Sultanistic regimes, an appropriate model for leaving the problems of bilateral explanations of authoritarianism and totalitarianism

Shiva Jalalpour

PhD student, Department of Law and Political Science, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran. Shiva.jalalpoor@yahoo.com

Abstract: Reviewing the history for the structure of power in the 3rd world expresses the principles of long time existence of non-democratic systems in power. Hence we observe the establishment of Eastern despotic models , Eastern inheriting sultanistic regimes, Asian inheriting despotism and the theories of sultanate systems, expressing this type of structure of power .The theory of sultanistic regimes is a rather modern model , with numerous and different characteristics , than other views , benefiting more strong points and less errors. Therefore , this article is dealing with considering this theory.

1. Formation of the theory of sultanistic regimes

The concept of sultanistic regimes was created by the conformity analysis of Juan Linz about non-democratic systems. By observing the differences between Franco's regime and Trujillo's regime due to visiting an exiled Spaniard called Jesus De Galindez, who had analyzed the secret performances of Trujillo's regime, he expressed a type of political system and selected the expression of "Weber sultanate system", for it.(J. Linz, and H. Chehabi , 1380:15-16)

The most important characteristics of Trujillo's system, in inspiring the primary formulation of the concept of sultanistic regimes , include: government individualism, loyalty due to apprehension and rewards , intervention in economy, widespread corruption, centralism, formation of private army, combination of public and private roles, developing military relations with the U.S.A , presence of sovereignty crisis, obstinate decision making and maintaining legal out looks, establishing the titles of "his highness", Dr. Trujillo", "Honorable president", "Supporter of the nation", "Provider of the country's financial independence", etc,… But, his seeming obligation for discipline, establishing an integrated national government and economic nationalism led to the general admission of his nation. (j. Linz,1970: 255-90)

Linz believes that:" The differences between sultanistic regimes and totalitarianism is not only referred to the rat of difference, but generally politics from the view point of the relevant rulers to the structure of power related to social and economic structures and the related people to such sovereignty." (j.j.Linz, 1975)

He believes that in contrast to sultanistic regimes, totalitarian systems are expressed as a real ideology, by the enlightened people supporting the system, to provide legitimacy and establish the policies, and the leaders and their followers believe in their prophecy and show a mortifying view of themselves. The possibility of gathering policies is provided by the party, subordinate organizations, such as the youth organizations, women's organ, etc. and the base for promoting partnership in the community is established and influential aspects are fulfilled in different fields of the community in quite a harmonious manner. (j.Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380:57-60)

The most important differences of authoritarian and sultanistic regimes include: Due to existence of limited social and political pluralism in authoritarian systems, the opportunity of selecting the elite is provided from among different structures, but the arbitrary method by the ruler in sultanistic regimes in selecting the assistants, lack of predictable ways for occupational progress and trivial supportive structures is in contradiction with authoritarian systems. (j.Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380: 60-1)

Distinctions between the people having political authorities and the individuals performing actions related to the modern government, in authoritarian systems, is possible by politicizing the community, but the ambiguity for the boundaries between the system and the government is evident in sultanistic regimes

2. Sultanistic regimes according to Max Weber and other:

According To Weber: "Each dominant tries to arise legitimacy for himself, among the followers". (J. Freund, 1362:240)

In this way, he defined the word "legitimacy" for the first time (A. Nabavi , 1379 :448) and recognized 3 types of legitimate domination.

In moral political system, which is known as" the most impersonal type of domination"(J. Freund, 1362:240), power is due to a set of organized regulations, related to positions and based on individual merits. Weber has referred to Rudolph Sohm (M. Weber,1382:62) for the word "Charisma", that is the specific characteristic of a person separated from ordinary people due to these characteristics, and uses this word for a person that his capabilities or ultra natural, extraordinary and exclusive character. (M. Weber, 1374:397) Hence the center of such system is the charismatic leader that obtains his legitimacy by the admission of public. (A .Bakhshayeshi, 1376:97)

According to Weber, the oldest type of legitimacy is based on the sanctity of tradition (M. Weber, 1368: 100, M. Weber, 1374: 42), I.E. the domination of the traditions that "have got sanctity from the old ages, due to acceptance and admissions". (H.Gerth and C.Wright Mills, 1970:78-90) According to Weber the traditional domain has a bilateral field: "The holy tradition and the ruler's authorities". According to Weber; "Patrimonialism is" a form of traditional political sovereignty that a royal family performs cruel power by a judicial establishment".(A.Ashraf ,1347:12)Ahmad Ashraf recognizes the basic for creation of Patriomonialism by the Weber's point of view as the construction of power known as royal father, that means if the political system lacks administrative officers, it will be called Patriarchy and if the system has administrative organization, it will be called patrimonial or Feodal. (A.Ashraf, 1347:12)

