

**Yuliia Dziubenko**

*National University "Odesa Law Academy", Ukraine*

## **BASIC REASONS AND CONDITIONS OF AUTHORITARIAN REVERSE WAVES: FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE**

The article analyzes basic reasons of authoritarian reverse waves, defines potential factors and conditions of authoritarian reverse wave after the third wave of democratization, such as: reduction of legitimacy of democratic regimes, general economic crisis, appearance of “snowballing” effect after authoritarian transition of any democratic or democratizing state, transition of recently democratized countries to dictatorship, successful expansion by undemocratic state against democracies, appearance of different forms of authoritarianism that respond the needs of the moment. The paper also determines fundamental reasons of authoritarian reverse waves in Central and Eastern European countries, Baltic states and analyzes general trends of authoritarianism in particular countries of the mentioned areas. It was determined that the largest number of authoritarian hallmarks in Ukraine emerged in times of V. Yanukovich presidency.

**Key words:** political regime, authoritarian regime, authoritarian reverse wave.

Conditions of globalized, fast-flowing, computerized and dynamic society result growth of actors in society, therefore the requirements to states grow, same as the amount of information needed for balanced political decision-making. In particular countries processes occur that are accompanied by social instability, ineffective mechanisms and methods of exercising power and implementation of political decisions. It should also be noted that within crisis of liberal paradigms of social development aspiration of a number of states to implement authoritarian modernization after the third wave of democratization is not weakened, but rather increases<sup>1</sup>.

Among the main reasons of authoritarian reverse waves, except such factors as global economic crisis and international pressure, we should separately highlight that each model of democracy has its temporal and geographic boundaries. As an example social-liberal model of democracy may serve, which originated in the US during the "New Deal" of Franklin D. Roosevelt and worked successfully for two postwar decades, but by the late 1960s early 1970s this model depleted. Nowadays, the qualitative reserve of liberal democracy model, created in 1970-1980's, is exhausted<sup>2</sup>. And as long as no new model will be produced, which, on the one hand, would work effectively in the context of globalization and, on the other hand, overcome civilization limitations, trends of authoritarian reverse waves would prevail in the world.

S. Huntington identified the following causes of reverse waves:

- disappearance of law and order as a result of terrorism and insurgent movements;
- intervention or conquest by undemocratic foreign country;
- “snowballing” effect as an example of collapse or overthrow of democratic systems in other countries;
- insufficient rootedness of democratic values among key elite groups and general public;
- economic crisis or collapse, which has exacerbated social conflict and increased popularity of tough measures that could be applied only by authoritarian government;
- social and political polarization, often caused by actions of leftist governments that tried to carry excessively many social and economic reforms too quickly;
- determination of conservative groups of the middle and upper class to remove populist and leftist movements, as well as the lower class of political power.

Transitions from democracy to authoritarianism, except those caused by actions of foreign actors, are almost always committed by those who had political power or were close to power in a democratic system.

<sup>1</sup> Вайнштейн, Г.И. (2010). *Фактор политической системы в процессах модернизации: мировой опыт и российские реалии. Модернизация, авторитаризм и демократия*. Москва: ИМЭМО РАН, 35.

<sup>2</sup> Радионов, К. Авторитарный откат на постсоветском пространстве. *Forbes*. <<http://www.forbes.ru/mneniya-column/opyty/62640-avtoritarnyi-otkat-na-postsovetском-prostranstve>>.

With one or two possible exceptions, there are no examples when the end of a democratic system was put by popular voting or nationwide uprising. The vast majority of transitions from authoritarianism to democracy took the form of military coups, upheavals or were carried out by executive power when democratically elected chief executive broke decisively with democracy and concentrated all power in his hands, usually by announcement of emergency or martial law.

It is also worth noting, that both the first and the second reverse waves of democratic systems were replaced by historically new forms of authoritarian rule. Fascism differed from earlier forms of authoritarianism due to its mass base, ideology, party organization and the desire to control and cover a large part of society. Bureaucratic authoritarianism differed from earlier forms of military rule in Latin America due to its institutional nature, predictable and permanent rule economic policy<sup>1</sup>. In fact, two new forms of authoritarianism were a response to social and economic development.

