

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

1: Hannah Arendt's Theory of Totalitarianism – Part One : Rozenberg Quarterly

Some have objected to the term totalitarianism as theoretically empty, for instance on grounds that it is simply a particular instance along the spectrum of authoritarianism (Barber,), while others want to apply it quite widely in recognition of the ambitions of many modern authoritarian regimes, even if they ultimately fall short of total management of society (Friedrich,).

Bibliografia [1] Altintas, K. The Situation in Turkey. First Monday, 7 6 , Financial Times, 18th May The Origins of Totalitarianism. BBC, 16th December The New Public Sphere: States, Citizens, and New Communication Technologies. Oxford University Press, Remarks of Internet Freedom. The Geopolitics of Internet Control. Routledge Handbook of Internet Politics. The Internet Censorship and China. Georgetown Journal of International Affairs, 7 2 , â€”, China Jins a Turf War. Guardian, 22nd September Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy. Chinese Woman Jailed over Twitter Post. BBC, 18th November Harvard International Review, 27 2 , 11â€”12, BBC, 26th September Foreign Policy February 10, Cyber War Mirrors Unrest on Streets. BBC, 14th January Slate, 2nd February Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation. John Hopkins University Press, Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes. Boulder, CO and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Open University Press, How not to Liberate the World. Secker and Warburg, Journal of Democracy, 6 1 , 65â€”78, Which Revolution will Egypt Choose? Financial Times, 8th February, Connectivity and Diffusion of Power. Rebooting Business and the World. China Clampdown on tech in Urumqi. BBC, 6th July Working around the State: Internet use and Political Identity in the Arab World. Bits, Bytes and Diplomacy.

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

2: Talk:Totalitarianism - Wikipedia

Authoritarian states and internet social media: Instruments of democratisation or instruments of control? Friedrich, C. J. The Evolving Theory and Practice of.

Totalitarianism is a concept rooted in the horror of modern war, revolution, terror, genocide, and, since , the threat of nuclear annihilation. It is also among the most versatile and contested terms in the political lexicon. Extreme in its denial of liberty, totalitarianism conveys a regime type with truly radical ambitions. Its chief objectives are to rule unimpeded by legal restraint, civic pluralism, and party competition, and to refashion human nature itself. Coined in May by Giovanni Amendola, totalitarianism began life as a condemnation of Fascist ambitions to monopolize power and to transform Italian society through the creation of a new political religion. The word then quickly mutated to encompass National Socialism , especially after the Nazi "seizure of power" in . By the mids, invidious comparisons among the German, Italian, and Soviet systems as totalitarian were becoming common; they increased considerably once the Nazi-Soviet pact was signed in . Meanwhile, recipients of the totalitarian label took different views of it. Granted, Adolf Hitler and Joseph Goebbels , during the early s, had a penchant for cognate expressions such as "total state"; so, too, did sympathetic writers such as Ernst Forsthoff and Carl Schmitt. The Volksgemeinschaft national community , Nazi spokesmen insisted, was unique: Totalitarianism suggested that German aspirations were a mere variant on a theme; worse, a theme that current usage extrapolated to the Bolshevist foe. Once Fascism and Nazism were defeated, a new global conflict soon emerged, and with it a reinvigorated role for "totalitarianism. A year later, the Truman Doctrine entrenched the word in American foreign policy and security jargon. At each turn, the language of totalitarianism received a further boost, though there were significant national variations in the credence it received. In the United States , the language of totalitarianism, despite dissenting voices, had wide appeal across the political spectrum. Postwar Germany represents an intermediate case: Some commentators optimistically announced its softening and demise, while others deplored collaborating with the totalitarian enemy. Authoritarian regimes sometimes also called "traditional" or "autocratic" typified the apartheid state in South Africa , Iran under the Pahlavis, and the South American military juntas. Though hierarchical, vicious, and unjust, they had limited goals, and they left large parts of society religious practice, family, and work relations untouched. Conceivably, they were capable of reformist evolution toward representative government. In contrast, totalitarian regimes were depicted as utopian, inherently expansionist, and indelibly tyrannical, an evil empire. Treating them as normal states was folly. Meanwhile, in central Europe, embattled oppositionists during the late s and s were coining terms that suggested novel permutations on the classical model. Resistance required puncturing a hollow, mechanically recited ideology by everyday acts of noncompliance and by "living in truth" that is, by speaking and acting honestly. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union , twenty-first-century Islamism and the "war against terror" continued to keep the idea of totalitarianism salient. Yet if all these experiences are inseparable from the discourse of totalitarianism, its longevity has also been promoted by three rather different factors. It can be applied either to institutions or to ideologies, to governments or to movements, or to some combination of all of these. Additionally, it can be invoked to delineate an extant reality or a desire, myth, aim, tendency, experiment, and project. Total and its cognates totality, total war , etc. A second factor, more important still, is the role played by journalists, novelists, poets, playwrights, and filmmakers in publicly disseminating the images of totalitarian domination. Their role was to ensure that totalitarianism never became a recondite, academic term but one central to the vernacular of educated people. Totalitarianism was a buzzword of political journalism before it received, in the late s and s, searching treatment by social science and political theory. Many great works on a similar theme followed, making totalitarianism vivid and unforgettable to readers electrified by the pathos and terror such writing evoked. Still, no novelist is more responsible for the notion that totalitarianism penetrates the entire human personality, dominating it from within, than George Orwell Eric Arthur Blair, â€” That view appeared nothing

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

less than prescient when stories later circulated in the s about "brainwashing" of captured prisoners of war POWs during the Korean War. Orwell deserves a special place in any historical audit of totalitarianism for another reason. So long as his work appears in the secondary school and university curricula, totalitarianism as an idea will survive. In a similar way, no one is more responsible for informing a general public about the Soviet Gulag than Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn b. To his extraordinary novels, memoirs, and what he called "experiments in literary investigation," one may add the work of Osip Mandelstam, Nadezhda Mandelstam, Anna Akhmatova , Boris Souvarine, and Boris Pasternak. Each bequeathed a searing portrait of the depravity and recklessness of "totalitarian" systems. It was not only heterodox Marxists such as Herbert Marcuse who indicted modern pluralist regimes for a systemically imbecilic, one-dimensional, and totalitarian mass culture. Liberals such as Friedrich Hayek also warned in of totalitarian developmental tendenciesâ€”particularly the fetish with state planning and interventionâ€”that were paving the "road to serfdom. The implication was that totalitarianism was not an exotic species of regime "over there" but a legitimized institution or trend deeply embedded within modernity as a whole. Origins, Trajectory, Causation Theorists of totalitarianism take very different views of its origins. From this perspective, attempts to locate a long-established lineage of totalitarianism are fundamentally mistaken. So, too, are analogies of totalitarianism with Caesarist, Bonapartist, and other dictatorial regimes. Totalitarianism is conjunctural or unique, not an extreme version of something previously known. The point of using the term is precisely to show the novelty of the regime type and the crisis it denotes. Other writers, conversely, believe that totalitarianism has deeper roots. Hence it might be said that totalitarianism is a perverted outgrowth of the Martin Luther â€”sanctioned authoritarian state, or an exaggerated legacy of tsarist intolerance. Or it might be argued that "totalitarian dictatorship" is ancient, prefigured in the Spartan state or the Roman imperial regime of Diocletian r. That was the judgment of Franz Neumann, who in addition claimed that National Socialism had revived the "fascist dictatorship" methods of the fourteenth-century Roman demagogue Cola di Rienzo. Nor, according to still others, should totalitarianism be understood as an exclusively occidental institution. Karl Wittfogel in *Oriental Despotism* found "total power" in the hydraulic governance of ancient China. And while sinologists have major reservations about describing Maoism as totalitarian, victims such as Harry Wu, imprisoned for nineteen years in the Chinese Laogai, exhibit no such compunction. Totalitarianism has also been located in Africa, for instance, in the rule of Shaka Zulu, while the Soviet Union itself was often depicted as a hybrid entity, more "Asian" than Western. The search for the roots of totalitarian ideas, as distinct from institutions, has generated yet another fertile literature. Karl Popper found protototalitarianism in Plato. Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno spied a totalitarian dialectic evolving out of an " Enlightenment " fixation on mathematical formalization, instrumental reason, and the love of the machine. Talmon discovered a creedal, "totalitarian democracy" arising from one tendency among eighteenth-century philosophies. Enunciated by Jean-Jacques Rousseau â€” , Morelly fl. It created an atmosphere of missionary fervor and, indeed, assumed all the aspects of a religious revival. It reminded his audience of what a modern "enlightened" European revolution shared with a declining Oriental civilization. Less than a century later, Bertrand Russell augmented that idea when he suggested that Bolshevism was like Islam, while John Maynard Keynes, in lapidary mood, remarked that "Lenin [was] a Mahomet, and not a Bismarck. On this account, twenty-first century Islamist and perhaps Ba athi ideology, practice, and organization bear many disquieting parallels with National Socialism and Bolshevism. Modern Islamism is a radical movement in which pluralism is anathema, and in which politics itself is derided as a sphere of venality. To that extent it mirrors Islamic doctrine more generally since the suras of the Koran make no categorical or principled distinction between public and private spheres: The state has no independent authority. Among Islamist militants, the substitute for political institutions is, above all, the fellow-feeling and camaraderie bestowed by membership of a secret society and the existential tests that confront the believer. Islamist militants combine the conspiratorial anti-Semitism of the Nazis for whom they entertain a nostalgic admiration with the pan-territorial ambitions of Bolshevik universalism. Islamist language is also replete with millenarian images of struggle, merciless destruction, and "sacred terror. That archaic demands for the