Like Ashraf, Turner believes: "By expansion of the roles and judicial duties, the patrimonial ruler has to assign a large no of workers as slaves inside its judicial system. It is why that patrimony is transformed to inheriting domain. (S.Hajariyan, NO.91-92:45-57)

Kirth and Mills point to a second basis, which is establishing the royal specific rights, which is based on the respect of the sovereign power. (S.Hajariyan, NO.91-92: 46)

The most important specifications of Patrimonilism include: Being close to bureaucratic that lacks mental and technical element and is the private tool of the ruler, and the uncontested parade of the ruler in economic and social field without any responsibilities for maintaining boundaries and classic obstacles, intermediately capital growth and

fear from faithful factors. In addition to introducing a specific type of Patrimonialism, Weber believes that: "In case of extraordinary power of the master, Patrimonialism tends to sultanate, Friends are transformed to peasants, the master's right that up to them was considered the head of the followers, is transformed to the personal right of the master and if the patrimonial supremacy relies on the authority and autocracy without observing the tradition, it is called the royal supremacy." (A.Azghandi, 1384:27-9. M. Weber, 1374 :329)

It is also said that: "Apparently the royal form of Patrimonialism is sometimes completely dependent on tradition, but it is never in real estate."(M. Weber, 1374:329)

Hence we observe a paradox from one side, Weber place the traditional basis of Patrimonialism in unfrontation with the personal authority in sultanistic regimes and on the on the other side recognizes monarchies as totally dependent on tradition. Goodin and scotchpoul believe: "A new patrimonial and sultanistic engine is a system that the power is in the hands of a dictator ruler that never allows the deployment of any groups with political stabilities in a political atmosphere"(S.Hajariyan, NO.91-92: 48)

Scholochter recognizes" The sultanistic regimes as a kind of extremist Patrimonilism, in which the authorities of the king is overrated.(M. Weber and others,1379:10)

Turner believes": Whenever the patrimonial authority could be released from tradition limits, it is called sultanate"(S.Hajariyan, NO.91-92: 48)

Roth also knows "The personal sovereignty as a type of de-traditionalized Patrimonialism".(P. Broker,1383,P.92)

Hajarian believes that "according to Linz, if a patrimonial government is restored trivially it gradually gets closer to sultanate ". (S.Hajariyan, NO.91-92: 48)

But Linz and Chehabi believe: "A system with some sultanistic regimes inclination that has expanded loop of followers, but the freedom and authority of the ruler is less, should be named as new Patrimonialsm and when this loop is getting tighter, this system me be transformed to sultanate system". (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi1380: 27-8, 18)

As defined, some researchers according to Hajarian namely Weber, Turner, Scholocher ,Routh and Linz -recognize the extreme state of Patrimonialism as sultanate system and some other including Goodin, and scotchpaul believe in the similarity of new Patrimonialism and sultanate, while some others including Linz and Chehabi recognize the new patriomonial extremism as sultanistic regimes .

3. Sultanistic regime by Juan Linz and Houshang Chehabi theory:

Some characteristics of the idealist type of contemporary sultanistic regimes from the view points of Linz and Chehabi:

Faithful motivations as a combination of fear and awards, (j.Linz, and H.Chehabi1380: 21)

Applying the ruler's power arbitrarily, with no legal abstraction or ideological obligations, weakening the obligating manners by personal decisions, Promoting corruption, selection of administrative and military personal by the ruler-independence of the ruler and his followers from any specific group-weakened legitimacy and lack of ideological justifications. In addition to the above points, Linz and Chehabi recognize 5 common characteristics of sultanistic regimes as: Tension regarding the boundaries between the system and the government, individualism, legal hypocrisy, limited social places, altered capitalism.

Tension regarding the boundaries between the system and the government:

system, with the meaning of gathering and combing(A.Biro, 1375:419) is a set of non-materialist elements depending in each other that by combination of the elements an organized combination is created and "the relevant commands are fulfilled in defined geographical limit".(A.Ghavam,1374:64.A.Alam,1373:150)Linz and Chehabi defines the system as "allocated models of power, using and misusing power in government "and recognize its inclusions as something more than the constitution of power in a democratic system and less than expanded structures of dominations in totalitarian system(j. Linz, and H.Chehabi,1380:28)

and express 3 fields of bureaucratic structures, armed forces organization and parties as the sub-systems.

