УДК 316.3

Shapovalenko M.
V.N.Karazin Kharkiv National University

LEGITIMIZING POLITICAL REGIME „THIRD WAVE” DEMOCRATIZATION

Dramatic dispersion of regime outcomes after an initial transition to competitive regimes has occurred in many parts of the world in the third and fourth waves of democratization. Many transitions to competitive regimes failed, resulting in a burgeoning number of competitive authoritarian regimes that sponsor controlled elections. Some regimes have status hybrid regimes. Freedom House's monitoring shows that Ukraine is hybrid regime. Political system of Ukraine is very instability and fragile under external factor. This article is devoted to analysis of some features of political institutions. Permanent political crisis during several years increases potential risks for Ukrainian independent and authoritarian tendencies.

***Key words**: legitimation, legitimizating, political regime, consolidation of regime.*

Шаповаленко М.В.

ЛЕГІТИМАЦІЯ ПОЛІТИЧНИХ РЕЖИМІВ „ТРЕТЬОЇ ХВИЛІ” ДЕМОКРАТИЗАЦІЇ

Практика останніх десятиліть свідчить, що найбільш вразливими э механізми та чинники легітимації нових політичних інститутів в країнах, в яких почалися процеси демократизації внаслідок третьої та четвертої „хвиль” трансформації. Багато демократичних переходів проявили чіткі тенденції до зменшення впливу демократичних інститутів на політику та зростання привабливості авторитаризму в очах населення. За результатами моніторингу Freedom House, Україна відноситься до країн „гібридним” режимом.

***Ключові слова:** легітимність, легітимація, політичний режим, консолідація режиму.*

Шаповаленко М. В.

ЛЕГИТИМАЦИЯ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ РЕЖИМОВ „ТРЕТЬЕЙ ВОЛНЫ” ДЕМОКРАТИЗАЦИИ

Практика последних десятилетий свидетельствует о том, что наиболее уязвимыми являются механизмы и факторы легитимации новых политических институтов, в которых начались процессы демократизации вследствие третьей и четвертой „волн” трансформации. Мноие демократические переходы проявили четкие тенденции к уменьшению влияния демократических институтов на политику и усиление привлекательности авторитаризма в глазах населения. По результатам мониторинга Freedom House, Украина отноится к странам с „гибридным” режимом”.

***Ключевые слова:** легитимность, легитимация, политический режим, консолидация режима*

For the post-communist transformation remain stableand effective existence of political institutions as important challenge. The main parameters of the capacity of the political system is the quality of the institutions of democracy (democratization, dedemokraty-zation) and the degree of strength of state institutions. Theories of political dynamics and political regime underscore the complexity of determining patterns of change in this area. Attention is drawn to the fact that it can lead to a successful democratization of the political system, and that, and conversely, dedemocratization factors in this process. In the national political science literature, the problem of sustainability and legitimization of political institutions of newly political regime to some extent found its mark. Interesting in this regard are the articles and monographs of scientists Babkina O. Horbatenko V. Matsiyevskoho J., Rudich, F., Yakushik V., M.I Sazonov,

O. Romaniuk, O.Fisun and other. Modern theorists on democracy transitions including, A.Melvil, V.Lamentovych, K.Makfol using S. Huntington’s theory of democratization „wave" in the world, carried by modern post-communist countries to the so-called „fourth wave" of demo-cratization. Democratic transit, which took place in the former Soviet Union is unique. Political regimes in these countries are hybrid, and hence their potential legitimization should be subject to detailed analysis because the political process is not linear and constantly moving to authoritarian democracy.

Legitimation can be defined as a process of explanation and justification of an institutional order. Thus it consists of normative and cognitive parts that includes both the formation of knowledge institutions and the formation of values. Knowledge of institutions involves the formation and distribution of rolls that define right and wrong actions of some predefined institutional framework. Legitimization first explains why an individual should do so and not otherwise, and then makes it clear why the order of things is the way it is.

