

# FORMATION OF AUTHORITARIAN AND DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL REGIMES: POLITICAL AND LEGAL ASPECT

## FORMAÇÃO DE REGIMES POLÍTICOS AUTORITÁRIOS E DEMOCRÁTICOS: ASPECTO POLÍTICO E JURÍDICO

### OLEKSANDR SKRYPNIUK

Koretsky Institute of State and Law of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Ukraine.  
[alexander.skrypniuk@gmail.com](mailto:alexander.skrypniuk@gmail.com)

### OLEKSII BURIACHENKO

National Aviation University, Ukraine.  
[youa@ukr.net](mailto:youa@ukr.net)

### VIKTOR MELNYK

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine.  
[melnyk1996ethnology@gmail.com](mailto:melnyk1996ethnology@gmail.com)

### VIKTORIYA KOBKO-ODARIY

National University "Odessa Law Academy", Ukraine.  
[Vika.kobko.93@gmail.com](mailto:Vika.kobko.93@gmail.com)

### OLENA BEREZOVSKA-CHMIL

Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ukraine.  
[olena.berezovska@pnu.edu.ua](mailto:olena.berezovska@pnu.edu.ua)

**Received:** 10 Jun 2023

**Accepted:** 30 Sept 2023

**Published:** 09 Oct 2023

**Corresponding author:**

[youa@ukr.net](mailto:youa@ukr.net)



**Abstract:** This article focuses on examining the formation of authoritarian and democratic political regimes throughout recent centuries and their consequential impact on contemporary political landscapes. The study emphasizes the political and legal aspects inherent to each regime type while analyzing both the positive and negative attributes associated with them. Furthermore, this article presents contemporary country examples that represent either authoritarian or democratic political regimes, alongside an exploration of historical underpinnings and influential factors that have contributed to their varied formation. Additionally, this paper includes reflections on the development of democracy within the twenty-first century, considering the challenges that have emerged in this era. Furthermore, this article explores the potential challenges and issues linked to digitalization, particularly the risk of it being exploited by autocratic leaders, transforming it into a tool for reinforcing authoritarian regimes. The research reveals that certain characteristics intrinsic to a democratic regime can be subverted and employed deceitfully to create an illusion of valuing citizens' opinions. This manipulation of public sentiment often occurs within countries governed by authoritarian regimes. Moreover, this study examines specific features and underlying foundations of the aforementioned political regimes, shedding light on the mechanisms through which power is sustained within each system.

**Keywords:** The political regime. Democracy. Authoritarianism. Human rights.

**Resumo:** Este artigo se concentra em examinar a formação de regimes políticos autoritários e democráticos ao longo dos últimos séculos e seu consequente impacto nos cenários políticos contemporâneos. O estudo enfatiza os aspectos políticos e jurídicos inerentes a cada tipo de regime, ao mesmo tempo em que analisa os atributos positivos e negativos a eles associados. Além disso, este artigo apresenta exemplos de países contemporâneos que representam regimes políticos autoritários ou democráticos, juntamente com uma

exploração dos fundamentos históricos e fatores influentes que contribuíram para sua formação variada. Além disso, este artigo inclui reflexões sobre o desenvolvimento da democracia no século XXI, considerando os desafios que surgiram nesta época. Além disso, este artigo explora os potenciais desafios e questões ligadas à digitalização, particularmente o risco de ser explorada por líderes autocráticos, transformando-a em uma ferramenta para reforçar regimes autoritários. A pesquisa revela que certas características intrínsecas a um regime democrático podem ser subvertidas e utilizadas de forma enganosa para criar uma ilusão de valorização da opinião dos cidadãos. Essa manipulação do sentimento público geralmente ocorre em países governados por regimes autoritários. Além disso, este estudo examina características específicas e fundamentos subjacentes aos regimes políticos mencionados, lançando luz sobre os mecanismos pelos quais o poder é sustentado dentro de cada sistema.

**Palavras-chave:** Regime político. Democracia. Autoritarismo. Direitos humanos.

## 1. Introduction

The significance of this topic stems from the enduring dichotomy between the two primary legal regimes that prevail within the social fabric of countries worldwide. Throughout their establishment and evolution, the perpetual contestation between these regimes has given rise to a plethora of legal and political characteristics that significantly influence the future and inter-state relations within the international legal domain.

The significance of this topic arises from the ongoing dynamics of the global order, characterized by a competition between two predominant legal regimes: the liberal-democratic and authoritarian-totalitarian systems. These regimes engage in a contest for political and legal dominance, driven by their distinct ideologies, values, and modes of governance. Concurrently, both regimes garner their respective proponents and detractors, exhibiting marked disparities in their approaches to addressing societal challenges and ensuring the rights and freedoms of citizens.

The liberal democratic regime is widely regarded by numerous countries as a preeminent model of governance, owing to its core tenets of individual freedom, adherence to the rule of law, the principle of separation of powers, and the safeguarding of human rights. It has served as the foundation for numerous international legal norms and agreements dedicated to safeguarding human rights, countering corruption, promoting democratic processes, and fostering the development of legal culture. Central to the liberal democratic regime is its emphasis on civil society, freedom of speech, an independent judiciary, and an effective system ensuring government accountability to its citizens.

Conversely, an authoritarian-totalitarian regime is founded upon centralized power, the curtailment of civil liberties, the enforcement of repression, and population control. Such a regime

prioritizes political stability and efficient governance, often at the cost of democratic principles and human rights. Authoritarian states frequently exert control over media outlets, curtail political opposition, and employ censorship as a tool to bolster their regime.