Bureaucratic structures:

The most important characteristics of it include: Direct intervention of the ruler and the assistants in the structures and not considering the vocational standards ,lack or distorting moral norms ,apparent existence of modern bureaucracy, entering the technocrats in to the system with the aim to please Americans supporters ,replacing non-political and non-authorized aspects for political disorders, agreeing with somewhat rationalizing affairs for increasing the capability of resource exploitations, loyalty of an official is the loyalty of a servant based on a precisely personal relation to the ruler(j. Linz, and H.Chehabi,1380:32) lack of employment security.

Armed forces organization:

In this field, we observe: Ruler's actions to extend mistrust among different branches of army providing spies among the armed forces personal, establishing private militias, lack of unique commands, lack or distorting of promoting criteriones. In this way, the armed forces leave their professional condition.

(j. Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380:32)

The party organization:

In such systems, we observe a single party system by the ruler. The name of the party could indicate "The efforts of the ruler to show the system, as for the revolutionary movement leader". (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380:35) Thus the party does not follow the normal trends and lacks legitimacy, Political selections and arranging the strategies.

Individualism:

It means that the person benefits from a complex of social and individual qualities and the community provides the individuality and possession of power.

Individualism has the two aspects of personality faith and inclination towards family orientation. (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380:35)

Personality faith:

includes the following :These leaders lack the wise leadership arrays and therefore tend towards establishing new titles for themselves and like to be considered as great intellectuals, Thus lots of books are filled by their notes and lectures and speeches and many books are published in their names and the selective ideology should be: legitimizing and reflecting of individualism and consists of the name of the ruler and benefits an inventing tradition to distinguish the nation from the neighborhood. More over" whatever the sultanate aspects are more pure, it will be more possible that the ideology is formed to justify the rulers. (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380: 37-8) the leader likes to have his name and picture and his interesting objects to gain the required authority in all over the country.

Inclination towards family orientation is due to the lack of social tribal, social economic trusting supports of monarchs. Humiliating looks of the elite to these leaders force them in addition to getting rid of some of the elite people, to gain the cooperation of a part of them by providing family unities and homogeneities with old elite and outstanding people.

Legal hypocrisy means that the leader seemingly respects the laws and "benefits from any opportunities to enlight democracy, although he presents some other concepts for it"

(j. Linz, and H.Chehabi,1380: 45) They are in the place That the governmental responsibilities are undertaken by others, intervention in elections, violating civil liberties of different groups , referring to public votes by the aim of representing democratic

society and proving legitimacy and the views of a charismatic leader are among the other indications in this regard.

Limited social base:

Social aspect is a condition that anyone obtains in social structure by the merit of social evaluations. (A.Nikgohar, 1375:64.B.Sarukhani, 1370:729. A. Biro, 1375:380-1)

Linz and Chehabi believe that the leaders of sultanistic regimes get into the power by the support of quite specific groups, but they do not attempt in maintaining the primary supports and deliberately try to omit the supports, since the individual -oriented nature of such governments requires the sense of not needing the coalition with the existing groups in the civil community. Therefore: "They lose their primary social supports and rely on fear and awards".(j. Linz, and H.Chehabi,1380:49)But the ruler provides supports from two domestic groups, family members & friends and the residence in the place of birth and a foreign group; mainly U.S.A with regards to his personal authorities. (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380:51)

Distorted capitalism:

The first point of capitalism is the primary savings, (Chilkut, 1375:13) but the sultanistic regimes "Prevents savings of the capital "by weakening responsibilities. (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380:56)

Thus, we observe the individualistic use of power for the purposes that are mainly personal for the ruler and his followers, concluding generous contracts between the ruler's economic establishments and the government, exclusive ownership of vital materials, ignoring contracts, evident confiscation of people's properties and assets, and the dependent economy for intervening the government is through controlling principle servicing. Wise economic activities are also for the aim of maximizing economic   profit abilities" (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380:56)

4. The reasons of formation of sultanistic regimes according to Linz and Chehabi:

Linz and Chehabi point to 3 factors, in the reasons for creation of these systems: macro structures-social_ economic conditions & international atmosphere (ruling crisis), fundamental political factors & leadership.