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

reestablishment of the hallowed caliphate are pursued with all the means modern technology affords is consistent with the "reactionary modernism" of earlier totalitarian movements. Such totalitarian parallels or intellectual lineages do not satisfy those who insist that family resemblance is no substitute for attributable historical causation. And since the early s it has frequently been acknowledged that theorists of totalitarianism are much more adept at constructing morphologies than they are at establishing the precise relationship of totalitarian regimes to one another. Like Ernst Nolte, Furet was convinced that a "historico-genetic" approach to these movements was required to supplement the standard typological one. Like Nolte, as well, he believed that Bolshevism and National Socialism were historically linked, still a taboo contention among many leftists. According to Furet, the genealogical relationship between Bolshevism and National Socialism was not principally cause and effect. Each had its own endogenous history. Equally, German anti-Semitism did not require Jews to be major spokesmen and leaders of the left to be an object of detestation. Anti-Semitism was already firmly established before Bolshevism erupted, because Jews were seen as a vanguard of democracy itself. Bourgeois democracy was the common enemy of totalitarian movements: In *Totalitarianism*, published in , Carl Friedrich itemized five elements, which, in a subsequent collaboration with Zbigniew Brzezinski, he increased to six. Yet, before that, Arthur M. Hill concocted fifteen points that Norman Davies, in *Europe: A History* , expanded to seventeen. Recurrently mentioned features of totalitarianism include the following: A revolutionary, exclusive, and apocalyptic ideology that announces the destruction of the old orderâ€”"corrupt and compromisedâ€”and the birth of a radically new, purified, and muscular age. Antiliberal, anticonservative, and antipluralist, totalitarian ideology creates myths, catechisms, cults, festivities, and rituals designed to commemorate the destiny of the elect. A cellular, fluid, and hydralike political party structure that, particularly before the conquest of state power, devolves authority to local militants. As it gains recruits and fellow believers, the party takes on a mass character with a charismatic leader at its head claiming omniscience and infallibility, and demanding the unconditional personal devotion of the people. A regime in which offices are deliberately duplicated and personnel are continually shuffled, so as to ensure chronic collegial rivalry and dependence on the adjudication of the one true leader. To the extent that legal instruments function at all, they do so as a legitimizing sham rather than a real brake on the untrammled use of executive power. Indeed, the very notion of "the executive" is redundant since it presupposes a separation of powers anathema to a totalitarian regime. A culture of martial solidarity in which violence and danger of the trenches, the street fight, etc. Youth are a special audience for such a culture, but are expected to admire and emulate the "old fighters" of the revolution. The pursuit and elimination not simply of active oppositionists but, and more distinctively, "objective enemies" or "enemies of the people"â€”that is, categories of people deemed guilty of wickedness in virtue of some ascribed quality such as race or descent. Crimes against the state need not have actually been committed by the person accused of them. Hence the "hereditary principle" in North Korea where punishment is extended to three generations the original miscreants, their children, and their grandchildren. Under totalitarianism, it is what people are, more than what they do that marks them for punishment.

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

3: Totalitarianism - Wikipedia

Carl Friedrich, "The Evolving Theory and Practice of Totalitarian Regimes", in Carl Friedrich, Michael Curtis, Benjamin Barber, Totalitarianism in Perspective: Three Views (New York: Praeger,), p

Partisan editing[edit] I see repeated attempts to hide information about totalitarian regimes under a smokescreen of "scholarly talk" about the meaning of term. There are passages on how it was coined, who applied the term to what, and so on. Usually when we describe a phenomenon we say what it is and then give examples of it. This article has long seemed to be an protest against any use of the term at all. I wonder if there is a deconstructionist trying to use Wikipedia as a soapbox here. Anyway, I think the thing to do is to condense the material on "the term itself" or at any rate to start adding many examples of totalitarian regimes. Once we have enough of those example, if anyone wants to include scholarly objections to the use of the term "totalitarian" to describe those regimes, they can. They say that Fascism and Communism have this "total control" aspect in common. One even called the two kinds of government "totalitarian twins". This view, that Fascism and Communism are twin instances of one thing, is more popular in the Christianized West, perhaps. It would not be NPOV to exalt this view over any dissenting views, any more than it would be neutral to exalt the viewpoint that "totalitarianism" is a poorly defined or useless term. Whether the "left" side Communism and the "far right" Hitler, Mussolini are diametrically opposed or simply mirrors with a lot in common, should be a major theme of this article. Archivists, please do not conceal this suggestion or discussions about it, as that might falsely give the impression that this article is a "done deal" or stable. In point of fact, the two were in direct competition with Communism for adherents. Totalitarianism could therefore be considered a left-wing ideology rather than right-wing. They may be on the right edge of the left because of their militarism and nationalism, but they are still leftists. On economics, all you can say about the Nazis is they were centrist. Nazis got their votes from working class voters who did not want to vote communists who were rising , but neither wanted to vote conservative-liberals accused of Great Depression. Nazis and Communists were not ideological enemies. They were allies with the Nazi-Soviet Pact which was broken when they became enemies over power and territory. Basically, dictators to the left and monarchs to the right. Not the clearest case of "totalitarianism". In dozens of socialist countries, on the other hand, one could not even visit an another town without a permit from communist officials. Getting passports for foreign travel required special position and hundreds of thousands soldiers served solely to prevent the escape of population. In some states as Cambodia, children were systematically separated from their parents for anti-capitalist indoctrination. Ridiculous how some editors try to censor experiences of some half the world population between and Valois bourbon talk. Most people were too poor to "buy many things" in Spain, Portugal, and Italy, and many starved. You definitely needed permission to travel under Fascism, even to a neighboring town in Italy. You had to present your papers to the local police department on arrival, and this situation persisted into the nineteen fifties. As for freedom to marry. Saddam Hussein and Hafez Assad ruled in much the same manner as the two other here recognized totalitarian general forms, Communist and fascist. Is totalitarianism "extreme dictatorship" or does it apply only those that fit certain cultural modes? The former is usually considered "fascist"; the latter "communist". Clear-cut ideology and no pluralism 2. No security of life and property 3. Personality cult in practice 4. Pretension to being "true democracy" as opposed to "false" democracy as in "plutocratic" or "bourgeois" societies 5. Extensive government control of the economy 6. Fraudulent elections and plebiscites, if any 7. Brutal repression of any real or imagined opposition 8. Simultaneous claim to modernity and an idealized but distant past 9. Attempt to re-shape the national culture It also badly describes the lunatic despotism of Idi Amin. Apartheid in South Africa or Rhodesia? Democracy for a privileged ethnic group, if oppression and repression for everyone else. Whatever offense Israel may be to its neighbors, Israeli citizens are relatively safe from their government, have free elections and much economic freedom, face no personality cult, and usually try to compare their government to liberal democracies. They had areas of agreement with