Consolidating democracy is impossible without both legitimacy belief that the leadership of this country competently and citizens must obey its decisions. This classic approach to the definition of „legitimacy” and „legitimized” as a process of constant reproduction rights to political power was developed by Max Weber. From his point of view, the process of legitimizing power occurs constantly provided political faith main participants in these relationships and value-rational untie their mutual actions and motives. „The legitimacy of the order can be guaranteed only internally ...” [1, c.639]. In this definition, there are two key points – the subordination and the right to control. Willingness to obey the decisions made manifest in trust, faith, loyalty and support. In this regard, S. Lipset legitimacy gave the following definition: „the ability of the system argue that it is these political institutions are the most adequate (acceptable) given society” [2, p.77]. H. Linz suggested minimalist definition: legitimacy – is „the belief that, despite the mistakes and failures, these political institutions are better than any other that could be installed and need to obey” [3, p.65]. In modern literature, identify different types of legitimacy: traditional, charismatic, legal-rational, eudemonic (conducive to happiness), officially nationalistic, traditional. For some types of legitimacy are important such external (primarily international) factors, such as the formal recognition or informal support from international organizations and the world community. In the history of any state there were situations when the leader was unpopular at home and enjoyed a very low support and confidence of the population, but have international credibility and appropriate support. Definitely need the support of democracy, and the country's leadership, declaring their commitment to democratic values, must continually legitimize itself. However, only the electoral mechanism demonstrates the credibility of the main political institutions (leaders, political parties, public authorities), and the degree of support for democratic values. Undemocratic regimes are less dependent on public support and may not have this, but they are also in need. Therefore, the definition of legitimacy can be used mostly only in relation to democratic states.

Typology of legitimacy Weber in the modern world is of little use, because good examples of traditional legitimacy today is almost gone, charismatic legitimacy, in terms of M. Dogan, in the twentieth century. Also virtually non-existent, because most often it is the official policy of either the product or creativity biographers (eg, charismatic Nasser). Even Mussolini and Stalin can not be considered charismatic leaders. Rational- legal legitimacy is, in terms of M. Dogan, in the modern world is presented in several very different groups of countries:
• development of a pluralistic democracy (there is a stable democracy for over 20 years);
• authoritarian bureaucratic system in which civil liberties are respected and partly they have support among some of the population, and the question here is not whether or not to have the legitimacy they have, and the question is how „diffuse support” (D. Easton) they have. Rational - legal legitimacy is, in terms of M. Dogan , in the modern world is presented in several very different groups of countries:

- development of a pluralistic democracy (there is a stable democracy for over 20 years);
- authoritarian bureaucratic system in which civil liberties are respected and partly they have support among some of the population, and the question here is not whether or not to have the legitimacy they have, and the question is how „diffuse support” (D. Easton) they have .
- totalitarian and dictatorial regimes, which may not have support, but at the same time the leaders of these powers can be charismatic. Lack of revolution does not

indicate legitimacy of the regime , and is tantamount to rebellion social suicide.

„Third World" in Asia, Africa and Latin America, with respect to which all the arguments about the legitimacy of a completely pointless, because these societies not be adequately structured and differentiated, power is perceived as divine or natural given, but the absence of violence does not says that there is legitimacy. Therefore, from the point of view of some scholars, typology Weber is actually an anachronism, since its inception [4, p.61].

English political philosopher D. Held offers the following typology of legitimacy [5, p.182]: no choice, due to the established order or the threat of violence; We can not choose the way due to the tradition; apathy; pragmatic submission (though we do not like the situation, but we can not imagine things differently, and perceive the regime as fate); instrumental adoption (despite the dissatisfaction with the existing order, we believe that the regime will eventually enable us to obtain certain benefits and advantages); o regulatory consent, as this order is correct and adequate, then we must obey him; o-ideal normative agreement – all the knowledge that we might like, all the possibilities that we could uncover, we accept as relevant to our standards and expectations. they are normally political regime does not have a 100% support, so it is necessary to introduce indicators that would allow to judge the degree of support for the regime. D.Easton suggested as indicators to measure the extent of the political legitimacy of the use of violence and expressions of defiance, dimensions of the dissident movement, the funds allocated by the government for security, which can serve as an indicator of support [4, p.163].

But quite difficult to measure the degree of violation of the law, the scope of the dissident movement, etc. undertaken political regimes attempt to manipulate public opinion – to influence the sympathy / antipathy towards the leaders or the policies they rate - may not coincide with the actual attitude of policy. There is an important degree of confidence to the different political institutions and personalities. But quite difficult to measure the degree of violation of the law , the scope of the dissident movement, etc. undertaken political regimes attempt to manipulate public opinion – to influence the sympathy / antipathy towards the leaders or the policies they rate – may not coincide with the actual attitude towards policies. There is an important degree of confidence to the different political institutions and personalities.

As noted by S. Lipset, people with incredible ease lose confidence in the institutions representatives, but not by the institutions. Therefore it is necessary to distinguish the legitimacy of the political regime, the credibility of its institutions and the popularity or confidence in its leaders. Mismatches unpopularity leaders and the legitimacy of the political system. Democratic regime can not break up, because there is no better alternative to democracy than its democratically improve [6, p.69].