Marco-structures:

From the view point of Linz and Chehabi, stability of sultanate system requires renovation of transport systems, military organizations and some offices to supply financial sources. Seclusion of rural population and lack and/or poor education is necessary for their effective obedience. (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380: 64) Therefore, the restoration of the 3 fields of transportation and communication,

military organization, bureaucracy and sociology analysis of the rural areas are emphasized. Contrary to Weber, they believe in the importance of the economic factor. They believe: the financial resources of the governments in small countries could be expanded via customs charges and in more complex communities, the financial resources are provided by the parts not needing work force in large industries, clients, modern administration systems, civilization, expanding of education, and the natural resources with easy exploitations and high profits that belong to one or more institutions are considered as proper financial and income sources. (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380:65) Also "the foreign aids or loans (in case of having no peculiar conditions) could encourage corruption". (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380: 66)

Sovereignty is the supreme power to issue commands. Linz and Chehabi believe that the "independence of such countries are somewhat vague and they are not respected by more powerful neighborhoods." (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi,1380:68)

They believe that" The internal crisis and instabilities provide the conditions primarily that facilitates the interventions of foreign powers and then the foreign interventions lead to creation of systems that replace internal collations for foreign supports and could lead to sultanistic regimes. Therefore the sovereignty crisis originated from domestic conditions ends up in increasing the crisis in the community macro-structure and by revealing the in efficiency of the existing structures, the mentality would be provided for the necessity in changes in the structures by an efficient and strong government.

Fundamental political factors:

An organization or a foundation is a sub-system of official groups (P. Meyer, 1375: 126) and "a type of human relations model forming materialistic and realistic relations "(M.Dovorje, 1376:118), with the aim to provide human requirements. Hence, the necessity for organizing constitutions is to be considered. Linz and Chehabi believe that " sultanistic regimes do not have specific constitution. (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi, 1380:78) Of course they mean that in such systems, the establishments are deviated from their own special tasks and are totally placed under the considered plans of the ruler.

Thus the ruler's dominations influence the establishments. They believe the supporting democracy collapse and dissolution of non-democratic systems leads to sultanistic regimes. The most important characteristics of supportive democracy include: Existence of multi-party system and entering or leaving the numerous parties to or from politics and facilitating the process for the

involvement of the elite. Thus the privatization of power structure would reduce. They believe that by the collapse of supportive democracy. The no. of supporters would reduce to only one supporter". (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi,1380:78) Such that: The possibility of parties (non-governmental parties) is provided by replacement of supportive democracy, in addition to maintaining the appearance of the former government, but the permanent dominance of a governmental party leads to dissolution of constitutions, monopolization of resources in the hands of the ruling party and individualism, and also the lack of obligation of the parties in these systems with regards to the party's ideologies could lead to concentration of supportive policies based on personal dependencies, dissolution of establishments and damaging legal systems against changes of parties variability and manipulations from top levels. Widespread corruption of democratic governments and destruction of the possibility for involvement of the elite are among the other indications."The public interests in authoritarianism systems are defined by the governments and involvement of people in politics is viewed as a suspecting phenomenon or abolishing phenomenon". (E.Tansi, 1376:162-3)

Linz and Chehabi believe that the traditional authoritative regimes (dictator regime) like china prior to the modern era "dealt with showing of their power after the death of the emperor and dependent servants". (j.Linz, and H.Chehabi1380:80)

Hence, changing the deciding mechanisms indicate the dissolutions. "The seniority principle in the west too used to avoid the appearance and formation of competitive royal groups". (j.Linz and H.Chehabi1380:80)

The modern authoritarian systems, such as the second period of Batista is Cuba and Duvallier government in Haiti became non-constitutive and the rulers became more corrupt, and the lack of considering constitutional laws in the country and ignoring the maintenance of the supportive network increase. Dissolution of totalitarian regimes such as the 1968 coup of Ba'ath party is defined by the presence of the king's family and relative in governmental organizations and their intervention in different fields.

The leadership factors:

In the "Twelfth night" play, Shakes pear wrote: "Some became aristocrats, some achieve aristocracy and aristocracy is imposed to some others".(D.Apter,1380:416)

Deep considerations of these phrases indicate that obtaining the leadership position depends on elements such as mutual actions between personal characteristics and social – political conditions. According to Linz and Chehabi, the founders of sultanistic regimes have limited education, arose from peasant families, their ascending movement is usually occurred by accident, they are clever, they are morally untruthful and revengeful, they have the ability to lie and are adulterous ,they are hedonists and often show personal ruthlessness(j. Linz, and H.Chehabi,1380:87-8)alongside these factors, they consider the element of "accidental" aspects, (j. Linz, and H.Chehabi,1380:87) like Machiavelli.