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

Marxism also - centralized command economy, for one, and secular government, for another. Unlike in the communist world religion per se was never suppressed, but any religious groups that he felt were escaping his control were cracked down on instantly. This made religions unable to function as independent moral guides, making their existence essentially pointless. In the same way, Hitler and Mussolini are generally considered totalitarian; Franco and Salazar, despite their almost identical ideology, are not. Thank you for clearly defining your terms, using more than two obvious examples, and contrasting with similar non-examples. The main article does none of these things. Their personality cults were practically non-existent despite token efforts to establish them. The "total" in totalitarianism is less about total control and more about a total and radical vision. They were extreme authoritarians who were, I think, ultimately insincere in their commitment to the ideologies their parties espoused. Trau Communism and Fascism section merge [edit] I have added a substantial amount of text merged under this header from the Totalitarian twins article regarding the combination of communism and fascism. So, I split them back. Its victims can look upon it as a crushing order. It might be freedom for some but tyranny for others, just like any totalitarian ideology. Its demise in South Africa was often seen in much the same light as the demise of Communism in the former Soviet bloc. I have removed the link on the grounds that there is not now and there likely will never be any "Scientologist" government. Scientology offends the sensibilities of many for its obscurantism, its extreme demands for personal compliance, its hard methods of attacking detractors If Scientology is totalitarian, then so is every religious, philosophical, and political cult; such an inclusion reduces the meaning of the category. Whether I like or dislike Scientology has nothing to do with it. It involves oppression of one minority by another, but not of the people as a whole by the government. Should the southern United States pre- Civil War be considered totalitarian? No, because most of the population whites were citizens with full voting rights. Totalitarianism implies state control of everything. Apartheid, sick and wrong? A form of oppression? Those who are suggesting placing Rhodesia and apartheid -era South Africa under the rubric totalitarianism are mistaking using the term for any form of extremely oppressive government. I would agree that yes, there were grave human-rights abuses in South Africa and Rhodesia, and yes, that for the black population who were the majority of the population , white supremacist rule was indeed oppressive. However, for those fortunate enough to be white during those regimes, the rule of law generally did apply. I also tried to improve the lead, and removed some redundancy. So, it is difficult to discuss them all at once. It would be more productive if you could make one change at a time, and then discuss. No, it is mostly used to describe historical political regimes. No, this text is not "according to Pipes". It is according to Hitler. This is fine to tell in a "Criticism" section, with all arguments and counter-arguments provided. Telling this in Introduction in such way is POV. Common to all definitions is The previous version of this paragraph was better and more concise. Please make one change at a time and discuss. This article should be improved by adding more scholarly information on the subject, not by "NPOVing" it the way you are doing. This is not a big issue for me, and I may be wrong about it. Indeed, the article states, "according to most scholars the first totalitarian regimes were formed in the 20th century. My "understanding was not just that this was a modern concept, but that that because states before the 20th century lacked the technological means for controlling large numbers of people in the way specified by the concept, its rare at best. That is with television, radio, and other mass media, it makes it relatively easy for "totalitarian regimes" to make their presence felt through campaigns of propaganda or the creation of the personality cult that sticks, hence the concept of totalitarian democracy which should have a section in this article, btw. I agree with that. Sorry, I did not understand what you mean. And you say, No, this text is not "according to Pipes". Therefore we are not quoting Hitler, and hence the statement we reference is not according to Hitler but according to Pipes, who asserts this statement of fact. Also, the wording was POV as it states it as an established fact, and avoids any attribution. This violate NPOV, and is misleading. I modified this paragraph to make a more clear attribution to Pipes. In fact its POV to state the concept as if it were a valid, accepted concept when it was not. Sure, in the body of the article, we can get into the issues, but the intro should reflect the major points in the body.

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

4: Comparison of Nazism and Stalinism - Wikipedia

Abstract. One of Carl J. Friedrich's major contributions to the study of politics 1 has been to systematize the concept of totalitarianism. His work in this field has been both pioneering and rigorous.

Hannah Arendt[edit] Hannah Arendt was one of the first scholars to propose that the regimes of Hitler and Stalin could be grouped in the same political category. Not all totalitarian movements succeed in creating totalitarian governments once they gain power. European imperialism of the nineteenth century also paved the way for totalitarianism, by legitimizing the concept of endless expansion. Their target audience did not have to be persuaded to despise the other parties or the democratic system, because it consisted of people who already despised mainstream politics. As a result, totalitarian movements were free to use violence and terror against their opponents without fear that this might alienate their own supporters. Indoctrination consists of the message that a totalitarian government promotes internally, to the members of the ruling party and that segment of the population which supports the government. Propaganda consists of the message that a totalitarian government seeks to promote in the outside world, and also among those parts of its own society which may not support the government. According to Arendt, totalitarian governments did not merely use these appeals to supposed scientific laws as propaganda to manipulate others. Rather, totalitarian leaders like Hitler and Stalin genuinely believed that they were acting in accordance with immutable natural laws, to such an extent that they were willing to sacrifice the self-interest of their regimes for the sake of enacting those supposed laws. The totalitarian leader does not rise to power by personally using violence or through any special organizational skills, but rather by controlling appointments of personnel within the party, so that all other prominent party members owe their positions to him. Even when the leader is not particularly competent and the members of his inner circle are aware of his deficiencies, they remain committed to him out of fear that without him the entire power structure would collapse. According to Arendt, totalitarian governments must be constantly fighting enemies in order to survive. This explains their apparently irrational behavior, for example when Hitler continued to make territorial demands even after he was offered everything he asked for in the Munich Agreement , or when Stalin unleashed the Great Terror despite the fact that he faced no significant internal opposition. Slaves were abused and killed for the sake of profit; concentration camp inmates were abused and killed because a totalitarian government needed to justify its existence. That is to say, most of the inmates had not actually committed any action against the regime. Totalitarian systems and autocracies[edit] The totalitarian paradigm in the comparative study of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union was further developed by Carl Friedrich and Zbigniew Brzezinski , who wrote extensively on this topic both individually and in collaboration. In particular, it is distinguished by a reliance on modern technology and mass legitimation. Friedrich and Brzezinski argue that Nazism and Stalinism are not only similar to each other, but also represent a continuation or a return to the tradition of European absolute monarchy on certain levels. This depends in part on the personal character of different leaders, but Friedrich and Brzezinski believe that there is also an underlying political cycle, in which rising discontent leads to increased repression up to the point at which the opposition is eliminated, then controls are relaxed until the next time that popular dissatisfaction begins to grow. Totalitarianism can only exist after the creation of modern technology, because such technology is essential for propaganda , for surveillance of the population, and for the operation of a secret police. First, an official ideology that is supposed to be followed by all members of society, at least passively, and which promises to serve as a perfect guide towards some ultimate goal. Second, a single political party , composed of the most enthusiastic supporters of the official ideology, representing an elite group within society no more than 10 percent of the population , and organized along strictly regimented lines. Fourth, a similar monopoly held by the party over the mass media and all technological forms of communication. The dictator, whether Stalin, Hitler or Mussolini, holds supreme power. Friedrich and Brzezinski explicitly reject the claim that the Party, or any other institution, could provide a significant

