons, against human rights. He believes that everything can be resolved with violence. He has the right to run. He projects a certain image to please a part of the society that is of the extreme right. He believes that those who defend human rights are doing a disservice to democracy. He is against everything that is discussed when one is talking about human rights. You can check it out at democracynow. Your comments on what he said, as we begin to wrap up, Glenn? When we take over, your days are numbered. They want to use violence to solve political problems here. But in this last minuteâ€”you are a constitutional lawyerâ€”your thoughts, as you look north to the United Statesâ€”you are an American citizenâ€”on the nomination and possible confirmation of Judge Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court, in just 30 seconds, if you can? So, I do think there are real due process questions when it comes to accusations about somebody that we ought to take very seriously. Well, I want to thank you, Glenn, for being with us. Also, you can go to democracynow. Please attribute legal copies of this work to democracynow. Some of the work s that this program incorporates,

however, may be separately licensed. For further information or additional permissions, contact us.

Chapter 9 : Project MUSE - How Democracy Triumphed Over Dictatorship: Public Diplomacy in Venezuela

It is often felt that dictatorship is efficient in framing new laws to dominate certain sections. You should remember that this framing new law to dominate certain sections is not done with best intentions all the time.