

Totalitarian government a historical study.

Major.Dr.Viji, M

Associate Professor, Department of History, Holy Cross College, Trichy-620002

Received: February 06, 2019

Accepted: March 12, 2019

Tyranny it is a type of government that which allows a person's opportunity which tries to subordinate all parts of individual life to the specialist of the state. Benito Mussolini was the Italian despot who begat the term totalitarianism amid the 1920s extraordinary or new to type of government that which he began that province of Italy is Fascism, which has likewise been characterized "everything that are accessible inside their very own express, no outside the state can be the part, none against the state." During the start of World War II, extremist had turned out to be synonymous with total and severe single-party government. Other present day instances of extremist states incorporate the Soviet Union under Joseph Stalin, Nazi Germany under Adolf Hitler, the People's Republic of China under Mao Zedong, and North Korea under the Kim administration. Authoritarianism that began coming up amid the II World war which has by solid expert or the all out power in the hands of the inside that which specifically had control in all parts of even individual life through compulsion and constraint. Verifiable instances of such incorporated authoritarian standard incorporate the Mauryan tradition of India (c. 321- c. 185 BCE), the Qin tradition of China (221- 207 BCE), and amid the standard of Zulu boss Shaka (c. 1816- 28). Nazi Germany (1933- 45) and the Soviet Union amid the Stalin period (1924- 53) were the principal instances of decentralized or well known tyranny, in which the state accomplished overpowering prominent help for its authority. That help was not unconstrained: its beginning relied upon a magnetic pioneer, and it was made conceivable just by current improvements in correspondence and transportation.

Autocracy is regularly recognized from fascism, dictatorship, or oppression by its displacing of every single political foundation with new ones and its broad away of all legitimate, social, and political conventions. The extremist state seeks after some unique objective, for example, industrialization or success, to the rejection of all others. All assets are coordinated toward its accomplishment paying little heed to the expense. Whatever may advance the objective is bolstered; whatever may thwart the objective is rejected. This fixations pawns a philosophy that clarifies everything as far as the objective, supporting all impediments that may emerge and all powers that may fight with the state. The subsequent prevalent help allows the express the greatest scope of activity of any type of government. Any contradiction is marked abhorrence, and inner political contrasts are not allowed. Since quest for the objective is the main ideological establishment for the authoritarian state, accomplishment of the objective can never be recognized. normal for a flat out ruler or supreme standard; having outright power; "a tyrant routine"; "absolutist government"; "dictatorial rulers"; "a dictatorial decide that went on for the span of the war"; "a domineering government"

Under extremist principle, customary social foundations and associations are disheartened and smothered. Therefore, the social texture is debilitated and individuals turn out to be progressively amiable to retention into a solitary, brought together development. Investment in affirmed open associations is at first energized and after that required. Old religious and social ties are displaced by counterfeit connections to the state and its belief system. As pluralism and independence decrease, the majority of the general population grasp the extremist state's belief system. The endless assorted variety among people obscures, supplanted by a mass similarity (or possibly passive consent) to the convictions and conduct authorized by the state.

Substantial scale sorted out viciousness winds up reasonable and in some cases important under extremist standard, legitimized by the superseding duty to the state philosophy and quest for the state's objective. In Nazi Germany and Stalin's Soviet Union, entire classes of individuals, for example, the Jews and the kulaks (wealthy labourer ranchers) separately, were singled out for mistreatment and termination. For each situation the aggrieved were connected with some outer adversary and accused for the state's inconveniences, and consequently general sentiment was excited against them and their destiny because of the military and police was overlooked.

Police tasks inside an authoritarian state frequently seem like those inside a police state, however

one essential distinction recognizes them. In a police express the police work as indicated by known predictable methods. In an extremist express the police work without the requirements of laws and guidelines. Their activities are unusual and coordinated by the impulse of their rulers. Under Hitler and Stalin, vulnerability was joined into the undertakings of the state. The German constitution of the Weimar Republic was never repealed under Hitler, however an empowering demonstration gone by the Reichstag in 1933 allowed him to correct the constitution voluntarily, as a result invalidating it. The job of administrator ended up vested in one individual. Likewise, Stalin gave a constitution to the Soviet Union in 1936 however never allowed it to wind up the system of Soviet law. Rather, he was the last referee in the understanding of Marxism- Leninism- Stalinism and changed his elucidations voluntarily. Neither Hitler nor Stalin allowed change to wind up unsurprising, in this way expanding the feeling of dread among the general population and quelling any contradiction.