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

counterweight to the power of the dictator in Nazism or Stalinism. This is partly due to the way that totalitarian governments arise. They come about when a militant ideological movement seizes power, so the first leader of a totalitarian government is usually the ideologue who built the movement that seized power, and subsequent leaders try to emulate him. Friedrich points out that neither the Nazi nor the Stalinist government ever established any official line of succession or any mechanism to decide who would replace the dictator after his death. There could never be any heir apparent, because such an heir would have been a threat to the power of the dictator while he was alive. Totalitarian Party[edit] Friedrich and Brzezinski also identify key similarities between the Nazi and Stalinist political parties, which set them apart from other types of political parties. Rather, they strictly tested potential members, in a manner similar to exclusive clubs, and often engaged in political purges of the membership, expelling large numbers of people from their ranks and sometimes arresting and executing those expelled, such as in the Great Purge or the Night of the Long Knives. While both Nazism and Stalinism required party members to display such total loyalty in practice, they differed in the way they dealt with it in theory. Stalinism, meanwhile, denied that it did anything similar, and claimed instead to uphold democratic principles, with the Party Congress made up of elected delegates supposedly being the highest authority. Thus, regardless of the differences in their underlying ideological claims, the Nazi and Stalinist parties were organized in practice along similar lines, with a rigid hierarchy and centralized leadership. Friedrich and Brzezinski argue, in agreement with Arendt, that Nazi and Stalinist leaders really believed in their respective ideologies and did not merely use them as tools to gain power. Friedrich and Brzezinski also draw attention to the symbols used by Nazis and Stalinists to represent themselves. According to Friedrich and Brzezinski, the most effective terror is invisible to the people it affects. They simply develop a habit of acting in a conformist manner and not questioning authority, without necessarily being aware that this is what they are doing. Propaganda is then used to maintain this appearance of popular consent. Both Joseph Goebbels and Soviet propagandists sought to demonize their enemies and present a picture of a united people standing behind its leader to confront foreign threats. In both cases there was no attempt to convey complex ideological nuances to the masses, with the message being instead about a simplistic struggle between good and evil. Both Nazi and Stalinist regimes produced two very different sets of propaganda – one for internal consumption and one for potential sympathizers in other countries. And both regimes would sometimes radically change their propaganda line as they made peace with a former enemy or got into a war with a former ally. With no way for anyone to express criticism, the dictator has no way of knowing how much support he actually has among the general populace. In , during the early days of the Berlin Blockade , the Soviet leadership apparently believed that the population of West Berlin was sympathetic to Soviet Communism and that they would request to join the Soviet zone. But to declare that the struggle had been won would have meant to declare that most of the totalitarian features of the government were no longer needed. A secret police force, for instance, has no reason to exist if there are no dangerous traitors who need to be found. In the Stalinist USSR, the repressive apparatus was eventually turned against members of the Communist Party itself in the Great Purge and the show trials that accompanied it. The Nazis did not turn inward towards purging their own party except in a limited way on two occasions the Night of the Long Knives and the aftermath of the 20 July plot. However, unlike Hannah Arendt, who held that the Gulag camps served no economic purpose, Friedrich and Brzezinski argue that they provided an important source of cheap labor for the Stalinist economy. At the outset, Lewin and Kershaw identify similarities between the historical situations in Germany and Russia prior to the First World War and during that war. Both countries were ruled by authoritarian monarchies, who were under pressure to make concessions to popular demands. And both countries had expansionist foreign policies with a particular interest in Central and Eastern Europe. Stalinism had an absolute leader, but he was not essential. He could be replaced by another. Stalinism had an ideology which existed independently of Stalin. In Stalinism, the bureaucratic apparatus was the foundation of the system, while in Nazism, the person of the leader was the foundation. This confusion produced competition between Nazi officials, as each of them attempted to prove that he was a more dedicated Nazi

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

than his rivals, by engaging in ever more extreme policies. This competition to please Hitler was, according to Mommsen, the real cause of Nazi irrationality. The Nazi regime, on the other hand, was much more personalized and depended entirely on Hitler, being unable to build any lasting institutions. Stalinism could exist without its leader. One of the topics they have studied is the question of how much power the dictator really held in the two regimes. Werth identifies two main historiographical approaches in the study of the Stalinist regime: However, there was a potential for division between the leader and the state bureaucracy, due to the way that Nazism came to power – as part of an alliance with traditional conservative elites, industrialists, and the army. This produced a surprising difference between Nazism and Stalinism: When the Stalinist USSR conquered territory, it created smaller copies of itself and installed them as the governments of the occupied countries. When Nazi Germany conquered territory, on the other hand, it did not attempt to create copies of the German government back home. At the top, high-ranking members of the Communist Party were arrested and executed under the claim that they had plotted against Stalin and in some cases they were forced to confess to imaginary crimes in show trials. At the bottom, the peasantry suffered the Holodomor famine especially in Ukraine, and even outside of the famine years they were faced with very high grain quotas. He lists them from smallest to largest. The second group consisted of mid-level Communist Party officials, who were subject to mass arrests and executions in the late s, particularly during the Great Purge. Eliminating them served a dual purpose: This type of petty crime became very widespread, and was often punished as if it were intentional sabotage motivated by political opposition to the USSR. The fourth and largest category consisted of ethnic groups that were subject to deportation, famine, or arbitrary arrests under the suspicion of being collectively disloyal to Stalin or to the Soviet state. This included the Holodomor famine directed at the Ukrainians, the deportation of ethnic groups suspected of pro-German sympathies such as the Volga Germans, the Crimean Tatars, the Chechens and others, and eventually also persecution of ethnic Jews, especially as Stalin grew increasingly antisemitic near the end of his life. In Stalinism, there was a gulf between ideology and reality when it came to violence. The Soviet regime continuously denied that it was repressive, proclaimed itself a defender of peace, and sought to conceal all the evidence to the contrary. The Nazis aimed to eliminate their real or imagined political opponents, first in the Reich and later in the occupied territories during the war. Some of these opponents were executed, while others were imprisoned in concentration camps. The death penalty was used on a wide scale, even before the war. During the war, political repression was greatly expanded both inside Germany and especially in the newly occupied territories. Political prisoners in the concentration camps numbered only about 25, at the beginning of the war. By January they had swelled to, – most of them non-Germans accused of plotting against the Reich. Such people were divided into two categories: Germans considered physically or mentally unfit were among the first victims. One of the first laws of the Nazi regime mandated the forced sterilization of people suffering from physical handicaps or who had psychiatric conditions deemed to be hereditary. As laid out in Generalplan Ost, the Nazis wished to eliminate most of the Slavic populations of Eastern Europe, partly through deportation and partly through murder, in order to secure land for ethnic German settlement and colonization. This culminated in the Holocaust, the Nazi genocide of the Jews. Unlike in the case of all other target populations, the Jews were to be exterminated completely, with no individual exceptions for any reason. Stalinism and Nazism Compared, editors Michael Geyer and Sheila Fitzpatrick disputed the concept of totalitarianism, noting that the term entered political discourse first as a term of self-description by the Italian Fascists and was only later used as a framework to compare Nazi Germany with the Soviet Union. The differences stem from the fact that their ideologies were opposed to each other and regarded each other as enemies. At the same time, they both vigorously denied borrowing anything from each other. For instance, Soviet wartime propaganda revolved around the idea of resisting imperial aggression, while Nazi propaganda was about wars of racial conquest. Both governments were highly concerned over low fertility rates in their respective populations, and applied extensive and intrusive social engineering techniques to increase the number of births.

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

5: Understanding Totalitarian Rule - Patria de MartÃ-

Get Textbooks on Google Play. Rent and save from the world's largest eBookstore. Read, highlight, and take notes, across web, tablet, and phone.

Instances of dictatorial rule are found in all epochs and in all civilizations. Several expressions have been used to characterize the historical phenomenon of dictatorial rule: Apart from constitutional dictatorships established to deal with governmental emergencies, all forms of dictatorship share the following features: Dictatorships are characterized by the absence of a division of power, the suppression of competing, legitimate political and social groups and institutions, the concentration of political power in the hands of a dictator or of an autocratically governing group of leaders elite , and the utilization of an autocratically guided and manipulated ruling apparatus to develop a monopoly of power. The constitutional state is eliminated, or a new revolutionary or counterrevolutionary law created, merely as an instrument of rule. Related to this feature is the difficulty or impossibility of regulating the succession of the dictator in a lawful fashion. Such methods range from intimidation to propaganda, from imposing the duty of obedience to methods of terror. These characteristics of dictatorship are to be found in various combinations and modifications in different historical configurations: The concept of dictatorship, in its origin and evolution, may be understood both as a complementary and protective constitutional device and as a complete antithesis to the democratic constitutional state. Friedrich , in referring to the ancient Roman model, makes a distinction between constitutional and unrestricted dictatorship. However, the view that a revolutionary dictatorship necessarily presupposes the existence or the counterpart of a democratic constitution is disputed. Answers may be provided by the recent sociological and political research into the historical process of transition from a constitutional, restricted dictatorship to an unrestricted, total dictatorship. The inability to function and the internal weakness of democracy are undoubtedly among the main causes of the establishment of dictatorial rule. The totalitarian communist system of the Soviet Union arose in consequence of the crumbling away of tsarist autocracy, hastened along by a mass movement. In general it can be shown that unresolved social tensions and economic crises, together with the undermining of constitutional order and the development of undemocratic power aggregates, are among the conditions that give rise to dictatorial regimes. Types of dictatorship Differences in origin, legitimation, organization of rule, and goals, as well as in political style, have led scholars to isolate types of dictatorship and to differentiate among them. Both Plato Republicvii and ix and Aristotle Politics book iii dealt mainly with the structure and methods of tyranny and provided initial insight into the nature of dictatorial rule. Machiavelli was the first to distinguish between dictatorship as a constitutional institution of the republic and as a despotic form of government, which he recommended to the ruler as a means of restoring political order. Absolute monarchies are generally not regarded as dictatorships, since the exercise of power is clothed in traditional legitimacy. Yet whenever an absolute sovereign actually rules despotically, violating the customary standards of monarchical authority, his rule must be termed a dictatorship e. The well-known distinction between provisional dictatorship kommissarische Diktaturâ€”the grant of special full powers in the event of state emergencies and sovereign dictatorship aimed at a revolutionary change of the entire political and social order made by Carl Schmitt is hardly fruitful sociologically in view of the historical and cultural variations in dictatorial rule. The three ideal types developed by Franz L. Some authors assume that the process of trans-forming a constitutional dictatorship into a revolutionary dictatorship leads, in modern industrial societies, either to authoritarianism, a form of dictatorship based upon the prevailing values in the society, or to totalitarianism, the form of dictatorship that is able to force through a new system of values in society cf. This distinction is worthy of note because it makes allowance for the fundamental importance of the different socio-cultural presuppositions and sociopolitical goals of dictatorships. Indeed, in any endeavor to set up a political-sociological typology of dictatorial systems the sociocultural factors must be regarded as the primary differentiating criteria, in addition