Therefore they have focused on 3 fields: family structure characteristics, individual and mental characteristics, and the role of the accident in hegemonism.

5. Conclusion:

The positive points of the theory include: simultaneous considerations to micro-elements (role of the leader) and macro-elements (economical-social-constitutional and international) ,simultaneous considerations to the structure and functional factors , avoiding the inclination towards determinism, combination of the elements of the theory from different theories such as Asian production method, John Fouran, shapour Ravasani, Huntington, Fred Holiday, etc-generalizing this model to all the countries that have not moved for social and economic evolutions.

Therefore a combination of internal and external factors determine the form and nature of the governments in the communities and determine the government oriented approach of this theory and direct consideration of the pathology of the modern government and inclination towards relativism that this of course could be an open rout for an evident escape and some in evident run-away to escape from criticisms of the critics.

Corresponding Author:
Shiva Jalalpour
PhD student, Department of Law and Political Science, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
Shiva.jalalpoor@yahoo.com

References:
[1] A. Ashraf, Political sociology of Max Weber, Institute of Social Studies and Research, Tehran,1347.
[2] A. Biro, Culture Social Sciences, Translated by B.Sarukhani,Keyhan Press, Tehran,1375.
[3]A.Alam, Foundations of science policy, Ney Press,Tehran,1373.
[4] A.Azghandi,Introduction to political sociology, Gomes Press, Tehran, 1384.
[5] A.Bakhshayeshi, Introduction to Comparative Political Systems,Farabi Press, Tehran,1376.

[6] A.Ghavam, Review theories of modernization and political development,Shahid Beheshti University Press, Tehran, 1374.

[7]A.Ghazi, Fundamental rights of political Institutions,Tehran University Press, Tehran, 1373.

A.Nabavi, Power Philosophy ,Samt Press, Tehran,1379.

[8] A.Nikgohar, Principles of Sociology, Rayzan Press,Tehran,1375.

[9] B.Sarukhani, Introduction to Social Science Encyclopedia, Keyhan Press, Tehran,1370.

[10] Chilkut, Introduction to economic income developing countries, Translated by A.Saii,Olume Novin Press, Tehran,1375.

[11] D.Apter,…… Translated by M.Saiid abadi, Institute for Strategic Studies , Tehran, 1380.

[12]E.Tansi, Foundations of science policy, Translated by H.Malek mohamadi,Dadgostar Press, Tehran, 1376.

[13] H. Gerth and C .Wright Mills, from Max Weber, London, Rutledge, 1970.

[14] J.Freund, Sociology of Max Weber, Translated by A.Nikgohar,Peykan Press,Tehran,1362

[15] j.j Linz, An Arthurian Regimes :Spain ,In Eallardt and s. rokkan (eds), mass political(first published 1964) New York, free press.1970.

[16] j.j Linz, and H.Chehabi , Sultanistic Regimes, Translated by M.Saburi,Shiraze Press. Tehran , 1380.

[17] j.j. linz, Totalitarian and Arthurian Regimes, in f.i Greenstein and N.W polsby(eds),Macropolitical Theory: Hand book of political science:vol 3,Reading,Mass:Addision-wesley. 1975.

[18] M. Weber and others, Rationality and Freedom, Translated by Y.Mughen & A.Tadayon, Hermes Press, Tehran, 1379.

[19] M. Weber, Basic concepts of sociology, Translated by A.Sedarati,Markaz Press, Tehran.1368.

M. Weber, Economy and society, Translated by A.Manuchehri,Molavi Press, Tehran, 1374.

[20] M. Weber, Religion, power, community, Translated by A.Tadayon,Hermes Press, Tehran,1382.

[21] M.Dovorje, Political sociology, Translated by A.Ghazi, Tehran University Press, Tehran, 1376.

[22]M.Jasemi, Culture of Political Science ,Gutenberg Press, Tehran.

[23] P. Broker, Non-democratic regimes, theories, politics and government, Translated by A.Samiee,Kavir Press, Tehran,1383.

[24] P. Meyer. Sociology War And Army, Translated by A.Azghandi, Gomes Press, Tehran, 1375.

[25] S. Hajariyan, Construction Sultany Authority: Pzyryha injury: Alternative, journal of Political Information - EconomicNO.91-92.

7/10/2011