

However, the concept of «national sovereignty» is the subject of scientific research in the context of ideas «rule of law» and «democracy.» From the author's perspective, national sovereignty is a central element of the system of basic principles which form such type of social relations as democracy.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 27.08.2015

УДК 321.7:328.18.008.1(477)

Dziubenko Yuliia, NU "OAL"

MAIN THEORETICAL APPROACHES ON THE ISSUE OF THREAT TO DEMOCRACY

The article analyzes main theoretical approaches of foreign and domestic scholars on the issue of threat to democracy («distortion of democracy», «non-fulfillment of promises of democracy», «threats to democracy», «fragility of modern democratic regimes»). The author defines contemporary threats to democracy and the main threats to democracy in Ukraine which are: incomplete administrative reform; absence of a functioning system of distribution of power for three branches; collisions in legislation; low social mobility; low level of economic development; inability to influence the government; low effectiveness of democratic mechanisms to select elites and elected government institutions; social apathy, «syndrome of uncertainty».

Modern political processes are characterized by democratic transformations in most countries, which, in turn, are characterized by development with particular problems. Of particular note is the problem of threats to democracy. This problem received relevance for our country after 2010, when the question of possible return of Ukrainian political regime to authoritarianism arose. Primarily, this is caused by a significant gap between the aim, objectives and possibilities of reforming society and its democratization.

The need to study threats to democracy is particularly important in current conditions of globalization, as far as democratic transition helps a state to find its place and role in the international community and will enable Ukraine to ensure further democratization of society and to build a developed European state.

Threats to democracy were studied by next foreign and domestic scientists: J. Beshler, F. Schmitter, S. Eisenstadt, A. Tocqueville, N. Baranov, R. Biliichuk, O. Myhailovska, O. Nikandrov, I. Pohorska, D. Lakishyk and others.

These authors consider a range of issues: from the essence and meaning of concepts «democracy», «democratization» to the major threats to democratic regime.

The aim of the article is to determine the main threats to democracy.

At the present stage of social development issue of threats to democracy remains relevant in many countries. J. Beshler introduced the concept «deficit of democracy» into scientific use, which means shortcomings inherent to democracy and problems arising in the course of democracy. By these, the author divided deficits into two types: 1) arise as a result of inconsistency between ideal and reality (economic problems); 2) related to objective circumstances that prevent approaching the ideal of democracy (power, prestige, wealth) [2, p. 168]. J. Beshler distinguishes three types of «distortions» – political, ideological and moral.

Under political distortions he understands political market – exchange (between private and public spheres), distribution and search. Private interests act as a part in the exchange and offer votes and support to partner during elections. Their partners are politicians who need votes and support of citizens to be elected in authorities. Thus appears a contradiction of democracy.

The author considers that false interpretation of basic democratic principles is the reason of ideological distortions, what leads to ideological conclusions that may adversely affect democratization [2].

To moral distortions J. Beshler includes abuse of freedom, which in most countries that hold democratic course is alleviated by guarantee of civil liberties and separation of public and private spheres. According to O. Myhailovska main deficiencies of Ukrainian democracy are «disregard of laws and absence of effective Constitution» [6, p. 66].

J. Beshler identified threats to democracy, based on retrospective trends and ratio between social expectations and political decisions; F. Schmitter, in his turn, focused on the study of political regimes in transitive period. The author determined two reasons of threats to democracy: «ideological hegemony of democracy may be depleted with the growth of frustration of new democracies in real results; the possibility that democracy will move forward without satisfying expectations of its citizens and without establishing acceptable and predictable set of rules for political competition and cooperation is low»[11].

According to F. Schmitter there are two ways of development in countries with democratic changes: 1) creation of a hybrid regime; 2) formation of a stable unconsolidated democracy [11]. The author notes that most countries of South America, Eastern Europe and Asia will not be able to form a stable government that would become acceptable to society [11].

F. Schmitter describes internal dilemmas to characterize modern democracy, regardless spatial and temporal factors and external dilemmas that challenge the compatibility of new democratic rules and practices with existing social, cultural and economic conditions.

Among internal dilemmas the author considers oligarchy; self-withdrawal, characterized by the lack of rational incentives for citizens to participate actively in political life that leads to political deprivation; «cycles in policy» which is caused by uneven distribution of costs and benefits among social groups that creates unstable majority formed by temporary coalitions; functional autonomy (accountability of undemocratic institutions of a state to citizens and experts); interdependence of national leaders with other democracies and some autocracies associated with limited ability to control decisions of multinational corporations, the spread of ideas, movement of individuals across borders ad so on, which indicates limitation of their power within a state [11].

External dilemmas are characterized by «collective choice between alternative institutional arrangements compatible with existing socio-economic structures and cultural realities» [11]. The author does not agree that historical experience provides adequate and optimal institutional compliance. Over the past twenty years democratic processes involved states without former democratic experience, including Ukraine. These countries, as a rule, rely on foreign experience.