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

to the specific governmental structures and the means of safeguarding the monopoly of power. The summary below of certain ideal types of dictatorship attempts to make allowance for the interaction of the cultural, social, political, and psychological factors, which is characteristic of the different historical manifestations of these systems of rule. At the same time, these types show how different are the intensity of this interaction and the stability of the political-social relationships within the several systems. Despotism

Despotic one-man rule Despotism is historically represented by the many forms of tyranny in ancient Greece and Sicily and in Renaissance Italy, by some instances of Oriental monarchic despotism, and by certain cases of one-man rule in the developing countries. This distinctly arbitrary rule is particularly unstable, because it is not supported by a strong organization; as a rule, it is backed only by some conspiratorial groups, small coteries, political bands or factions, camarillas, or military cliques. Usually the motive for the seizure of power is not concern for the commonweal, but personal gain, the suppression of opponents, or the conquest of foreign territory. Sometimes these leaders have the political regime they usurped confirmed by plebiscites or try to consolidate it by victorious military campaigns. The premises of such rule are the insecurity of social conditions, class conflicts, crises phenomena in existing democratic systems, military threats from foreign countries, as during the period of tyranny in ancient Sicily, and the meeting of different civilizations. In some instances e. Despotism

Elite-related rule The most important feature of elite-related rule, whether by one man or by a group, is the development of a pyramid of power in an authoritarian state. He endeavors to achieve a balance of power among these elites or else to range the groups that support him against others. Recognition of the fact that the more stable the foundations of this rule, the greater the likelihood of continuous exercise of power, places limitations on the arbitrariness of the dictator. In many instances such rulers have attempted to provide constitutional guarantees for their regimes. This form of rule is constantly subject to the hazard that its terroristic nature will be exacerbated by rivalries among the leading elites or by foreign military threats, In an elite-related dictatorship a division of political functions exists almost by definition. The rulers surround themselves with revolutionary councils, advisory committees, and paramilitary organizations. Ambitious aides or competitors of the dictator demand their share of political power e. Governmental systems of this type may in certain cases serve to maintain a sociopolitical status quo, to overcome a crisis, to prevent a revolution. Yet, as a rule, the measures taken by dictators and their advisory committees in a given socioeconomic situation are based on a particular sociopolitical concept of planning. The revolutionary or reform or restoration policies they advocate require popularity among the masses of the people. Historical examples of this type are: The means of social control employed are primarily aimed at the core of the power organization or at the elites emerging from the ruling class. The masses of the people are constrained to admire or revere the personality of the leader. The social and political activities of such dictatorships are partly revolutionary and partly restorative especially when the powers of the different social classes are balanced. Oriental despotism The concept of an Oriental or Asian society, including primarily the ancient civilizations of China, India, the Near East, and Tatar and tsarist Russia, but also the Eastern Roman and Byzantine empires, was known to the early political economists, as well as to Karl Marx and Max Weber. Wittfogel has explored anew the socioeconomic, cultural, and political factors that characterized it. He finds that Oriental despotism differs in essential features from the dictatorships of antiquity, the Middle Ages, and modern Europe, although it is akin in some ways to the elite-related as well as the totalitarian types. The person of the ruler enjoyed the highest secular and, in part, religious authority. Although the ruler did demand obedience and complete submissiveness from his servants, he respected the human rights of social groups in areas outside the purview of the state. Most political conflicts occurred within the ruling class; social conflicts and insubordination outside the ruling stratum were prevented by customary techniques of terror [see Asian society, article on southeast asia].

Totalitarian rule Examples of totalitarian rule fall into two groups. First there are the sociopolitical systems of fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, and the semifascist dictatorships of Peron in Argentina and Franco in Spain; second, there is the communist system in its various historical versions above all, the Soviet Union and China and similar political structures in the

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

developing countries. The Soviet communist system, on the other hand, was born of the class antagonisms of bourgeois society, with the aid of an originally democratic mass movement based on a revolutionary theory of society. Notwithstanding resemblances and parallels in social structure, in the use of political ideology for legitimizing and maintaining the regime, and in the application of modern scientific and technological means of organizing the economy and controlling men, there are striking differences between the communist and fascist systems. Fascism and National Socialism proceeded from counterrevolutionary concepts of society. Communism, however, has a revolutionary model of social development and evolved rational, bureaucratic forms of policy making that have maintained the system through many generations and have helped to consolidate the political structure despite domestic and external perils. Some of these differences involve the historical conditions under which the movements developed and the structure and the special functions of the political ideologies and values that determine the actions of the leadership and mass behavior. Every fully developed totalitarian rule involves not only the political structure, the position and function of the monopoly party and its organizational satellites, and the relations among the state, the social movement, and the society. The concept of totalitarianism also includes the entire social structure and all the measures taken to transform it, a centrally directed economy, as well as the political ideology and legal system developed to justify and maintain the regime. In sum, we can speak of totalitarian rule only where a centralistically oriented mass movement, led by a militant political minority in an authoritarian manner, relying on the monopoly of power, and with the aid of a dictatorially ruled state, builds an apparatus of power which bears upon all parts of the society. This multidimensionality, and the diversity of the various historical systems making up the phenomenon of totalitarianism, makes it difficult to elaborate a politically and sociologically fruitful concept of totalitarian rule, as is shown by the existing literature, in which the concept of totalitarianism has become increasingly subject to scientific criticism. Some scholars maintain that there are no significant differences between the older dictatorships and modern mass despotisms except, say, in the art of mass domination Hallgarten ; , p. Others deny that totalitarianism is merely a product of industrial society and point to totalitarian features that may be found, for example, in ancient Sparta and in the tyranny of Diocletian Neumann , p. Several younger scholars believe that general concepts of ideal types and static, classificatory methods are of little use in the historical-empirical analysis of the various totalitarian power structures [see Totalitarianism].

