Annals of "Constantin Brâncuşi" University of Târgu Jiu, Education Sciences Series, ISSN 1844-7031, No. **1/2020**

ON POLYARCHY IN THE VISION OF ROBERT DAHL

Mirabela Rely Odette CURELAR,
Associate Professor PhD,
"Constantin Brâncuşi" University of Târgu-Jiu

Sheilla Patricia STAMATOIU
Faculty of Political Sciences, Philosophy and Communication Sciences,
West University of Timişoara

Abstract: In many countries where the polyarchy currently exist, political parties gained relative freedom of organization before suffrage expanded, with one of the first demands of the socialist and labor parties being the universal right to vote. Certainly, after the working class gained this right, the respective parties focused their efforts on mobilizing this category. If, nowadays, a pre-industrial society is not a suitable ground for a competitive policy or a polyarchy, it is certainly the consequence of social characteristics such as illiteracy and poverty. In general the polyarchy was defined as a regime that offers extensive possibilities for public contestation and participation, materialized by satisfying the eight conditions listed above (and which allow citizens to formulate their preferences, make them known and enjoy an equal treatment from. the leaders' side, in terms of "strengthening" of their preferences.

Keywords: polyarchy, integrity, domination, democracy, hegemony.

In the new states where the feeling of belonging to the same nation is underdeveloped, the leaders of nationalist movements, who, in the struggle for independence, proclaimed democracy as their goal, once at the head of a new and fragile nation, is organized opposition as a threat to the integrity of the country. Thus, in the new states, nationalism does not encourage tolerance of dissent and opposition, but rather provides an acceptable justification for intolerance and repression.

The military technology deepens inequalities, facilitating the monopoly of a small minority on the instruments of coercion, as in the common case of the knight armed to the teeth, in front of which the unarmed or insufficiently armed medieval peasant feels quite helpless and uses abstract notions via concrete terms and expressions.

A small minority, with superior resources, establishes and maintains a hegemonic political system (often governed by a single leader), through which it can also exercise its domination over the social order, thus exacerbating inequalities. A negative example is the Spanish military monopoly, which was able to conquer and subjugate the advanced Indian civilizations of Mexico and Peru, or a positive example, when military technology supports equality, as in the case of relatively cheap and good muskets and rifles in eighteenth-century America and the 19th century.

The right to participate in the public contest would allow us to compare different regimes, depending on their scope. The public appeal and the coverage vary from person to person. By the end of the eighteenth century, Britain had a very well-developed system of public contestation, but until the expansion of the right to vote - in 1867 and 1884 - it included only a tiny part of the population. Switzerland has one of the most developed public appeal systems in the world. There are few who could question the fact that the Swiss regime is very "democratic". And yet, is it an opposition between the evolution and decay, in half of the populations, if we talk about women, they do not yet have the right to run in national elections.

These are the causes that leads to a new system of power in a state, much stronger than democracy and named by Robert Dahl the polyarchy. If we have the example of polyarchies and quasi-polyarchies (from the early 1960s) with an accentuated or extreme pluralism, from the 3 countries with accentuated pluralism, we can say that in Belgium, sub cultural conflicts have intensified since the early 60s, and In the Philippines, there has been a resurgence of guerrilla movements in rural areas (the third country is Lebanon). Of the six polyarchies with extreme pluralism, Sierra Leone is no longer even a quasi-polyarchy; Malaya was divided into two countries; India had strong language conflicts; In Ceylon, because of communal disputes and restrictions imposed on the opposition, many wondered for a time whether the country still met at least the conditions for a quasi-polyarchy; and Canada witnessed an explosion of Franco-Canadian nationalism. Of the six countries, only Switzerland was somewhat quieter. But even there, French-speaking citizens of Jura have recently called for the establishment of a separate canton (Dahl, 2000, p.131).