As potential causes for third reverse wave we may determine:

- reducing of legitimacy of democratic regimes through a systematic inability to act effectively;
- general economic crisis, which can also deprive democracy of legitimacy in many countries;
- appearance of "snowballing" effect because of a transition to authoritarianism of any democratic or democratizing state;
- transition of recently democratized countries to dictatorship because of the lack of many necessary conditions for democracy, which can also lead to "snowballing" effect;
- successful expansion of a non-democratic state against democratic countries;
- emergence of different forms of authoritarianism that meet the needs of the time: authoritarian nationalism, religious fundamentalism, oligarchic authoritarianism, populist dictatorships, group dictatorships, which may take the whole society under control<sup>2</sup>.

O. Ponomariova among common factors that determined authoritarian transition in Central and Eastern European countries, Southeast Europe and Baltic states identified:

- 1) the unwillingness of people to govern the country in terms of parliamentarism; most of people did not know democratic traditions and did not perceive democracy as a value in itself; lack of appropriate political culture;
- 2) liberal electoral laws have opened the way to politics for small and extremist parties, whose role in a Parliament was clearly destructive;
- 3) absence of social structures essential for democracy, stable and numerous middle class; predominance of peasant population, that generally did not support democracy;
- 4) unwillingness of political elite for democracy; excessive personal ambition of leading politicians;
- 5) extremely difficult economic situation in the countries;
- 6) external pressure of the Triple Alliance<sup>3</sup>.

Most authors call that centralization of power vertical as a mechanism for modernization, has almost exhausted resource of its post-Soviet economic legacy<sup>4</sup>. As another reason of authoritarian reverse wave is called living resource exhaustion of liberal-democratic model of development, which is the benchmark for most post-Soviet states<sup>5</sup>. According to A. Suzdaltsev, "authoritarian trend combined with state, and in some cases ethnic nationalism, undeveloped party systems and criminalization of power can become a major political dominant" of former Soviet republics<sup>6</sup>.

The reason for strengthening of authoritarian tendencies of political system in new independent states the author sees, above all, in improvement of mechanism of "ruling circles' access" to the national heritage. Not accidentally, authoritarian regimes received logical implementation especially in countries with strong export, re-export and energy transit opportunities.

However, the similarity of general trends in political development of post-Soviet republics does not

<sup>1</sup> Хантингтон, С. (2003). *Третья волна. Демократизация в конце XX века*. Москва, 310-314.

<sup>2</sup> Баранов, Н.А. Волны демократизации в современном мире. <[http://nicbar.ru/polit\\_trans\\_lekzia2.htm](http://nicbar.ru/polit_trans_lekzia2.htm)>.

<sup>3</sup> Пономарева, Е.Г. (2009). Авторитарный транзит периферийных стран межвоенной Европы: политологический анализ. *Вестник МГИМО-Университета*, 6 (9), 188-199.

<sup>4</sup> Власов, А.В. (2011). Постсоветское пространство: 20 лет спустя. *Выступление на заседании Евразийского форума экспертов «20 лет постсоветского развития: итоги и новые тенденции»*. Астана, 1.

<sup>5</sup> Радионов, К. Авторитарный откат на постсоветском пространстве. *Forbes*.

<<http://www.forbes.ru/mneniya-column/oputy/62640-avtoritarnyi-otkat-na-postsovetskom-prostranstve>>.

<sup>6</sup> Суздальцев, А. (2009). Постсоветское пространство: единство и многообразие. *Актуально*.

mean that the establishment of superstructural institutions generally occurs under one scenario. Scientists associated significant differences in national political processes primarily with differences in pace and content of market transformation in new independent states.

Analyzing political development of Central and Eastern European countries, Southeast Europe and Baltic states in the interwar period, it should be remembered that the region is not a part of the West World, but only the periphery of nucleus of the capitalist system.

The first half of the twentieth century for the countries and peoples of this area is “a slow, choppy, stopping and ongoing process of modernization, which has been radically transformed by a communist revolution, with its special modernization projects, myths and utopias”<sup>1</sup>.

And for the most objective assessment of political situation prevailing in most CEE countries, Southeast Europe and Baltic states within interwar period, it is important to understand not only the complexity of socio-economic situation, but also the evolutionary direction of social attitudes and political spectrum.

In the interwar period, all CEE, SEE and Baltic states had authoritarian regimes in the form of presidential or monarchical dictatorships. Dictatorship of 1920-1930 in Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Estonia and Yugoslavia had a lot in common. With all the differences of occurrence circumstances they were combined with nationalism, denial of liberal democracy, anti-parliamentarism, critical attitude to political parties and aspiration for personal power of a leader (monarch, president or a military dictator)<sup>2</sup>.