Constitutional dictatorship Unlike the revolutionary and counterrevolutionary types of dictatorship, in which the legality of the exercise of power is dubious and in many cases represents a break with the political evolution of the state, constitutional dictatorship respects the limits fixed by the constitution. Its function is to protect or restore the traditional, legal order in crisis situations or in domestic or foreign emergencies. Such an emergency *Staatsnotstand* can be defined as a serious disturbance or endangering of public safety and order, which cannot be overcome in normal, constitutional ways but can only be eliminated by the use of exceptional means Hesse A constitutional dictatorship exists when martial law or a state of siege is proclaimed, and the executive, specifically the military commanders, can limit civil rights and liberties. A tendency toward this form of dictatorship can also be seen, however, in the so-called emergency decree legislation. The problem of assuring respect for the limits of constitutional dictatorship is a very difficult one and has been exhaustively debated in politics and in scholarly literature. A limited emergency dictatorship may turn into a counterrevolutionary dictatorship whenever the conditions of political power are favorable, as shown by the exploitation of article 48 of the Weimar constitution by the National Socialists. A constitutional dictatorship has no revolutionary objectives with regard to socio-political change, although it may fulfill counter-revolutionary functions if class conflicts or disputes between social and political elites become widespread. The restoration of constitutional conditions, which is the objective of emergency legislation, often signifies the hardening of a socioeconomic status quo and may encourage revolutionary forces within a country to intensify their attacks upon the existing political and social order. The following historical instances of constitutional dictatorship are often cited. First, the classical legal dictatorship of the early Roman Republic in which one of the consuls appointed the dictator, upon the motion of the Senate, for a term of no more than

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

six months and entrusted him with the task of defending or restoring constitutional order. He became, in effect, an extraordinary constitutional organ and remained bound by the laws. Second, the exercise of power by the medieval Italian commissioners, who were appointed by a sovereign prince in conformity with the constitutional order and were given extraordinary powers to act on his behalf. Research interests and problems

Legitimacy The issue of the legitimacy of dictatorial systems has often been discussed in terms of the relation of the dictatorship to tradition, to law, and to the constitution [see Legitimacy]. Practically every historical dictatorship has tried to justify its existence, its methods, and its measures. In many cases where the dictatorship tried to secure legitimation by appealing to a law that it created, the attempt failed, because the leadership, the state organs, and the administration always succumbed to the impulsive element in decision making. Whenever they have been unable to appeal to tradition, to natural law, to customary or existing law, they have endeavored to legitimize the despotic exercise of power either, in an existential, Machiavellian vein, as the exalted art of building a state and directing society; or else, on a more pretentious ideological plane, as the expression of a communal order predestined by providence or by historical evolution. The charismatic element has always been a major factor in efforts to legitimize dictatorship. Dictators and their aides have time and again managed to achieve an identification of broad strata of the population with the rulers, especially whenever they have manipulated the democratic means for the expression of public opinion popular assemblies, plebiscites, and parliamentary elections. In the process they have imposed extraordinary restrictions on the freedoms of the citizens. Social structure and mobility The problems of the interdependence of the political and social orders found in the various dictatorships are another subject of lively contemporary discussion. It is widely recognized that dictatorships are able to change social structure, provided they have sociopolitical ambitions and approach the solution of social and economic problems with progressive goals and programs. This applies not only to the various systems of modern mass dictatorship in which, as under Soviet rule, some social classes workers, peasants, and the working intellectuals have an economically and politically dominant function, while others the petty bourgeoisie are assigned a tributary function, and still others disappear completely the nobility, the upper class; it also applies to the systems of elite-dominated, authoritarian dictatorship. The very formation of a new political and economic ruling class from the leading elites, bureaucrats, and political functionaries that are needed to run the state apparatus can serve as an index of social-class formation in these systems of government. But little research has been done thus far on the specific forms of social mobility in societies that are dictatorially manipulated. The rise from the lower classes may be due to advancement within the political organization as well as to active participation in solving the economic problems of these achievement-oriented societies. Political sociology is interested in ascertaining the social and political composition of the ruling class and of the larger groupings from which members of the elite are drawn; in determining how change in this composition is effected; and in discovering the causes of conflicts within the elite and how they are resolved. The conquest of a foreign country or its political penetration—a common occurrence of the last fifty years—may place large sections of the conquered population in the role of an oppressed class. The only way to maintain such a situation is by the use of adequate military, police, and administrative instruments of power. Otherwise, the social structure and the national consciousness of the conquered country must be transformed by political—ideological infiltration in the image of the conquering society. The establishment of satellite states and political satrapies and their relationship to the respective autocratic or totalitarian central state is, therefore, an interesting problem for research.

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

6: Totalitarianism | www.enganchecubano.com

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.

Written by Julio M. Shiling Ideology, as a comprehensive set of ideas, helps explain how one sees the world, where it comes from and is headed and where it stands. For some, ideology is a genuine belief system, while for others it is, functionally, simply political discourse. The culture it invariably breeds renders irrelevant, in practice, which understanding society has of ideological dogma. All three utopian-premised movements, in pursuit of ideology, embraced totalitarianism as its "modus operandi". Key to establishing and maintaining the totalitarian apparatus is organization. While the mirage of its existence appears so to the non-totalitarian world, the craft of organization is perfected through the forced compliance of the established rules, official guidelines, and the high cost of dissent. The art of totalitarianism, notes prominent professor and former U.S. Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick, is "organizing political power. Avtorkhanov as citing, "The strength of the Communist regime resides Organization is the mechanism. Politics escapes nothing in a totalitarian-run society. Society now becomes divided into the integrated with the movement or the enemy nonconforming. In *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Hannah Arendt highlights the typical totalitarian hierarchical composition in essentially six levels. It presents, at all times, in all aspects two faces: At the bottom level are the fellow-travelers. These are mostly compiled by those who support the totalitarian regime and its objectives but typically live outside its territorial compounds. The fellow-travelers are instruments of the system mostly used for marketing benefits generated in its dealings with the non-totalitarian world. The power that they generate in the internal structure is minimal but their influence can be exceptional, dependent upon the value the regime places on their services at any given time. The front organizations are the next strata. Unlike authoritarian regimes, which are much more isolationists and do not concern themselves with imagery, totalitarian systems are quite susceptible to appearance maintenance. The image is not inhospitable to change. The radicalness of its ideological underpinning assures the movement the sufficient margin to mold itself and its means, to facilitate the attainment of its ends. Front organizations serve that purpose masterfully both for the internal world totalitarian and its external counterpart non-totalitarian. This sophisticated stratagem formulates for the captive society a mechanism of control and filter. Being themselves mass organizations penetrated, run and choreographed by the ruling single party, they have no autonomy outside of the official dogma. There is a front organization for workers, one for students, a paramilitary watchdog committee, and another for women, etc. Advances in the workplace, school, and access to housing, commodities, etc. Society is controlled and their level of integration with the movement revolution is meticulously noted and measured. They, therefore, serve as filters which the movement separates the perceived conforming from the non-conforming. Front organizations are the facade which the non-totalitarian world sees in foreign conferences and seek to give the appearance of equivalency with their counterparts of the Free World. Image maintenance is crucial for the sustenance of the totalitarian regime. The appearance of normalcy, which the totalitarian face seeks to project to those on the outside, is presented by the front organizations. It is their function in their dealing with the non-totalitarian world. Their existence is imperative for any totalitarian regime. The next layer, which itself contains three different tiers, is the most relevant. Societies in totalitarian regimes are divided, as was cited earlier, into two categories: Within those integrated with the movement are further varying degrees of movement-assimilation. The draconian role of the party in every aspect of totalitarian life can not be understated. Renowned Italian Marxist Gramsci wrote in *Prison Notebooks* referring to the party and their role in society: But the varying stratus qualifies them. This strata itself contains three differing tiers within the totalitarian apparatus. Membership in the party is a prerequisite for any position of power in the regime. Absolutely every high-ranking member of the armed forces, high-level government position must be a party