It can be recognized a definition of the political regime that Dahl characterizes as that type of the social order that is distinguished by the existence of seven fundamental institutions, without which no structuring of relations between the state and the society can be

considered "democratic", that sustain the interests of the persons referring to the current manner of the term of "democracy".

We can discus about the rulers of today's pre-industrialized societies that opt more towards a conductor-type strategy and a tendency towards centralization and hegemony. If, nowadays, a pre-industrial society is not a suitable ground for a competitive policy or a polyarchy, it is certainly the consequence of social characteristics such as illiteracy and poverty.

Robert Dahl launches a definition of the concept of power in society: one subject's ability to act in such a way as to control of another subject's answers. He notes, in this context, that "the legislature, the executive, and the executive the judiciary do not cover all power relations or control processes in the society".

Through better perception of the society and the world, Dahl later adapts his conceptual system, understanding by the power relation that relation where there is the intentional element on the part of someone, and introducing the correlated concepts of control, the influence and the autonomy. By "control," Dahl thinks that exists" a relationship between actors, such that the preferences, desires, or intentions of one or more actors provoke conforming reactions or predispositions to such actions to other actors."(Dahl, 2000, 10)

Dahl sought the concepts of poliarchy and democracy in the power," a power that is no longer an abstract potential of any institution, but a resource that manifests itself, concretely, in the relationship between actors and materialized throughout the European construction. Max Weber was the first political theorist who emphasizes the relational aspect of power, for him, power means "any chance to make one's own will triumph in a social relationship, even against the resistance." Therefore, Dahl considers, as an object of study - to see whether or not there was a power relationship - B's behavior; that is, the changes in B's behavior represent a measure of the power exerted on him by A (Dahl, 2000, 10).

At the end of World War II, the conditions in Austria, Germany, Italy and Japan where by no means fully favorable to the establishment of polyarchy, by comparison, each of these countries a serious candidate for polyarchy. Greece and Turkey received aid to establish the polyarchy. All the countries that gained their independence after 1945 had conditions that were as unsuitable as possible for the establishment of the polyarchy. However, Jamaica, Trinidad, India, the Philippines and Lebanon were ruled in 1970 by polyarchic regimes, and Malaysia and Cyprus by quasi-polyarchies.

Attempts to impose polyarchy through direct military intervention have failed. The tragedy in Vietnam has shown how illusory it is to believe that the United States could establish, by its own will, a polyarchy in another country, by force. And the removal of one hegemonic regime by revolution can only prove to be a replacement for another.

One of the most important works of political science of the century, in which Dahl sets out to investigate and critique Charles Wright Mills' thesis on the existence of an elite that dominated American society it is named *Who Governs?*. In Mills' view, this domination would be exercised behind democratic mechanisms, which in fact reconstitute and refresh the elite (political, military, business, trade union, etc.). MiIls' approach is a "positional" one, in the sense that power is a resource focused on various "levels" of society. Robert Dahl believes that the power of an "elite" member should be manifested in his or her success in making others change their behavior (Dahl, 2000, 13-14).

Dahl's fundamental strategy is to reserve the term of "democracy" for an "ideal system" and to use "polyarchy" as an approximation of democracy. (Sartori, 1999, p.153) Dahl is a valuable political writer and his strategies are very important for political literature. For an author to be understood at such profound level by the writers of a nation there would be a high demand of good translations.

New Haven represents the important field of study, for Dahl, which he considers "typical" for the United States, and uses the "reputable" method: that is, who were those who, in the local political process, are known to Is it true, however, that Dahl checks the influence rather than the power, and the concepts of the autonomy and the control are important tools in the analysis of a pluralistic democratic society.

Dahl supports the concepts of autonomy and control as important tools in the analysis of a pluralistic democratic society. For Dahl, the research and the conclusions from to the New Haven represent the opportunity to present the empirical confirmation of some hypotheses, of some open paths in the work *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, through which, the American society represents "a strange hybrid [...] that cannot be exported elsewhere, but in which the social preconditions of democracy are present, there is an effective system of relations, strengthening the agreement between members of society, encouraging moderation and maintaining social peace ", (Dahl, 2000, 14-15), a real means of escaping the realities of the world. And in terms of political decision, American democracy he faithfully approximated the model that Dahl then called polyarchic in 1956.