Regimes in all these countries have evolved from a quasi-democracy to authoritarianism, which main justification was “to find a way out of a pan-European crisis, approval and stabilization of a national state”.

In the study region all authoritarian regimes of interwar period were characterized by the presence of the three pillars of authoritarianism: leaderism, ideas of a nation-state and nationalism.

The most important part of authoritarian ideology, its core was the idea of a nation-state and nationalism, which expressed in the requirement “to rebuild the national justice” and create “Polish Poland”, “Latvian Latvia”, “Hungarian Hungary” and etc., that is a state with a clear dominant indigenous nation. These goals were to be achieved through provision of “indigenous” with leading positions in economy, politics, culture, upbringing of population in nationalist spirit, in intolerance towards other nationalities, especially Jews, Ukrainians, Belarusians and Russian.

The most important characteristic of authoritarian regimes is the presence of a strong charismatic personality: J. Pilsudski in Poland, M. Horthy and G. Gömbös in Hungary, A. Smetona in Lithuania, K. Ulmanis in Latvia, A. Hlinka in Slovakia, etc.

In peripheral countries, where political orientation was primarily defined by devotion of a person, but not a political program, a camp of leaders and dictators consisted of loyal them personally praetorians.

It should be remembered that the genesis and flourishing of authoritarian regimes is associated with amorphousness of political rivals and the presence of too soft of parliamentary structure, incapable for decisive and tough actions in difficult socio-economic conditions.

Authoritarian regimes should be assessed pragmatically, “as an organism, which filled a void in the center of a political scene and promoted stability in the country”<sup>3</sup>.

Evolution of all authoritarian regimes goes through three general stages. The first is the appearance of authorities defined to “serve” to a certain idea. On the second, a simple careerism starts to dominate, techniques that violate not only the political pluralism, but human and civil rights are increasingly used. The prevailing authoritarianism actively restricts the opposition<sup>4</sup>.

As for the general population, except of infringed in rights ethnic minorities, it has very positively perceived authoritarian transformation, which brought an order with it, restricted corruption and ensured social and economic development of society.

Separately, I would like to analyze the example of Ukraine, presidency of Viktor Yanukovich halted

<sup>1</sup> Пономарева, Е.Г. (2009). Авторитарный транзит периферийных стран межвоенной Европы: политологический анализ. *Вестник МГИМО-Университета*, 6 (9), 188-199.

<sup>2</sup> Пономарева, Е.Г. (2009). Авторитарный транзит периферийных стран межвоенной Европы: политологический анализ. *Вестник МГИМО-Университета*, 6 (9), 188-199.

<sup>3</sup> Пономарева, Е.Г. (2009). Авторитарный транзит периферийных стран межвоенной Европы: политологический анализ. *Вестник МГИМО-Университета*, 6 (9), 188-199.

<sup>4</sup> Пономарева, Е.Г. (2009). Авторитарный транзит периферийных стран межвоенной Европы: политологический анализ. *Вестник МГИМО-Университета*, 6 (9), 188-199.

democratic tendencies and led to reverse process and movement towards authoritarianism. The beginning was the abolition of the 2004 constitutional reform in October 2010 and a return to presidential-parliamentary form of government. The purpose of this step is more than understandable; it was the concentration of state power within the executive branch, which is a characteristic for authoritarianism. For three years in power, V. Yanukovich was able to subdue not only the judiciary, characterized by corruption and dependence on the bureaucracy, but legislative power also.

Ukraine, like Russia and Belarus began to rapidly closer to authoritarianism. Authoritarian tendencies in the dynamics of transformation of the political regime won democratic.

In March 2013 Ukrainian political analysts noted the fact that the three-year rule of President V. Yanukovich led to a governance model transformation and changed the type of political regime, which was characterized by a departure from democratic values. By assessment of international non-governmental organization Freedom House, since the reign of V. Yushchenko and Y. Tymoshenko Ukraine has lost a number of positions in the list of signs of free and democratic countries, and fell down to the level of countries such as Pakistan, Colombia and Mozambique, and moved from the category of "free countries" to "partly free"<sup>1</sup>. From 12 basic signs of authoritarian regime, political power of V. Yanukovich in Ukraine fully met with eight criteria and partly with four, keeping some ineradicable signs of democracy, civil liberties and unfinished authoritarianism<sup>2</sup>.