Extremist tyranny was a wonder initially limited in twentieth century Europe. Various improvements made it conceivable. Since the nineteenth century the automatic rifle had enormously encouraged extreme group control. Government, the political framework by which a nation or network is directed and managed suppression. Chronicled instances of such brought together extremist principle incorporate the Mauryan administration of India (c. 321- c. 185 BCE), the Qin line of China (221- 207 BCE), and the rule of Zulu boss Shaka (c. 1816- 28). Nazi Germany (1933- 45) and the Soviet Union amid the Stalin period (1924- 53) were the primary instances of decentralized or prevalent autocracy, in which the state accomplished overpowering mainstream support for its administration. That help was not unconstrained: its beginning relied upon an appealing pioneer, and it was made conceivable just by current advancements in correspondence and transportation.

Tyranny is a political idea of a method of government which disallows resistance parties, limits singular restriction to the state and its cases, and activities an incredibly high level of power over open and private life. It is viewed as the most outrageous and complete type of tyranny. Political power in extremist states has frequently been held by guideline by one pioneer which utilize sweeping purposeful publicity crusades communicated by state-controlled broad communications. Extremist routines and are regularly set apart by political constraint, identity cultism, command over the economy, limitation of discourse, mass reconnaissance and broad utilization of state fear mongering. Student of history Robert Conquest portrays an "extremist" state as one perceiving no restrictions to its position in any circle of open or private life and which stretches out that specialist to whatever length feasible.

The idea was first created during the 1920s by both Weimar legal adviser later Nazi scholarly Carl Schmitt and, simultaneously, by the Italian fundamentalists. Italian fundamentalist Benito Mussolini said "Everything inside the state, nothing outside the state, nothing against the state". Schmitt utilized the term Totalstaat in his persuasive 1927 work on the legitimate premise of an almighty express, *The Concept of the Political*. Later, the idea was utilized broadly to think about Nazism and Stalinism. The Economist has depicted China's as of late created social credit framework to screen and rank its residents dependent on their own conduct as "authoritarian".

Extremist routines are not quite the same as other dictator ones. The last indicates a state in which the single power holder - an individual "despot", a council or a junta or a generally little gathering of political tip top - consumes political power. "The tyrant state is just worried about political power and as long as that isn't challenged it gives society a specific level of freedom". Dictatorship "does not endeavour to change the world and human instinct". Conversely, an authoritarian routine endeavours to control practically all parts of the public activity, including the economy, training, craftsmanship, science, private life and ethics of natives. Some extremist governments may advance an intricate belief system: "The formally broadcasted philosophy enters into the most profound compasses of societal structure and the authoritarian government looks to totally control the contemplations and activities of its citizens". It additionally activates the entire populace in quest for its objectives. Carl Joachim Friedrich composes that "a totalist belief system, a gathering fortified by a mystery police, and imposing business model control of modern mass society" are the three highlights of authoritarian routines that recognize them from different absolutisms.

The thought of tyranny as an "all out" political power by the state was figured in 1923 by Giovanni Amendola, who depicted Italian Fascism as a framework in a general sense not the same as ordinary autocracies. The term was later doled out a positive significance in the compositions of Giovanni Gentile, Italy's most noticeable rationalist and driving scholar of autocracy. He utilized the term totalitario to allude to the structure and objectives of the new state, which were to give the "all out portrayal of the country and absolute direction of national objectives". He depicted tyranny as a general public in which the belief system of the state had impact, if not control, over the greater part of its residents. As indicated by Benito Mussolini,

this framework politicizes everything otherworldly and human: "Everything inside the state, nothing outside the state, nothing against the state".