Therefore, we can say that there is a significant „gap” between confidence in the institutions as such and trust in their representatives. Widespread penetration (born ubiquity) of this „gap" between trust in institutions and individuals in all pluralistic democracies actualizes the problem of representation functions mediative institutions, etc. [6, p.416-423].

Legitimacy based on „ignorance” people unconscious acceptance of prevailing values and attitudes. Under „ignorance” means incomplete, distorted, mystified knowledge that enables legitimization of their own power. The very power is exercised through the structures (political parties, interest groups, decision-making centers – legislative, executive and judicial branches of government) and the aggregation process, articulating interests, collection and storage of information, evaluation of resources, decision-making and policy-making [7, p. 79-83].

This, in turn, can not be achieved without socialization and recruitment of new actors of the political process. Constant criticism by opposition forces official policy contributes to the improvement and correction of the political system, integrates into the legitimate political system, any potential anti-systemic effect, contributing to the stability and soundness of individual political institutions and the political system as a whole.

Incomplete policy and group structuring Ukrainian society can turn green light for rapid establishment of authoritarian structures in the future without much stress dispose of the burden of democratic demands and restraining mechanisms. Even nowadays there are some hazards. These include, in particular, the merging of state bureaucracy into a single anti-democratic force, representing various branches of government. This political party frequently provides political decision to bypass the constitutionally enshrined procedures leads to the chaotic nature of the legislation, which manifests itself in adopting imperfect laws, a

large number of regulations, hampering the emergence of an effective system of social control and regulation.

Thus, the legitimation of political institutions in Ukraine is in its infancy. Given that Ukraine has often changed the basic rules of the struggle for power, respectively, and values formation process is far from over. This confirms the popular belief, a low level of civic political culture in Ukraine. But hardly alarmed, because the regular holding of elections helps to maintain this level of legitimation of political institutions which will ensure the stability and effectiveness of minimum total institutional order.

REFERENCES

1. Вебер М. Протестантская этика и дух капитализма / М. Вебер // Избранные произведения. – М., 1990. – С. 273-306.
2. Lipset S. Cleavage structures, party systems and voter alignments. An introduction / S. Lipset, S. Rokkan // Party systems and voter alignments. – New York, 1967. – P. 1-64.
3. Linz J. J. Presidential or parliamentary democracy: does it make a difference? / J. Linz // The failure of presidential democracy / ed. J. J. Linz & A. Valenzuela. – Baltimore, 1994. – P. 3-87.
4. Easton D. A Systems Analysis of Political Life / D. Easton. – New York: Wiley, 1965. – 507 p.
5. Di Palma G. Legitimation from the top to civil society: politico-cultural change in Eastern Europe / G. Di Palma // World Politics. – 1991. – Vol. 44, № 1. – P. 49-80.
6. Held D. Models of Democracy (3rd edition) / D. Held. – Publisher: Polity Press, 2007. – 408 p.
7. Democracy and authoritarism in postcommunist world / edit. By V. Bunce, M. McFaul, K.Stoner-Weiss. – Cambridge, 2010. –367 p.

УДК 329

Власенко Т. Т.
Харківський національний педагогічний університет імені Г.С.Сковороди

ІДЕОЛОГІЧНІ СИМУЛЯКРИ ЯК ІНСТРУМЕНТ МОБІЛІЗАЦІЇ ГРОМАДЯН (УКРАЇНСЬКИЙ КОНТЕКСТ)

Розглядається проблема створення і функціонування симулякрів в українському політичному дискурсі. Аналізується механізм використання ідеологічних симулякрів в якості інструменту мобілізації громадян, зокрема, розглядається вплив симулякрів на переформатування політичних реалій в Україні. Досліджується виробництво символів і симулякрів в умовах кризи політичної влади

Ключові слова: *знак,ідеологія, імітація, мобілізація, символ, симулякр, симуляція*

Власенко Т. Т.

ИДЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ СИМУЛЯКРЫ КАК ИНСТРУМЕНТ МОБИЛИЗАЦИИ ГРАЖДАН (УКРАИНСКИЙ КОНТЕКСТ)

Рассматривается проблема создания и функционирования симулякров в украинскомполитическом дискурсе. Анализируется механизм использования идеологических симулякров в качестве инструмента мобилизации граждан, в частности, рассматривается влияние симулякров на переформатирование политических реалий в Украине. Исследуется производство символов и симулякров в условиях кризиса политической власти.

Ключевые слова: *знак, идеология, имитация, мобилизация, символ, симулякр, симуляция*