населением и обеспечение стабильности в поселенческих структурах. Целесообразно проанализировать отношение сельчан к работе районной исполнительной власти, которая является органом первичного обращения по тем проблемам, которые не в состоянии решить сельисполком. По итогам исследования выяснилось, что деятельность райисполкомов оценили на «хорошо» 32,6% сельчан; на «удовлетворительно» – 25,6%; на «неудовлетворительно» - 11,6%; уклонились от оценки 30,2% опрошенных. В целом сельское население (более 50%) положительно охарактеризовали деятельность районной исполнительной вертикали, но в тоже время каждый десятый продемонстрировал неудовлетворенность деятельностью этого уровня исполнительной власти.

http://edoc.bseu.by:8080

J. Rak, *Associate Professor*
Faculty of Political Science and Journalism
joanna.rak@amu.edu.pl
Adam Mickiewicz University (Poznań, Rzeczpospolita Polska)

ESTABLISHING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE STATE AND (UN)CIVIL SOCIETY WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF NEO-MILITANT DEMOCRACY[1]

"Militant democracy" is a theoretical category formulated by Karl Loewenstein in the 1930s to comprehend the Weimar Republic's failure to defend itself against the threat of Nazism (Loewenstein 1937: 640). This German philosopher and political scientist assumed that "democracy, becoming militant, can be saved; and when fascism uses with impunity democratic institutions to gain power, democracy cannot be blamed if it learns from its ruthless enemy and applies in time a modicum of the coercion that autocracy will not hesitate to apply against democracy" (Loewenstein 1935a: 593). In this approach, militancy consists in the use of legislative measures against subversive propaganda and limitations of democratic liberties of free speech, the press, association, assembly, universal suffrage, and organization in political parties (Loewenstein 1937: 638; 642). These anti-democratic measures serve democrats to protect democracy. Accordingly, the implementation of the militant democracy principle aims to preclude the undermining practices of the enemies of democracy. The alarming methods included fascists' non-democratic propaganda, the forming of private armies, the wearing of party uniforms and badges in public, and the parading of the semi-military paraphernalia, which are essential for the initial display of fascist activities (Loewenstein 1935a: 593; 1935b: 762). As Loewenstein noted, enemies of democracy use democratic institutions to destroy the system from within. The restriction of these institutions' free functioning closes the channels of subversive entry into the democratic regime. It takes away the available means of taking over and changing the nature of the political system.

Despite the passage of time, Loewenstein's theoretical category still shows analytical utility in explaining changes at the level of contemporary political structures (Gökarıksel 2020: 216; Hilal-Harvald 2020: 1228). Nevertheless, some of the contextual defining factors have changed. Hence the term neo-militant democracy can be used to distinguish present-day transpositions in political structures. First of all, the modern social, political, cultural, and economic context of the power relations has provided the new spheres of influence. The repertoire of militant democracy measures has expanded, and thus democrats have gained new opportunities to protect political systems. Simultaneously, however, the range of subversives' possibilities and means of action has also developed. Nor can fascists any longer be seen as the only enemies of democracy (de Leeuw and Bourne 2020: 696; Ermakoff 2020: 167). Contemporary anti-globalization, escapist, and self-isolationist movements offer ideological and organizational frameworks to stand against democracy. Democratic institutions are also used to destroy them through impetuous and reactive political activities. Therefore, research on contemporary political regimes should go beyond the influence of non-democratic political parties on the neo-militant democracy rule implementation.

This study aims to uncover how the state authorities establish relationships between the state and civil society within the framework of neo-militant democracy. A case study shows the essential features of the relationships produced during the Corona crisis that generated favorable conditions for a political structure change.

This research advances the definition of neo-militant democracy as the democratic system that legally restricts individual democratic freedoms to protect itself from the threat of being changed by legal means. As the current studies on modern militant democracies show, democrats use the following neo-militant democracy measures: the limitations of the freedom of assembly, the press, speech, association, religion, passive voting rights, active voting rights, referendum organization, legislation on counterterrorism, anti-terrorism, anti-extremism (including state of siege, emergency, norms directed at the maintenance of public order, with the specific aims of maintaining public peace and ensuring the "correct" development of the democratic dialectic, treason, and seditious acts, and antipropaganda), the limitation of registration and functioning of political parties, naturalization (restriction on acquisition of citizenship), and access to public employment (Capoccia 2005; Macklem 2006; Müller 2012). In practice, however, neo-militant democracy measures can serve the state authorities not to protect democracy but to expand the scope of their sovereign power, limit political pluralism, eliminate the opposition and potential counter-candidates for state offices. In such cases, the purpose of using neo-militant democracy measures is distorted and indicates quasi-militant democracy. The state authorities take advantage of the latter's semblance to militant democracy to legitimize the weakening of democracy.