One of the first to utilize the expression "tyranny" in the English language was the Austrian essayist Franz Borkenau in his 1938 book *The Communist International*, in which he remarked that it joined the Soviet and German fascisms more than it isolated them.[11] The mark "extremist" was twice appended to the Hitler routine amid Winston Churchill's discourse of October 5, 1938[12] before the House of Commons contrary to the Munich Agreement, by which France and Great Britain assented to Nazi Germany's extension of the Sudetenland. Churchill was then a backbencher MP speaking to the Epping body electorate. In a radio location two weeks after the fact, Churchill again utilized the term, this time applying the idea to "a Communist or a Nazi oppression".

George Orwell made incessant utilization of the word authoritarian and its cognates in different papers distributed in 1940, 1941 and 1942. In his article *Why I Write*, he stated: "The Spanish war and different occasions in 1936-37 turned the scale and from that point I knew where I stood. Each line of genuine work that I have composed since 1936 has been composed, specifically or by implication, against tyranny and for vote based communism, as I comprehend it". Amid a 1945 address arrangement entitled *The Soviet Impact on the Western World* (distributed as a book in 1946), the genius Soviet British history specialist E. H. Carr asserted: "The pattern far from independence and towards tyranny is wherever undeniable" and that Marxism- Leninism was by a wide margin the best kind of autocracy as demonstrated by Soviet mechanical development and the Red Army's job in crushing Germany. Just the "visually impaired and hopeless" could overlook the pattern towards autocracy, said Carr.

In *The Open Society and Its Enemies* (1945) and *The Poverty of Historicism* (1961), Karl Popper enunciated a persuasive study of tyranny: in the two works, he differentiated the "open society" of liberal vote based system with autocracy and contended that the last is grounded in the conviction that history pushes toward an unchanging future as per comprehensible laws.

In *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Hannah Arendt contended that Nazi and Communist routines were new types of government and not only refreshed variants of the old oppressive regimes. As per Arendt, the wellspring of the mass intrigue of extremist routines is their belief system, which gives an encouraging, single response to the puzzles of the past, present and future. For Nazism, all history is the historical backdrop of race battle and for Marxism all history is the historical backdrop of class battle. When that premise is acknowledged, all activities of the state can be supported by offer to nature or the law of history, defending their foundation of dictator state apparatus.

Not with standing Arendt, numerous researchers from an assortment of scholastic foundations and ideological positions have intently analysed authoritarianism. Among the most noted pundits on despotism are Raymond Aron, Lawrence Aronsen, Franz Borkenau, Karl Dietrich Bracher, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Robert Conquest, Carl Joachim Friedrich, Eckhard Jesse, Leopold Labedz, Walter Laqueur, Claude Lefort, Juan Linz, Richard Löwenthal, Karl Popper, Richard Pipes, Leonard Schapiro and Adam Ulam. Every last one of these portrays authoritarianism in somewhat extraordinary ways, yet they all concur that autocracy looks to assemble whole populaces in help of an official state belief system and is bigoted of exercises which are not coordinated towards the objectives of the state, involving suppression or state control of business, worker's guilds, non-benefit associations, religious associations and structures and ideological groups.

The idea ended up noticeable in Western enemy of socialist political talk amid the Cold War time as an apparatus to change over pre-war hostile to extremism into after war against communism. The political specialists Carl Friedrich and Zbigniew Brzezinski were essentially in charge of extending the use of the term in college sociology and expert research, reformulating it as a worldview for the Soviet Union just as fundamentalist routines. Friedrich and Brzezinski contend that an extremist framework has the accompanying six, commonly steady, characterizing attributes:

1. Elaborate controlling belief system.
2. Single mass gathering, commonly driven by a despot.
3. System of fear, utilizing such instruments as brutality and mystery police.
4. Monopoly on weapons.
5. Monopoly on the methods for correspondence.
6. Central course and control of the economy through state arranging.

Authoritarian routines in Germany, Italy and the Soviet Union had starting beginnings in the turmoil that followed in the wake of World War I and enabled extremist developments to catch control of the legislature while the refinement of current weapons and correspondences empowered them to successfully build up

what Friedrich and Brzezinski called an "authoritarian autocracy". Some social researchers have censured Friedrich and Brzezinski's enemy of authoritarian methodology, contending that the Soviet framework, both as a political and as a social element, was in reality better comprehended as far as premium gatherings, contending elites, or even in class terms (utilizing the idea of the nomenclature as a vehicle for another decision class). These pundits indicated proof of prevalent help for the routine and far reaching scattering of influence, at any rate in the execution of arrangement, among Sectoral and local specialists. For certain adherents of this pluralist approach, this was proof of the capacity of the routine to adjust to incorporate new requests. Nonetheless, defenders of the extremist model asserted that the disappointment of the framework to endure demonstrated its powerlessness to adjust, however the unimportant custom of assumed prevalent support.