S. Eisenstadt believes that as a result of ideological and institutional history of modern political systems, fragility and instability inherent to any constitutional-democratic regimes. The author believes that the basis for these statements is openness of political process in constitutional democracies and accompanying trend to constant reassessment of the political sphere. «This openness is the main reason for fragility of modern democratic regimes, but the paradox is that it ensures the continuity of their existence» [12, p. 67]. The author notes that if a political system is characterized by openness, it testifies about its ability to adapt to contemporary social and political processes and to form an idea of politics as a «game» without zero sum, when gainings of one party do not tantamount to losing of another [12].

Among the main «contradictions» S. Eisenstadt names: «contradictions between an emphasis on human autonomy and powerful, severe control; contradictions between creativity, which internally inherent to images created by the ideas of the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and the great revolutions and the blurring of these images, frustration due to routine and bureaucracy of the modern world; contradictions between the complete picture of the modern world, that fills its with meaning, and crushing

of this meaning due to increasing institutional autonomy of such spheres as economics, politics and culture; contradictions between the tendency to self-determination and establishment of independent political units and the growth of international forces that are outside of the control of these units» [1, quote: 12, p. 71].

Threats to democracy may also come from the masses and from the elite. N. Baranov stressed that democracy is best ensured by increasing participation of the masses in politics. However, in the twentieth century the masses became the most susceptible before the temptations of totalitarianism [1].

In his work «The Future of Democracy» N. Bobbio identified three obstacles to the development of democracy: technocracy, bureaucracy and the problem of «unmanageable» democracy [8, p. 89].

A. Tocqueville identified «two major threats to democracy: complete dependence of legislature on the wishes of voters, concentration of all other forms of government in the legislative bodies» [10, p. 158]. Also, «exercising democracy a number of real threats to democracy should be taken into account, e.g. a representative institution, absenteeism, manipulation by the will of people, «the tyranny of masses». Only civil society with a high level of civic democratic culture can confront such threats» [5].

R. Biliichuk among threats to democracy in Ukraine identifies «syndrome of uncertainty inherent both to government and society. Stereotype of the Soviet authorities entrenched in the minds of society; power acted by the scheme a leader – the party – people, and all decisions were taken «from above». In the context of democratic development, society takes a lot of decisions independently, and therefore temptation to return to well-known and simple scheme is more acute»; patronizing and clientelistic model of political elite; oligarchic-corporate type of Ukrainian political system, where representatives of the richest population groups and forensic groups have huge impact on power solutions [3].

I. Pohorska, D. Lakishyk in their work determined conditions and trends that threaten democratic transformation, which deserve support, «the growth among supporters of extreme forms of nationalism, religious intolerance and theocratic aspirations, terrorism and criminal violence, the crisis of the modern model of socio-political system that dominates in most developed countries, the increasing role of advertising specialists and consultants in the media in politics, the lack of interest of citizens in public affairs when it does not concern their specific interests» [9].

M. Boichuk proposed the most appropriate classification of threats to democracy in Ukraine into political and social, with which we actually agree.

The threats of the first type are: «incompleteness of administrative reform; absence of effective system of separation of powers; internal legislative collisions; absence of a strong middle class; low social mobility; low level of economic development; absence of fully-fledged private property; immaturity of basic institutions of civil society in Ukraine; absence of a formed political nation; tendency to form several types of identities at once. A number of authors consider one of the main threats within the procedural factors the regressive trend of democratization, namely the fact that by many signs Ukrainian form of democracy falls under the definition of imitation of democracy or controlled democracy. The social threats to Ukraine's democratic development should include those that appear in the overall public assessment of a state of democracy in Ukraine, in evaluation of the ability to influence the government by society itself, in evaluation of the effectiveness of democratic mechanisms in selection of elites and institutions of government, in evaluation of the situation with the rights and freedoms and general dynamics of assessments on availability of democracy in Ukraine» [4, p. 20].

Thus, after analyzing different views regarding threats to democratic changes in general and in Ukraine in particular, we believe that current trends are characterized by democratic institutions that may peacefully and effectively resolve problems that arise between society and government by changing the ruling elite during the elections.

Summarizing the abovementioned, we conclude that democratic changes in modern conditions are characterized by complexity and ambiguity. As M. Nazarov correctly notes «the immaturity of the political elite, political corruption, clannishness and orientation solely on a leader of a political party, the loss of connection between political forces and voters in the absence of political, economic and social reforms led to prolonged political and economic crisis in the country. The use of democratic slogans by elites in undemocratic struggle for power, became the causative factor for the growth of demands for a politician, which with «a strong hand» establishes order in Ukrainian society» [7].