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

member. After the general members of the party, Communist or Nazi, are elite party formations. The secret police differing names may apply given differing regimes is the following layer. The secret police obeys its own rules and penetrates all levels of the party. They are the enforcers of democratic centralism, as well as in charge of internal espionage not just the opposition, but also the military, government and other party members and external non-totalitarian world. This elite institution is secretly feared, particularly by other general party members civil, military, government, etc. Following the secret police in the totalitarian network is the next phase in party membership: This higher totalitarian echelon forms an intimate circle around the "leader. They also are autonomous from the rest of the party and also report directly to the "leader. They, like the regular secret police, are armies outside the armed forces and governments within the government, all with the absolute power curtailed in the totalitarian chain of command, only by the "leader" himself. At that point, the "leader" level is the epic of power within totalitarianism organizational structure. There the subject rules without the obstruction of any written law and embodies the movement, which is by this point the party and the state, with its laws and ideological abstractions. The "leader" contrives to incarnate the nation as well. The complete totalitarian hierarchical structure is configured so as to accommodate totalitarianism rule as willed by the tyrant. It is the absolute perversion of power. Through this elaborate organization of society, political power is contrived in such a way as to assure minimal space for effective dissent and a very narrow route for material advancement: The most relevant factor to assure that society has only that extremely narrow route for moving space is the party. Without the structural existence of the Communist and Nazi parties, totalitarianism could not and cannot be exercised. It is the indispensable contexture of the totalitarian wall. It bears no resemblance de facto or de jure to its semantic counterpart in the Free World. The totalitarian party is a process of steady osmosis, unlawfully violent revolutionary, i. Bolsheviks or legalistically nonviolent constitutionally. Nazis , which commences from an ideological movement then converts itself, once approaching or having gained power to a party. The next step in the process is the appropriation of the state. This is the springboard to disseminate the totalitarian reign. The party-state can, at this point, spread, on a broad spectrum basis, the tenets of the ideology by attempting to institutionalize the counterculture domestically and, universally, present the state with its legitimacy mask, as the face for the non-totalitarian world. The state is, for non-totalitarian world purposes, the "dejure" governing body. The party is, without a doubt, the "defacto" sovereign. Buchheim brilliantly observed, the term "party" neither arises from the theory of the totalitarian claim to power nor does it fit into the totalitarian ruling system; rather it belongs to the concept of the free political life, especially of democracy. In contrast, National Socialists and Communists have characterized themselves The "movement" is the typical form representing the totalitarian claim to power in politics. To the extent that such a political reality includes a democratic constitution, the movement can also represent itself as a party. But it is not a genuine party After the seizure of power But it is an artificial meaning After its "seizure of power" the totalitarian movement converts the state, which until then had been its enemy, into its slave. The movement maintains that it alone represents the will of a people or a class, and it deprives the state of its existence as a sovereign legal institution. Totalitarianism carries out its politics, not within the framework of governmental order, but beyond all norms, and in this endeavor it employs the state simply as a tool whenever such manipulation appears useful. The edifice that sustains totalitarianism, and its repressive tenet, is, as was earlier cited, the party. The subservience of the state to the party is one of the bedrock features in that building of totalitarian despotism. The idea of democratic centralism was conjectured by the father of Communist praxis, Vladimir Lenin. Premised on instigating non-factionalism, the end result was tyranny of the party. The application of the principle heavily favored the "centralism" at the expense of the "democratic" in order to muzzle dissent and to dictate hierarchical decisions. With the abolition of factions, inner party dissent was eliminated. This political ambiance breeds coherently a "cult" around the "personality" figure of the "leader. Just as the party is the key to totalitarianism. The secret police is the sustenance of the totalitarian party. They are enforcers of democratic centralism. The party was, as democratic centralism required, no exception. Despite ideological differences, the totalitarian secret police was synonymous in its application and

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

service to the maintenance of absolute tyranny. Hitler found himself loyally supported throughout by Himmler and his guards SS. He therefore made the SS into an autonomous organization within the party, directly reporting to him, and providing the party with the firm backbone that a totalitarian regime requires. It has become quite clear in course of time, the SS managed to infiltrate various key positions in party and government, especially the military and economic cadres. Their presence is awesome, secret and everywhere. Former Yugoslav communist Milovan Djilas, totalitarianism targets not just "actual" enemies but also "potential" ones.

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

7: Dictator | www.enganchecubano.com

Understanding Totalitarian Rule by Julio M. Shiling Ideology, as a comprehensive set of ideas, helps explain how one sees the world, where it comes from and is headed and where it stands. For some, ideology is a genuine belief system, while for others it is, functionally, simply political discourse.

The individual capacity for comprehension was overwhelmed, and the nature and extent of these programmes added to the surreal nature of the revelations. In the case of the dedicated death camps of the so-called Aktion Reinhard, comparatively sparse documentation and very low survival rates obscured their significance in the immediate post-war years. The remaining death camps, Majdanek and Auschwitz, were both captured virtually intact. They were thus widely reported, whereas public knowledge of Auschwitz was already widespread in Germany and the Allied countries during the war. Nonetheless it had the effect of throwing into relief the machinery of destruction rather than its anonymous victims, for the extermination system had not only eliminated human biological life but had also systematically expunged cumulative life histories and any trace of prior existence whatsoever, ending with the destruction of almost all traces of the dedicated extermination camps themselves, just prior to the Soviet invasion. Moreover, unlike previous regimes of terror, totalitarianism does not merely aim to eliminate physical life. In other words, total terror aims to eliminate the total life-world of the species, leaving few survivors either willing or able to relate their stories. Conversely, many survivors were disinclined to speak out. Incredulity was thus both a prevalent and understandable human reaction to the attempted total destruction of entire peoples, and in the post-war era the success of this Nazi strategy reinforced a culture of denial that perpetuated the victimisation of the survivors. However this war may end, we have won the war against you; none of you will be left to bear witness, but even if someone were to survive, the world will not believe him. There will be perhaps suspicions, discussions, research by historians, but there will be no certainties, because we will destroy the evidence together with you. The silence following the war was therefore quite literal, and the publication of *Origins* could not and did not set out to bridge that chasm in the human imagination. It did, however, establish Arendt as the most authoritative and controversial theorist of the totalitarian. From an early stage in its development, Arendt was sensitive to the inherent danger of dismissing Nazi ideology as an incoherent form of virulent nationalism. She viewed Nazi ideology, as indeed all totalitarian ideologies, as both coherent and internally consistent. Nevertheless, *Origins* yields a whole range of innovative insights that Schmitt could not have developed beyond a preliminary analysis in the work *Staat, Bewegung, Volk*. Thus he argues that In the sociological and ideological analyses of totalitarianism qua novel contemporary phenomenon Hannah Arendt, Talmon, C. Friedrich, Brzezinski a dialectical moment may be discerned in the evolution of terminology. If the concept of totality is not merely quantitative but instead consists of a specific intensity of organised power, then it is not the state, but strictly a party that constitutes the subject and protagonist of totalitarianism. In these circumstances, part of the erstwhile totality confronts the latter as a new totality and demotes the state to a mere quantitative totality. Accordingly, the historical dialectic brings about a negation of the erstwhile totality by a part thereof, whereas the latter asserts its status as something more than the pre-existing totality. In this sense, there are no totalitarian states, only totalitarian parties. This will be the guiding theme of this chapter. Totalitarian rule is thus distinguished from the mere imposition of an arbitrary personal will characteristic of tyranny, instead actively mobilising the population, even as it eliminates coexisting loyalties as well as autonomous institutional and social spaces. *Origins* routinely elicited the charge of Cold War-mongering, not least of all by those least flattered by the comparison. It was only with the collapse of Soviet Communism in that scholars would embark upon a fundamental reassessment of the Stalin years, a project that is still in process. It was not without irony, therefore, that many partisans of the Soviet cause felt themselves compelled to defend all of Soviet history, as indeed the unfolding of the promise of the October Revolution, a view shared as axiomatic by anti-Communists. Her refusal to concede anything to the seed of totalitarian ideology,

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

and its harvest of untold corpses, met with widespread incomprehension and hostility. In that, fortunately, she was wrong. For her critics point to the markedly different forms of and roles played by anti-Semitism and imperialism in German and Soviet history. In other words, Arendt has something to say of general theoretical and philosophical significance and she is not attempting to write a comparative history of the Nazi and Stalinist dictatorships. At the heart of her account lies her insight that both dictatorships revealed a proclivity for transforming ideological systems of thought into deductive principles of action. Critics on both the historical Left and Right have also, and quite rightly, stressed that the contents of the Nazi and Stalinist ideologies are fundamentally distinct; a fact of which Arendt was well aware. This process may generate both refugees and corpses. The destruction of the public realm of politics by tyrannical government condemns both the tyrant and his subjects to a condition of isolation, arbitrary rule and powerlessness. Conversely, although totalitarianism, like tyranny, eliminates the public realm, it also eliminates the ground for sustainable relations of power. The destruction of the individual capacity for action complements a complex dynamic of ideological compulsion and popular plebiscitary rule that implicates the totalitarian subjects in the policies of the regime. A declaration of war on ideology