The German student of history Karl Dietrich Bracher, whose work is fundamentally worried about Nazi Germany, contends that the "authoritarian typology" as created by Friedrich and Brzezinski is an exorbitantly unbendable model and neglected to consider the "progressive dynamic" that Bracher states is at the core of autocracy. Bracher keeps up that the quintessence of autocracy is the complete case to control and redo all parts of society joined with a widely inclusive philosophy, the incentive on tyrant initiative and the misrepresentation of the regular character of state and society, which recognized the authoritarian "shut" comprehension of governmental issues from the "open" law based comprehension. Not at all like the Friedrich-Brzezinski definition, Bracher contended that extremist routines did not require a solitary chief and could work with an aggregate initiative, which drove the American student of history Walter Laqueur to contend that Bracher's definition appeared to fit reality superior to the Friedrich-Brzezinski definition.

In the field of Soviet history, the extremist idea has been vilified by the revisionist school, a portion of whose increasingly conspicuous individuals were Sheila Fitzpatrick, Jerry F. Hough, William McCagg, Robert W. Thurston and J. Curve Getty. Despite the fact that their individual elucidations contrast, the revisionists have contended that the Soviet state under Joseph Stalin was institutionally frail, that the dimension of dread was quite overstated and that—to the degree it happened—it mirrored the shortcomings as opposed to the qualities of the Soviet state. Fitzpatrick contended that the Stalin's cleanses in the Soviet Union gave an expanded social versatility and in this way a shot for a superior life.

Writing in 1987, Walter Laqueur said that the revisionists in the field of Soviet history were blameworthy of mistaking prevalence for ethical quality and of making exceedingly humiliating and not persuading contentions against the idea of the Soviet Union as an extremist state. In the 2010, Vladimir Tismaneanu, Richard Shorten and Aviezer Tucker contended that extremist philosophies can take diverse structures in various political frameworks, yet every one of them center around utopianism, scientism and additionally political viciousness. They feel that both Nazism and Soviet Communism stressed the job of specialization in present day social orders and saw polymathias "a relic of days gone by"; both professed to have factual logical help for their cases, which prompted a strict "moral" control of culture, mental viciousness and abuse of whole gatherings. Their contentions have been scrutinized by different researchers because of their prejudice and erroneous date. For example, Juan Francisco Fuentes regards tyranny as a "developed convention" and the utilization of idea of "present day dictatorship" as a "switch erroneous date". For Fuentes, "the behind the times utilization of authoritarian/tyranny includes the will to reshape the past in the picture and resemblance of the present."

Non-political parts of the way of life and themes of extremist nations have themselves regularly been named naturally "authoritarian". For instance, Theodore Dalrymple, a British writer, doctor and political pundit, has composed for City Journal that brutalist structures are an outflow of tyranny given that their stupendous, concrete-based plan includes wrecking gentler, progressively human places, for example, gardens. In 1949, writer George Orwell portrayed the Ministry of Truth in Nineteen Eighty-Four as a "huge, pyramidal structure of white solid, taking off up a great many terraces, three hundred meters into the air". Journalist Ben Macintyre of The Times composed that it was "a farsighted portrayal of the kind of authoritarian engineering that would before long command the Communist bloc".

REFERENCE:

1. Conquest, Robert (1999). Reflections on a Ravaged Century. p. 74. ISBN 0-393-04818-7.
2. Schmitt, Carl (1927). The Concept of the Political (German: Der Begriff des Politischen)(1996 University of Chicago Press ed.). Rutgers University Press. p. 22. ISBN 0-226-73886-8.
3. "China invents the digital totalitarian state". 17 December 2017. Retrieved 14 September 2018.
4. "China has started ranking citizens with a creepy 'social credit' system — here's what you can do wrong, and the embarrassing, demeaning ways they can punish you". Business Insider. Retrieved 2018-06-08.
5. "China experiments with sweeping Social Credit System". DW.COM. Deutsche Welle. 4 January 2018. Retrieved 2018-06-08.

