

Section: Political sciences

Radionova Ludmila

PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor

*O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv,
Kharkiv, Ukraine*

Kozyrieva Nataliia

PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor

*O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv
Kharkiv, Ukraine*

M. WEBER'S RATIONALISM VS R. MICHELS' "BONAPARTISM"

The current process in the political system of Ukraine is another attempt to integrate into the world community of countries that profess rational political values. This complex problem can be solved if it is approached taking into account the ideas of Weberian rationalism. For Weber, the realisation of the idea of political rationality is connected with different degrees of people's participation in political life in general and political power in particular. However, it seems completely unjustified to ignore the study of hidden dangers of rational political domination, especially since their existence was recognised by M. Weber. In research terms, it is important to analyse not only irrationality as a consequence of rationalisation, but also to analyse what contributes to the growth of irrationality. In our opinion, it is in this direction that both the modern globalisation of the world and the activities of the leaders of domestic political parties have an impact.

Rationality helps to reduce risks and dangers, ensuring the efficiency and predictability of many politically important and everyday problems. However, whether consciously or not, people lose their own active involvement in events, human interaction is curtailed, and therefore the qualities without which human

progress stops are inevitably eroded from politics. Rational methods ensure a high standard of political decisions and laws, and reduce the risks of unskilled lawmaking. But this practice inevitably reduces the communication between the legislator, representatives of parties, political movements and ordinary citizens, and thus reduces the creative-critical potential of information perception and as a consequence – the creativity of political life is reduced.

Then, like a snowball, irrational consequences increase. If the process of creativity decreases, a person stops creating his life, sometimes accepting a favourable but passive role of his existence. According to E. Fromm, the limitation or diminution of the creative beginning leads to the thirst for destructiveness, envy, destructiveness – those potentialities, which, in his opinion, are rooted in the very existence of man [1].

In the conditions of today's model of globalisation of the world, as well as the development of the political system of Ukraine, these processes are not removed, but aggravated. The political culture of the West followed the path of creation and development of individuality, which was the source of strong, creative aspirations. However, today young people seek to make a career not so much through personal initiative, but through technology, strict adherence to the rules of the game. Rationalisation in the Ukrainian way creates an even worse situation: climbing the social ladder depends on following very primitive political technologies and on proximity to specific members of the elite. In this context, R. Michels' conclusions about the study of political parties are particularly relevant [2].

According to Michels, the specific final phase of the revolutionary process is the formation of the so-called "Bonapartist regime". Bonapartism is an authoritarian regime established by a popular national leader, who is approved by popular vote, stands above political parties, promotes equality, progress and social change, considers religion as one of the means of state policy, believes in the ability of central power to transform society, asserts the

cult of the "nation", its glory and universal faith in national unity [2].

The essential feature of such a regime is that it usually emerges after a tumultuous period of revolutionary change and social instability, thus providing itself with additional legitimacy in the eyes of the majority of citizens: the "man on the white horse" becomes a symbol of the taming of the revolutionary element and the return to a more stable state. At the same time, the Bonapartist regime is the heir and, to a certain extent, the continuator of the cause of the revolution. Bonapartism is always a synthesis; it is not coloured in distinctly red or white tones, but rather in a mixture of ideological shades. Bonapartist regimes are not identical to the so-called sultanist regimes, which arise as a result of the extreme concentration of power in the hands of one person within the framework of a previously established and sufficiently stable political system.

Bonapartism is the authoritarian power of a minority, often a minority of the minimum possible: one person, although in fact the leader of such a regime does not always have truly absolute powers in making key political decisions. However, such power exists with the blessing of the majority and is legitimised through the institutions of direct democracy, most often plebiscites. In terms of social structure, Bonapartism usually presents itself as a "national", supra-class regime, although in reality it relies on those social groups whose interests are primarily served by its existence. Bonapartism is a theory of the state that grew out of the general will but freed itself from it, becoming an independent unitary will. Its democratic origin protects it from the dangers of an undemocratic present.

References

1. Fromm A., Sullivan H. Social psychological theories. URL: <https://psylib.org.ua/books/holli01/txt04.htm> (access date: 13.05.2024).
2. Міхельс Р. Соціологія політичної партії в умовах демократії. URL:

<https://ibib.ltd.ua/mihels-sotsiologiya-politicheskoy-partii.html> (access date: 13.05.2024).