Once the human collective is redefined in terms of the ideological imperatives of race or class – i. Certainly the Soviet purges and Nazi street massacres in Eastern Europe attest to the potential for a regime of violent terror. Nonetheless, Arendt argues that the relation established between the ruler and the ruled – established by the novel device of total domination – is both more complex and equivocal than it might appear. Moreover, unlike the tyrant, the totalitarian dictator is typically a popular figure and thus bound to his potential victims, who constitute society. Ideology plays a crucial role in all of this. Moreover, it would not be an exaggeration to claim that *Origins* is a declaration of war on ideology. However, as Margaret Canovan has noted, it is also a proof of a profound and troubling paradox. But the paradox of totalitarian novelty was that it represented an assault on that very ability to act and think as a unique individual. For on the one hand, she argues that the nation-state, which has become virtually synonymous with political modernity, constitutes a barrier to the anti-state ambitions of the totalitarian movements. On the other hand, however, she is scathingly critical of the nation-state, which she views as something akin to an excrescence of political modernity. Totalitarianism and the nation-state

The modern European nation-state is accorded great significance by Arendt as an obstacle to totalitarian rule. However, as I shall argue in the remainder of this study, nothing could be further from the truth. However, in her attempts to come to terms with the totalitarian phenomenon, she embarked upon a fundamental reassessment of the modern nation-state that culminated in her embrace of the federal principle, as it emerged in the writings of the Founding Fathers and in the early political settlement that constituted the United States of America. It is nonetheless also true that this theoretical turn remained largely implicit in *Origins*. To understand why Arendt viewed the nation-state as part of the problem rather than as part of its solution, we need firstly to understand why Arendt rejected the nation-state as a basis for reconstituting the political in the wake of totalitarianism. Moreover, her most concise formulation of the fundamental problem underlying her totalitarianism thesis is not contained in *Origins*, but in a little noted but highly significant essay published shortly after the war. The brief review of J. In the latter work, Arendt introduces her classic analysis of the decline of the nation-state, which culminates in her account of the crippling impact of both European imperialism and the First World War on the comity of European nation-states. To understand how Arendt came to this view, the modest little essay in question proves to be highly instructive. Secondly, she identifies a theme that was to play an important and controversial role in her analysis of totalitarianism: Henceforth, the identification of nation and state generated a tension between the territorial state qua legal institution protecting the rights of citizens and the rights of nationals. As a legal institution, the state only recognises the rights of citizens, no matter what their nationality. This brief review is fascinating for several reasons. Arendt engages an enduring preoccupation with the interrelation between nation, state, nationalism, imperialism and totalitarianism. As the sovereignty of the nation was shaped after the model of the sovereignty of the individual, so the sovereignty of the state as national state was the representative and in its totalitarian forms the monopolizer of both. The state

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

conquered by the nation became the supreme individual before which all other individuals had to bow. For as long as the state retained its sovereign power and political primacy, this development went unnoticed. However, the rise of nationalism during the nineteenth century undermined the sovereignty of the state until, finally, the nation asserted its sovereignty over the state. By successfully challenging the sovereignty of the state, the nation not only asserted its sovereignty over the state, but also fundamentally transformed the state. Anticipating a key finding of *Origins*, Arendt argues that totalitarianism has exposed the folly inherent in attempts to reconcile nation and state. She contends, accordingly, that the post-war refashioning of legal state institutions presupposes the distinction between the citizen and the national, between the political order and the national order. Arendt concludes her review by criticising Delos for focusing on the relation between nationalism and totalitarianism, whilst occluding the question of imperialism. The boundless dynamism of totalitarian rule is antithetical to the liberal institutionalisation of political rule as well as its territorially finite state, whose legal guarantees of civil and political rights presuppose a stable constitutional order. In his *Second Book*: The foreign policy of the bourgeois world is in truth always only focused on borders, whereas the National Socialist movement, in contrast, will pursue a policy focused on space. The National Socialist movement knows no Germanization but only the expansion of our own people. The national conception will not be determined by previous patriotic notions of state, but rather by ethnic and racial conceptions. The division of territory on the earth is always the momentary result of a struggle and an evolution that is in no way finished, but that naturally continues to progress. Hitler in *Bartov* Hitler, it should be noted, wrote this in *From this perspective, the idealisation of the state is not only antithetical to the Nazi project but would in fact constitute a deliverance from its most radical objectives. Hitler early on identified the bourgeois territorial state first and foremost as an obstacle to his ideological goals. Arendt is arguing that however imperfectly, the modern nation-state has performed the function of the ancient polis. By attacking the institutions of the state, the totalitarian movements gauged, correctly as it turned out, the one great vulnerability of the bourgeois nation-state in the post-World War One era; namely, its complete lack of defences in the face of extra-parliamentary and extra-legal challenges to state authority. Developments in the Soviet Union were markedly different and more complex, although there too, war and revolution had shattered its neo-feudal class system. Anti-semitism and imperialism in nineteenth-century Europe Bolshevism and Nazism at the height of their power outgrew mere tribal nationalism and had little use for those who were still actually convinced of it in principle, rather than as mere propaganda material. This is not a view that is universally shared. And yet this passage is deserving of a contextual reading. Indeed, as Arendt repeatedly stresses, comprehension means examining and bearing consciously the burden that events have placed upon us neither denying their existence nor submitting meekly to their weight as though everything that in fact happened could not have happened otherwise. The irreversibility of what happened does not mean that it could not have happened differently. This is especially true of her controversial account of the former, which distinguishes between historical forms of religious and social anti-Semitism on the one hand, and the Nazi ideology of biological racism on the other. She contends that prior to the advent of Nazism, anti-Semitism played a purely secondary role in European history and politics, and was of far less significance than the phenomena of imperialism and class politics. None of this would have been possible, or at least very likely, would it not have been for the devastation of total war, which transformed the landscape of possibilities in post-war Germany much as the Bolshevik Revolution itself no small miracle of history blasted away the detritus of a reified tradition. From a present-day perspective, the Nazi genocide of European Jewry, Sinti and Roma, and homosexuals seems all but inevitable. Yet despite the enormity and sheer horror of the Nazi mass crimes, they entered popular Western consciousness relatively late, and only began to play a central role in Western historiography more than a decade after the war. In various different contexts, and in all of her works, Arendt challenges deterministic philosophies of history that reduce the unprecedented to precedents. She illustrates this point with a startling analogy. For the cataclysm that was Nazi rule was a fusion of novel forms of ideology and political organisation, which attained its most concentrated expression in the death*

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

factories for the production of human corpses. If this destructive phenomenon could now seem to have been predictable, this is only because we have recovered our senses following the first shock of discovery. Arendt contends that the acquisition of empire undermined the national political institutions of the imperial states and fundamentally transformed the balance of forces and interests that had sustained the latter for much of political modernity. Arendt cites an interesting precedent in this regard. Similarly, European Jewry was tolerated within the national body politic for as long as its pseudo-bourgeoisie served a demonstrable public function in the comity of European nation-states. Conversely, their Jewish counterparts were, first and foremost, ethnic and religious outsiders whose tenuous social status was an exclusive function of their economic usefulness. This signified the transformation of social and religious anti-Semitism into a political creed that served as the organising principle of mass political movements.

THE EVOLVING THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES, BY C. J. FRIEDRICH. pdf

Speeches, Articles, Interviews Walt Disneys Animated Features and Silly Symphonies Literature in Vienna at the Turn of the Centuries Pioneering the Snake River fork country Japanese submarine force and World War II TEACHERS GUIDE FOR REUBEN and FIRE Principles and practice of radiation oncology 6th edition A ticket to Nigeria Bearings and Lubrication Caught by the Turks And He Chose Them Faces of the disenfranchised Bergsma Clinical Delineation of Birth Defects Muscle Statistical Measures Flurothyl convulsive therapy The obligations of children and parents Wilson American Government Essentials With Upgrade Cdrom Ninth Edition Plus Cigler American Politics Federal aid for the Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers The cold world loves not my love : 1895-1900 Jeedarra country. From neuron to brain 5th edition zip Environmental management in construction Franklin Silas Terry (1862-1926), industrialist Fat cats craft and coloring book Bugler Officer of the Rifles-with the 95th Rifles during the Peninsular Waterloo campaigns of the Napoleo Eenadu telugu calendar 2014 Letter 82, Owen to Avery, May 18 Monitoring populations of Shoshonea pulvinata in the Pryor and Beartooth Mountains, Carbon County, Montan Policy, practice and teacher experience Special edition of the 9/11 Commission report On great writing (On the sublime) Almost single Strawberry Shortcake and the butterfly garden Makers of Modern Europe Evolution for Creationists Math quiz bee questions for high school with answers Writings of Daniel Berrigan Look whos cooking Looking Good Families (Norelco Box) The case of the pizza pie spy