6. Radu Cinpoes, Nationalism and Identity in Romania: A History of Extreme Politics from the Birth of the State to EU Accession, p. 70.
7. Richard Pipes (1995), Russia Under the Bolshevik Regime, New York: Vintage Books, Random House Inc., p. 243, ISBN 0394502426
8. Payne, Stanley G., Fascism: Comparison and Definition (UW Press, 1980), p. 73
9. Gentile, Giovanni and Benito Mussolini in "La dottrina del fascismo" (1932)
10. Conquest, Robert, The Great Terror: A Reassessment (Oxford University Press, 1990) ISBN 0-19-507132-8, p. 249
11. Nemoianu, Virgil, "Review of End and Beginnings" pp. 1235–38 from MLN, Volume 97, Issue #5, December 1982, p.1235.
12. Churchill, Winston, Speech to the House of Commons, October 5, 1938: "We in this country, as in other Liberal and democratic countries, have a perfect right to exalt the principle of self-determination, but it comes ill out of the mouths of those in totalitarian states who deny even the smallest element of toleration to every section and creed within their bounds." "Many of those countries, in fear of the rise of the Nazi power, ... loathed the idea of having this arbitrary rule of the totalitarian system thrust upon them, and hoped that a stand would be made."
13. Churchill, Winston, Radio Broadcast to the United States and to London, October 16, 1938
14. Mann, Michael (2004). Fascists. New York: Cambridge University Press. p. 331. ISBN 9780521831314.
15. Paul Preston. The Spanish Civil War: reaction, revolution and revenge. 3rd edition. W. W. New York, New York: Norton & Company, Inc, 2007. 2006 pp. 64.
16. Orwell, George, "Why I Write", *Gangrel* (Summer) 1946.
17. Laqueur, Walter, The Fate of the Revolution, New York: Scribner, 1987, p. 131.
18. Dana Richard Villa (2000), The Cambridge Companion to Hannah Arendt. Cambridge University Press, pp. 2–3. ISBN 0-521-64571-9
19. Defty, Brook (2007). Britain, America and Anti-Communist Propaganda 1945–1953. Chapters 2–5. The Information Research Department.
20. Achim Siegel, The totalitarian paradigm after the end of Communism: towards a theoretical reassessment, 1998, p. 200 "Concepts of totalitarianism became most widespread at the height of the Cold War. Since the late 1940s, especially since the Korean War, they were condensed into a far-reaching, even hegemonic, ideology, by which the political elites of the Western world tried to explain and even to justify the Cold War constellation"
21. Nicholas Guilhot, The democracy makers: human rights and international order, 2005, p. 33 "The opposition between the West and Soviet totalitarianism was often presented as an opposition both moral and epistemological between truth and falsehood. The democratic, social, and economic credentials of the Soviet Union were typically seen as "lies" and as the product of a deliberate and multiform propaganda...In this context, the concept of totalitarianism was itself an asset. As it made possible the conversion of prewar anti-fascism into postwar anti-communism
22. David Cauter, Politics and the novel during the Cold War, 2009, pp. 95–99
23. George A Reisch, How the Cold War transformed philosophy of science: to the icy slopes of logic, 2005, pp. 153–54
24. Laqueur, Walter, The Fate of the Revolution: Interpretations of Soviet history from 1917 to the Present (New York: Scribner's, 1987) pp. 186–89, 233–34
25. Kershaw, Ian The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives of Interpretation, London: Arnold; New York p. 25.
26. Laqueur, Walter The Fate of the Revolution: Interpretations of Soviet history from 1917 to the Present, New York: Scribner's, 1987 p. 241
27. Eric Hoffer, The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements, Harper Perennial Modern Classics (2002), ISBN 0-06-050591-5, pp. 61, 163
28. "Furet, borrowing from Hannah Arendt, describes Bolsheviks and Nazis as totalitarian twins, conflicting yet united." Singer, Daniel, *The Nation* (April 17, 1995)
29. "The totalitarian nature of Stalin's Russia is undeniable." Singer, Daniel, *The Nation*
30. "The government of Nazi Germany was a fascist, totalitarian state." Grobman, Gary M.
31. Eric J. Hobsbawm (2012), Revolutionaries. Abacus, Ch. 7. ISBN 0-34-912056-0
32. Laqueur, Walter The Fate of the Revolution: Interpretations of Soviet history from 1917 to the Present (New York: Scribner's, 1987) pp. 225–27
33. Laqueur, Walter, The Fate of the Revolution: Interpretations of Soviet history from 1917 to the Present (New York: Scribner's, 1987) pp. 225, 228
34. Fitzpatrick, Sheila, Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999)
35. Laqueur, Walter The Fate of the Revolution: Interpretations of Soviet history from 1917 to the Present (New York: Scribner's, 1987) p. 228
36. Laqueur, Walter The Fate of the Revolution: Interpretations of Soviet history from 1917 to the Present (New York: Scribner's, 1987) p. 233.
37. Paul Buhle and Edward Francis Rice-Maximin (1995), William Appleman Williams: The Tragedy of Empire.