The case study concerns the Polish political structure, in which the use of neo-militant democracy measures was confirmed by recent studies (Wolkenstein 2020). It reflects on the relationships between the state and civil society established by the president. Behind this choice is the president's role in the Polish political system. According to the Constitution of the Republic of Poland, the president is the highest

representative of the Polish authorities, the guarantor of the continuity of state power, the highest state authority in the field of executive power, oversees the observance of the provisions of the Constitution, and the head of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Poland.

The research draws on the qualitative source analysis of the president's verified Twitter account. Andrzej Duda used his official profile (@AndrzejDuda) to communicate with his followers and inform them about political views. Besides, tweets offered records of exchanges regarding current political affairs. The analysis covers entries released during the first wave of the coronavirus pandemic in Poland, from the first confirmed case up until the loosening of lockdown measures (March 4 – May 31, 2020). The source analysis rests upon content analysis and thematic analysis linked in the iterative process of text skimming, examination, and interpretation. First, the content analysis leads to identifying tweets that contain references to the neo-militant measures implemented to prevent the spread of the coronavirus. Second, the references are divided into quasi- and neo-militant democracy expressions, depending on the purposes of applying neo-militant democracy measures. Third, the thematic analysis combines rereading and reviewing information to uncover themes relevant to the objectives. These procedures lead to the data characteristics-based coding and category definition (Bowen 2009: 32). Whereas the references to neo-militant democracy measures are mutually listed and compared, codes serve to group ideas and pinpoint clustering concepts (Bowen 2009: 37). Finally, the study finishes with reporting the analyzing process and the research results through the conceptual systems of legitimizing neo-militant democracy measures produced by the president.

The main argument is that the President of Poland manifested the need for undermining civil society to achieve the state-set goals. Neo-militant democracy disguise provided justifications for quasi-militant democracy and subordinating independent individuals to the government.

The president actively supported lockdown and safety measures implemented by the Polish government, including limitations on freedom of assembly, religious expression, and additional movement restrictions. Although the Polish Commissioner for Human Rights found them unconstitutional and illegally established, they remained in effect and were enforced. Andrzej Duda sought their legitimacy by identifying the internal enemy in the Polish political structure (Duda 2020, April 20; May 12; May 14). The anti-democratic measures introduced by the government were the only available and effective means of fighting the spread of the Covid-19 and addressing the socio-economic crisis. The effectiveness was proven by the successes achieved so far, but it was still undermined by the enemies of Poland and Poles. Full victory over the coronavirus pandemic would occur after eliminating enemies. The enemy category was inclusive and encompassed everyone who questioned the legitimacy of government measures to combat the pandemic.

Additionally, the mere discussion of the legality of anti-democratic measures was treated as subversive. Duda observed social energy used to destroy the Polish community from the inside (Duda 2020, May 14). According to the president, all counterarguments were hostile actions aimed at the development of the pandemic.

They took the form of misinformation, lies, and manipulation (Duda 2020, April 20; May 21). Such a non-exceptional approach limited the pluralism of views and freedom of speech not to protect democracy but to generate the ideological homogenization of the social structure. This was based on the premise that all those who did not fully support the government were against it.

The anti-pluralist approach laid the foundations for intense antagonisms between "we who supported the government and took care about our community" and "they who did not" (Duda 2020, March 9; March 15; March 17; May 14). It created a sense of dependence on the government's aid, whose social and economic programs guaranteed prosperity. Besides fueling a feeling of mutual hostility, the approach contributed to the spread of fear of the others. No one could be sure what the intentions of the other person were or believe in the information distributed in the public discourse. Thereby, Duda reduced mutual trust in a social structure, which in turn might have led to the weakening of social ties.