By adopting of so called "Laws of January 16" in 2014 during the Revolution of dignity Viktor Yanukovich and his encirclement decided to "finish" establishment of authoritarianism and "eradicate democracy" and civil liberties. The shooting of demonstrators in the tragic days of February 2014 can be considered as the apogee of the prevailing kleptocratic authoritarianism. Landmark was the fact that Yanukovich's political career ended up the way as many failed authoritarian dictators did - escape from the country with stolen possessions. Given that, according to the existing in political science classifications of authoritarianism, we can determine the political regime of Viktor Yanukovich as authoritarian, oligarchic and kleptocratic<sup>3</sup>.

It should be noted that the dynamics of transformation of the political regime in post-Soviet Ukraine had contradictory and unpredictable nature. Authoritarian tendencies were in confrontation with democratic alternative and in this context transition period meant rather uncertainty of the final results, incompleteness, contradictions and inconsistencies of transformation of the regime. All this, in our view, determines the specific of post-totalitarian period and transformation of the political regime in Ukraine compared to other post-totalitarian state, so in the longer term we consider it urgent to study separate basic conditions and causes of authoritarian transit in Ukraine and other countries, namely after 2000 year, which will enable to forecast trends and threats to democracy.

## References

1. Baranov, N. A. Volny demokratizacii v sovremennom mire. <[http://nicbar.ru/polit\\_trans\\_lekzia2.htm](http://nicbar.ru/polit_trans_lekzia2.htm)>.
2. Vajnshtejn, G. I. (2010). *Faktor politicheskoy sistemy v processakh mdernizacii: mirovoj opyt i rossijskie realii. Modernizacija, avtoritarizm i demoratija*. Moskva: IMEEMO RAN.
3. Vlasov, A. V. (2011). *Postsovetskoe prostranstvo: 20 let spustja. Vystuplenie na zasedanii Evrazijskogo foruma ehkspertov «20 let postsovetskogo razvitiya: itogi i novye tendencii»*. Astana.
4. Ponomareva, E. G. (2009). Avtoritarnyj tranzit periferijnykh stran mezhoennoj Evropy: politologicheskij analiz. *Vestnik MGIMO-Universiteta*, 6 (9), 188-199.
5. Radionov, K. Avtoritarnyj otkat na postsovetskom prostranstve. *Forbes*. <<http://www.forbes.ru/mneniya-column/opoty/62640-avtoritarnyi-otkat-na-postsovetskom-prostranstve>>.
6. Suzdal'cev, A. (2009). Postsovetskoe prostranstvo: edinstvo i mnogoobrazie. *Aktual'no*.
7. Tomakhiv, V. (2014). Transformacija politichnogo rezhimu v nezalezhnij Ukraini: zagal'ni tendencii, osoblivosti, definicii. *Ukrains'ka nauka: minule, suchasne, majbutne, vip. 9, ch. 1*.
8. Ukraina nabula majzhe usikh 12 oznak avtoritarnoi derzhavi. <[http://vgolos.com.ua/articles/ukraina\\_nabula\\_mayzhe\\_usih\\_12\\_oznak\\_avtorytarnoi\\_derzhavy\\_106965.html](http://vgolos.com.ua/articles/ukraina_nabula_mayzhe_usih_12_oznak_avtorytarnoi_derzhavy_106965.html)>.
9. Khantington, S. (2003). *Tret'ja volna. Demokratizacija v konce XX veka*. Moskva.

<sup>1</sup> Томахів, В. (2014). Трансформація політичного режиму в незалежній Україні: загальні тенденції, особливості, дефініції. *Українська наука: минуле, сучасне, майбутнє, вип. 9, ч. 1*, 338.

<sup>2</sup> Україна набула майже усіх 12 ознак авторитарної держави. <[http://vgolos.com.ua/articles/ukraina\\_nabula\\_mayzhe\\_usih\\_12\\_oznak\\_avtorytarnoi\\_derzhavy\\_106965.html](http://vgolos.com.ua/articles/ukraina_nabula_mayzhe_usih_12_oznak_avtorytarnoi_derzhavy_106965.html)>.

<sup>3</sup> Томахів, В. (2014). Трансформація політичного режиму в незалежній Україні: загальні тенденції, особливості, дефініції. *Українська наука: минуле, сучасне, майбутнє, вип. 9, ч. 1*, 338.