Psychology Press, p. 192. ISBN 0-34-912056-0

38. Enzo Traverso (2001), *Le Totalitarisme: Le XXe siècle en débat*. Poche. ISBN 978-2020378574
 39. Richard Shorten "Modernism and Totalitarianism: Rethinking the Intellectual Sources of Nazism and Stalinism, 1945 to the Present", Palgrave, 2012; Vladimir Tismaneanu, "The Devil in History: Communism, Fascism, and Some Lessons of the Twentieth Century", University of California Press, 2012; Aviezer Tucker "The Legacies of Totalitarianism: A Theoretical Framework", Cambridge University Press, 2015.
 40. Juan Francisco Fuentes, "How Words reshape the Past: The 'Old, Old Story' of Totalitarianism", *Politics, Religion & Ideology*, 2015, p. 15.
 41. Theodore Dalrymple (Autumn 2009). "The Architect as Totalitarian". *City Journal*. Retrieved January 5, 2010.
 42. Ben Macintyre (March 30, 2007). "Look on those monuments to megalomania, and despair". *The Times*. Archived from the original on August 29, 2008. Retrieved January 5, 2010.
- Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1958, new ed. 1966).
 - John A. Armstrong, *The Politics of Totalitarianism* (New York: Random House, 1961).
 - Peter Bernholz, "Ideocracy and totalitarianism: A formal analysis incorporating ideology." *Public Choice* 108, 33–75, 2001.
 - Peter Bernholz, "Ideology, sects, state and totalitarianism. A general theory". In: H. Maier and M. Schaefer (eds.): *Totalitarianism and Political Religions, Vol. II* (Routledge, Abingdon Oxon and New York, 2007), 246–70.
 - Franz Borkenau *The Totalitarian Enemy*, London, Faber and Faber 1940.
 - Karl Dietrich Bracher "The Disputed Concept of Totalitarianism," pp. 11–33 from *Totalitarianism Reconsidered* edited by Ernest A. Menze (Port Washington, N.Y. / London: Kennikat Press, 1981), ISBN 0804692688.
 - Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics* (in particular March 7, 1979 course).
 - Carl Friedrich and Z. K. Brzezinski, *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy* (2nd ed. 1967).
 - Zhelyu Zhelev, *The Fascism*, 1982.
 - Guy Hermet, with Pierre Hassner and Jacques Rupnik, *Totalitarismes* (Paris: Éditions Economica, 1984).
 - Abbott Gleason *Totalitarianism: The Inner History Of The Cold War*, New York: Oxford University Press, (1995), ISBN 0195050177.
 - Jeane Kirkpatrick, *Dictatorships and Double Standards: Rationalism and reason in politics* (1982).
 - Walter Laqueur *The Fate of the Revolution Interpretations of Soviet History From 1917 to the Present*, London: Collier Books, (1987) ISBN 002034080X.
 - Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems Of Democratic Transition And Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, And Post-Communist Europe*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, (1996), ISBN 0801851572.
 - Ludwig von Mises, *Omnipotent Government: The Rise of the Total State and Total War* (1944).
 - Ewan Murray. *Shut Up: Tale of Totalitarianism* (2005).
 - Stanley G. Payne, *A History of Fascism* (Routledge, 1996).
 - Robert Jaulin *L'Univers des totalitarismes* (Paris: Loris Talmart, 1995).
 - Rudolf Rocker. *Nationalism and Culture*. 1937.
 - Giovanni Sartori, *The Theory of Democracy Revisited* (Chatham, N.J: Chatham House, 1987)
 - Wolfgang Sauer, "National Socialism: totalitarianism or fascism?" *The American Historical Review*, Volume 73, Issue #2 (December 1967): 404–24.
 - Leonard Schapiro, *Totalitarianism* (London: The Pall Mall Press, 1972).
 - Marcello Sorce Keller, "Why is Music so Ideological, Why Do Totalitarian States Take It So Seriously", *Journal of Musicological Research*, XXVI (2007), no. 2–3, pp. 91–122.
 - J. L. Talmon, *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy*, (1952).
 - Enzo Traverso, *Le Totalitarisme : Le XXe siècle en débat*, (Poche, 2001).
 - Slavoj Žižek, *Did Somebody Say Totalitarianism?* (London: Verso, 2001).
1. "dictator - Definition from the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary". www.merriam-webster.com. Retrieved 2008-08-01.
 2. Papaioannou, Kostadis; vanZanden, Jan Luiten (2015). "The Dictator Effect: How long years in office affect economic development". *Journal of Institutional Economics*. **11** (1). doi:10.1017/S1744137414000356.
 3. Olson, Mancur (1993). "Dictatorship, Democracy, and Development". *American Political Science Review*. **87** (3).
 4. *Freedom in The World 2017 - Populists and Autocrats: The Dual Threat to Global Democracy* by Freedom House, January 31, 2017
 5. "Democracy Index 2017 - Economist Intelligence Unit" (PDF). EIU.com. Retrieved 17 February 2018.
 6. Keatley, Patrick (18 August 2003). "Obituary: Idi Amin". *The Guardian*. London. Retrieved 2008-03-18.
 7. Fritz Morstein Marx, et al. *Propaganda and Dictatorship* (Princeton UP, 1936). excerpt
 8. "Daniele Manin Facts". *Biography*. Retrieved 6 January 2016.