We can observe that In any country, the preferences and interests taken into account in the political decision will be more and more diverse in a polyarchy, than in a mixed regime and more numerous and varied in a mixed regime, of polyarchical type, than in a hegemony. The emphasis is on the interests of management, integration with business strategy, obtaining added value from people by the processes of human resource development and performance management and the need for a strong corporate culture expressed in mission and value statements and reinforced by communications, training and performance management processes.

In general the polyarchy was defined as a regime that offers extensive possibilities for public contestation and participation, materialized by satisfying the eight conditions listed above (and which allow citizens to formulate their preferences, make them known and enjoy an equal treatment from. the leaders' side, in terms of "Strengthening" of their preferences.

Robert Dahl sustain that the principle that leaders must respond to the preferences of citizens (treated equally) is a key-principle of democracy. Therefore, the eight institutional agencies mentioned define a system with superior efficiency that satisfies one of the essential characteristics of democracy.

Dahl establishes the four "ideal" types of regimes, as well as, the future in which "the real" regimes are situated and evolve, and the persons involved in this process. Thus, the four ideal types are: closed hegemony (which limits both the right to participate and the right to contest), comprehensive hegemony (which grants the first but denies the second), the competitive oligarchy (which denies the first, but grants the second) and the polyarchy (which guarantees both of the highest possible degrees) (Dahl, 2000, 18).

For Dahl, the principle that leaders must respond to the preferences of citizens (treated equally) is a key-principle of democracy. Therefore, the eight institutional agencies mentioned define a system with superior efficiency that satisfies one of the essential characteristics of democracy.

A country with a completely repressive government offers less chance of opposition than one that has a limited voting right but a very tolerant government. If we classify countries only according to their scope, without taking into account other circumstances, we will arrive at incorrect results. And yet, distinguishing regimes by inclusion is a useful thing as long as it is very clear to us that the proportion of "suffrage" or, in general, the right to participate, is only one of the features of the systems, which can only be interpreted. In the

context of other features. Dahl sustains in his study the conditions that lead to the process of democratization, and implicitly to the restructuring of polyarchy.

The historic process of evolution of the society took place with the rapid development of the democratic state, after the outbreak of the Great Depression: it was being interrupted by World War II, and the process gained new momentum in the late 1960's, as a result of claims, especially from the youth part, regarding the democratization of various social institutions. The third stage of democratization will, of course, prove as important as the others.

In many countries where the polyarchy currently exist, political parties gained relative freedom of organization before suffrage expanded, with one of the first demands of the socialist and labor parties being the universal right to vote. Certainly, after the working class gained this right, the respective parties focused their efforts on mobilizing this category.

In the real world, arises not only from the need to create a model that lends itself to scientific analysis, but also from the need for a democratic ideal - often compromised by association with political practice in regimes. "Polyarchical"- to be able to become again a "value", a safe guide for people who wants to find the value among other principles, and that human dignity presupposes that he remains a social being and participates, equally with his peers, in the governance of the city

Bibliography

Dahl, R,A, (2000), *POLYARCHIES. PARTICIPATION AND OPPOSITION*, In memory of Mary and her hopes), POWER, PLURALISM, POLYARCHY: the conceptual route of Robert Dahl (review by LUCIAN DUMITRU DÎRDALĂ). EUROPEAN INSTITUTE, Iasi. Retrieved from https://pdfslide.net/documents/robert-a-dahl-poliarhiile-institutul-european-2000pdf.html

Dahl, Robert A, (1971) *Original edition*: .*Polyarchy. Participation and Opposition*, New Haven, Yale University Press.

Giovannj Sartori, The *Theoy of reinterpreted democracy*, Iaşi, Polirom,1999.