Bibliography:

1. Баранов Н. А. Трансформации современной демократии : учебное пособие / [Electronic source] / Н. А. Баранов. СПб. : Балт. гос. техн. ун-т, 2006. – 215 с. – Access mode: http://read.virmk.ru/b/BARANOV_DEMOKRATIA/07.htm
2. Бешлер Ж. М. Демократия. Аналитический очерк / Ж. М. Бешлер. – М. : б.и., 1994. – С. 168 187.
3. Білійчук Р. В. Перспективи та загрози для демократії в Україні після президенських виборів 2010 р. [Electronic source] / Р. В. Білійчук //

- Наукові записки. Серія «Політичні науки» : матеріали конференції: «Перспективи та загрози демократії у постпомаранчевий період в Україні». – Острог : Видавництво Національного університету «Острозька академія», 2010. – Вип. 4. – Access mode: http://eprints.oa.edu.ua/845/1/NZ_stud_Vur_4.pdf
4. Бойчук М. А. Демократичний процес в Україні: проблема вибору і механізмів реалізації : автореф. дис ... д-ра філос. наук : 09.00.03 / Микола Андрійович Бойчук. – К., 2012. – 30 с.
 5. Загрози реальній демократії та її захист [Electronic source] / Навчальні матеріали on-line. – Access mode: http://pidruchniki.com/10560412/politologiya/zagrozi_realniy_demokratiyi_zahist
 6. Михайловська О. Г. Деякі проблеми демократичних змін у сучасній Україні / О. Г. Михайловська // Політологічні записки. – 2013. – № 2(8). – С. 63–69.
 7. Назаров М. С. Особливості процесу демократичного транзиту в Україні та Республіці Молдова [Electronic source] / М. С. Назаров. – Access mode: <https://www.academia.edu/4761413>
 8. Никандров А. Социализм или демократия: дискуссии Н. Боббио с итальянскими коммунистам [Electronic source] / Александр Никандров // Обозреватель. – 2013. – № 3. – С. 84–92. – Access mode: http://observer.materik.ru/observer/N2_2013/084_093.pdf
 9. Погорська І. І. Демократизація і сучасному світі: тенденції поширення та перспективи розвитку [Electronic source] / І. І. Погорська, Д. М. Лакішик. – Access mode: http://www.kymu.edu.ua/vmv/v/p07/pogorska-lakishyk_u.pdf
 10. Токвиль А. О демократии в Америке / А. Токвиль ; пер. с франц. – М. : Прогресс, 1992. – 560 с.
 11. Шмиттер Ф. К. Угрозы и дилеммы демократии [Electronic source] / Ф. К. Шмиттер. – Access mode: <http://www.russ.ru/antolog/predely/1/dem2-2.htm>
 12. Эйзенштадт Ш. Н. Парадокс демократических режимов: хрупкость и изменяемость (I) / Ш. Н. Эйзенштадт // Политические исследования. – 2002. – № 2. – С. 67–80.

Проаналізовано основні теоретичні підходи зарубіжних та вітчизняних вчених відносно проблеми загрози демократії («перекручування демократії», «невиконання обіцянок демократії», «загрози демократії», «крихкість сучасних демократичних режимів»). Визначено сучасні загрози демократії, також до основних загроз демократії в Україні слід віднести: незавершеність адміністративної реформи; відсутність дієздатної системи розподілу трьох гілок; колізії у законодавстві; низька соціальна мобільність; низький рівень розвитку економіки; неспроможність впливати на владу; низька ефективність демократичних механізмів відбору еліт та виборних інститутів влади; соціальна апатія, «синдром невизначеності».

Проанализированы основные теоретические подходы зарубежных и отечественных ученых относительно проблемы угрозы демократии («искажения демократии», «невыполнение обещаний демократии», «угрозы демократии», «хрупкость современных демократических режимов»). Определено, что к основным угрозам демократии в Украине следует отнести: незавершенность административной реформы; коллизии в законодательстве; низкая социальная мобильность; низкий уровень развития экономики; неспособность влиять на власть; низкая эффективность демократических механизмов отбора институтов власти; социальная апатия; «синдром неопределенности».

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 14.09.2015

УДК 321.6/8:061.2 (477)

Стоцький В. В., ДЗ «ПНПУ імені К. Д. Ушинського»

КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНІ ОСНОВИ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ПОЛІТИЧНОЇ СТАБІЛЬНОСТІ ЯК СТАНУ ДЕМОКРАТИЧНОЇ ПОЛІТИЧНОЇ СИСТЕМИ

Розглядаються основні підходи до аналізу політичної стабільності в контексті демократичної політичної системи. Наводяться відомі моделі сучасного суспільства, розроблені зарубіжними фахівцями. Розкривається саморганізаційний потенціал, властивий будь-якій складній динамічній системі, який спрацьовує в екстремній ситуації і забезпечує стабільність політичної системи. Показано, що взаємодія соціального середовища з інституційною системою становить динаміку політичного процесу.

Політичні системи демократичного типу розуміються синергетикою, як відкриті системи, що засвоюють зовнішні дії і знаходяться в процесі зміни і оновлення. Центром синергетичного підходу є флуктуації, під якими розуміються випадкові відхилення значень від їхніх середніх показників, які характеризують стан рівноваги політичної системи. Наявність флуктуації свідчить про хаос на мікрорівні політичної системи. У процесі функціонування системи, завдяки дії позитивних зворотних зв'язків, що забезпечуються суспільством, флуктуації посилюються. Флуктуації можуть виявитися такими сильними, що виникає беззворотність розвитку. Таким чином, попередній стан політичної системи або якісно змінюється (народжується нова структура, політичний порядок, що ґрунтується на новій диференціації елементів системи), або взагалі руйнується.