9. "The First Philippine Republic". National Historical Commission. 7 September 2012. Retrieved 26 May 2018. On June 20, Aguinaldo issued a decree organizing the judiciary, and on June 23, again upon Mabini's advice, major changes were promulgated and implemented: change of government from Dictatorial to Revolutionary; change of the Executive title from Dictator to President
10. Philippine Legislature:100 Years, Cesar Pobre
11. Dune, Eduard Martynovich; Koenker, Diane; Smith, S. A. (April 1993). Notes of a Red Guard. Urbana Illinois, U.S.A.: University of Illinois Press. p. 101. ISBN 978-0252062773. ISBN 0252062779.
12. "Gulag Prisoner Population Statistics from 1934 to 1953." Wasatch.edu. Wasatch, n.d. Web. 16 July 2016: "According to a 1993 study of Soviet archival data, a total of 1,053,829 people died in the Gulag from 1934 to 1953. However, taking into account that it was common practice to release prisoners who were either suffering from incurable diseases or on the point of death, the actual Gulag death toll was somewhat higher, amounting to 1,258,537 in 1934-53, or 1.6 million deaths during the whole period from 1929 to 1953.."
13. ""Top 15 Topped Dictators". Time. 20 October 2011. Retrieved 4 March 2017.
14. William Branigin, Architect of Genocide Was Unrepentant to the End The Washington Post, April 17, 1998
15. "Equatorial Guinea country profile". BBC News. 8 May 2018.
16. "Sudanese dictator Omar al-Bashir faces war crimes charges". The Daily Telegraph. July 14, 2008.
17. "Idi Amin: a byword for brutality". News24. 2003-07-21. Archived from the original on 2008-06-05. Retrieved 2007-12-02.
18. Lloyd, Lorna (2007) p.239