

deplorable or criminal”, were in fact so recent. What brings us to our point is the fact that “in spite of it, they replenished the century; one against the other, sustaining each other, they fabricated their material. Simultaneously very powerful, very ephemeral and very ominous, how could they mobilise so much hope, or so much passion in so many individuals?” (Ibid.). Furet’s analysis brought forward an interpretation that in quite clear terms reveals the mechanisms of interdependence between fascism and bolshevism. Being adversaries, both ideologies and for some time also political systems needed each other. Still more, they were in a relation of complicity regarding their common enemy: “The heftiest secret of complicity between bolshevism and fascism remains however the existence of their common adversary, which the both hostile doctrines reduced or exorcised with an idea that it had been in agony, and which therefore constituted their soil: very simply, democracy” (Ibid.: p. 39). Maybe it is not so important that this interpretation, which in its minute scrutiny of both historical occurrences maintains a constant awareness of their irreducible differences, makes possible to comprehend the turning points of history such as Hitler’s and Stalin’s temporary alliance. From a theoretical point of view, it is more instructive that Furet’s interpretation in its retrospective insight demonstrates what could be called the vulnerability of democracy. Since the representative democracy as the formal political system does not offer much else, but the rule of the abstract *Law*, it maintains openness for a variety of different political alternatives and unfortunately for the anti-democratic ones too. This trait of democracy is known as its basic paradox: as soon as democracy defends itself using the power of the State apparatuses, it is in danger to cease to be democracy. Alternatively, democracy stays open to a subversion or usurpation by the anti-democratic movements. Therefore, the perpetuation of democracy keeps dependence on “fine tuning” between the democratic parties and maintaining the democratic functioning of its institutions of the state of law. This task seems to be complicated during the times of prosperity and even more, when tensions and crisis hit a society. Robert Michels in his brilliant sociological book (first edition was published in 1915) made his point about the *iron law of oligarchy*: “There is no essential contradiction between the doctrine that history is the record of a continued series of class struggles and the doctrine that class struggles invariably culminate in the creation of new oligarchies which undergo fusion with the old” (Michels. 2001: p. 233). Michels actually hints that