The research points to the use of neo-militant democracy cover to legitimizing quasi-militant democracy purposes. It argues that the state authorities may establish relationships between the state and civil society within the framework of neo-militant democracy to transform a social structure into the government's active and loyal supporters. Hence, the uncivil nature of society results from unconditional compliance with the government. Dependence on the government and limitation of the possibility of deliberating over the political structure favor social deactivation. Such a social structure becomes a pre-condition for democratic backsliding towards authoritarianism.

References:

Bowen, Glenn A. 2009. "Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method." Qualitative Research Journal 9(2): 27–40.

Capoccia, Giovanni. 2005. Defending Democracy Reactions to Extremism in Interwar Europe. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

de Leeuw, Sjifra E., and Angela K. Bourne. 2020. "Explaining Citizen Attitudes to Strategies of Democratic Defense in Europe: A Resource in Responses to Contemporary Challenges to Liberal Democracy?." International Journal of Public Opinion Research 32(4): 694–710.

Duda, Andrzej. 2020. March 9. "Szanowny Panie Ministrze." https://twitter.com/AndrzejDuda/status/1237066492748992512.

Duda, Andrzej. 2020. March 15. "Wszystkich, którzy w." https://twitter.com/AndrzejDuda/status/1239227299226058752.

Duda, Andrzej. 2020, March 17. "Ostatnie dni pokazały." https://twitter.com/AndrzejDuda/status/1239895366314741761.

Duda, Andrzej. 2020, April 20. "Precz z manipulacją." https://twitter.com/AndrzejDuda/status/1252346158208311301.

Duda, Andrzej. 2020, May 12. "Jak widać dobre." https://twitter.com/AndrzejDuda/status/1260154309871906816.

Duda, Andrzej. 2020, May 14. "W tych dniach." https://twitter.com/AndrzejDuda/status/1260913596378353665.

Duda, Andrzej. 2020, May 21. "Współpracuję z Rządem." https://twitter.com/AndrzejDuda/status/1263456492679823360.

Ermakoff, Ivan. 2020. "Law against the Rule of Law: Assaulting Democracy." Journal of Law and Society 47: 164–186.

Gökarıksel, Saygun. 2020. "Antifascist Strategy Today: Lineages of Anticommunism and "Militant Democracy" in Eastern Europe." In Back to the '30s? Recurring Crises of Capitalism, Liberalism, and Democracy, edited by Jeremy Rayner, Susan Falls, George Souvlis, and Taylor C. Nelms, 215–234. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hilal-Harvald, Malthe. 2020. "Islam as a Civilizational Threat: Constitutional Identity, Militant Democracy, and Judicial Review in Western Europe." German Law Journal 21(6): 1228–1256.

Loewenstein, Karl. 1935a. "Autocracy Versus Democracy in Contemporary Europe, I." American Political Science Review 29(4): 571–593.

Loewenstein, Karl. 1935b. "Autocracy Versus Democracy in Contemporary Europe, II." American Political Science Review 29(5): 755–784.

Loewenstein, Karl. 1937. "Militant Democracy and Fundamental Rights, II." American Political Science Review 31(4): 638–658.

Macklem, Patrick. 2006. "Militant Democracy, Legal Pluralism, and the Paradox of Self-determination." International Journal of Constitutional Law 4(3): 488–516.

Müller, Jan-Werner. 2012. "Militant Democracy." In The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Constitutional Law, edited by Michel Rosenfeld and András Sajó, 1118–1132. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wolkenstein, Fabio. 2020. "Partisan Complicity in Democratic Backsliding." Global Justice: Theory Practice Rhetoric 12(2): 117–140.

Л.Н. Семёнова, профессор
ludmila.semenova@bntu.by
БНТУ (Минск, Беларусь)

ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОГО ГОСУДАРСТВА

В вошедшем в стадию разрушительной турбулентности калейдоскопе современных процессов за видимой для всех событийной поверхностью, где полыхают военные столкновения, острые гражданские конфликты, баталии психоинформационной войны, экономические кризисы, идет борьба с эпидемией коронавируса, давно наметилась тенденция демонтажа национальных государств. В топке современного многостороннего кризиса, понимаемого прежде всего как кризис материалистической технократической денежной цивилизации и мировой капиталистической системы, сгорают многие традиционные институты, включая и такой, казавшийся незыблемым, мощным и весьма эффективным, как государство.