The objective of this study: is to elucidate the process of the formation of authoritarian and democratic political regimes and assess their influence within the contemporary context.

The focus of the study is centered on the political and legal aspects of the emergence and evolution of these regimes.

The achievement of the research objective can be facilitated through the utilization of various methodologies, including historical and legal analysis, comparative analysis, formal legal analysis, and systems analysis.

In light of the aforementioned, particular attention should be directed toward the later stages of societal development, as they have significantly shaped the formation of these political regimes.

Examining the factors that have served as prerequisites for the development and proliferation of authoritarian and democratic political regimes on the global political landscape will enable a focused analysis of their present-day context.

Furthermore, emphasizing the directional trajectories of influential states worldwide and exploring the approaches they employ to reach compromises will provide further insight into the feasibility of effective international cooperation between proponents and representatives of these two regime types.

## 2. Literature Review

Analysis of recent research and publications. Numerous scholars and researchers have extensively studied the political and legal dimensions of the formation and development of authoritarian and democratic political regimes. Notably, Holovaty M.V., Kabanets O.S., Petryshyn O.V., Andriichuk T.S., Kolodii M.M., Shvets V.D., Dolzhenkov O.O., Boichuk M.A., Kozma V.V., and various other national academics have dedicated their works to this subject.

Equally significant are the contributions made by international counterparts who have explored the chosen research topic in their publications. Noteworthy among them are Abraham F. Lowenthal, Sergio Bitar, Nic Cheeseman, Marie-Eve Desrosiers, Natasha Lindstaedt, Michael Wahmana, Jan Teorellb, Axel Hadeniusc, and numerous other researchers.

### 3. Research

Employing rigorous methodologies, the author undertakes an analysis of the formation and development of authoritarian and democratic political regimes, primarily focusing on the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Notably, particular attention is dedicated to investigating the distinct characteristics and defining features exhibited by each regime type through separate examination.

The author adeptly illustrates the reciprocal influence exerted by authoritarian and democratic political regimes upon one another and the broader society of numerous prominent nations. This analysis facilitates the identification of discernible negative aspects and serves as a cautionary signal for the ongoing endeavor to combat and rectify shortcomings. Furthermore, it provides insights into the approaches to influence future democratization processes and informs the trajectory of global development among nations worldwide.

It is crucial to recognize that in certain instances, an authoritarian regime may manipulate and exploit the tools and fundamental principles associated with a democratic political regime, thereby distorting and diluting the values that are intended to benefit the populace. Consequently, public trust in the democratic ideal can erode as it becomes a manipulated concept wielded by the leaders of such states. Within this framework, it becomes imperative to sustain the trajectory of ongoing democratization efforts and endeavor to rid governance structures of unscrupulous officials entangled in corruption and driven by self-serving materialistic ideals.

### 4. Discussion

It is imperative to commence by examining the concepts of authoritarianism and authoritarian regimes to conduct a comprehensive analysis of this matter. Accordingly, within the realm of politics and governance, authoritarianism entails unwavering submission to authority and the curtailment of individual freedom of thought and action (Sukhonos V.V., 2000).

Authoritarian regimes are political systems characterized by the absence of a well-defined mechanism for the transfer of executive power, coupled with the denial of civil liberties and political rights to citizens (Diamond L., 2005).

Power is concentrated within the control of either a singular leader or a small elite group, who exercise decision-making authority without considering the consent or preferences of the

populace. Although the term authoritarianism is frequently employed to encompass any type of non-democratic governance, research has revealed the existence of various manifestations and distinct variations within this category.

Prominent authoritarian regimes of the twentieth century were notably distinguished by the presence of a charismatic leader, a formidable political party, and a potent secret police apparatus (Levytsky S., 2010). Regimes that employ state institutions to infiltrate the consciousness of the population, impose total ideological conformity, and exert comprehensive control over all aspects of society are categorized as totalitarian.

Totalitarian regimes endeavor to cultivate unwavering allegiance among their citizens towards both the regime itself and its leader. From a young age, children are indoctrinated with narratives that exalt the heroism of their leaders and promote the supremacy of the governing ideology espoused by the regime (Brownlie J., 2007).

Dissent within totalitarian regimes is vehemently suppressed, with any form of opposition being met with exile, execution, or imprisonment. The prevalence of political trust is notably low, as citizens are systematically encouraged to surveil and report on one another, assuming the role of informants for the regime.

Totalitarian regimes are characterized by their inherent cruelty. A poignant example of this can be found in Ukraine, where an estimated 4 million people perished due to starvation during the Holodomor, a man-made famine engineered and protracted by the Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin (Ganji J., Pshevorskyi A., 2007). The term totalitarianism also aptly encapsulates the nature of Soviet regimes in Eastern Europe throughout the Cold War era, as well as the contemporary regime in North Korea (Ganji J., Pshevorskyi A., 2007).

Conceptually defining fascism can be challenging, but it represents an overtly militaristic and hyper-nationalistic form of governance. Fascist regimes share similarities with totalitarian systems in terms of mobilizing the public through a mass political party and exalting a charismatic leader. However, unlike totalitarian systems, fascist regimes often establish a rigid social hierarchy, and the extent of state control over society tends to be less pervasive (Sukhonos V.V., 2000).

Similar to totalitarian systems, fascist regimes emerged in times of turmoil and crises. Figures such as Adolf Hitler in Germany and Benito Mussolini in Italy rose to power by capitalizing on an unstable political climate (Ganji J., Pshevorskyi A., 2007). Gandhi J. posits that totalitarian modes of governance encompass fascist regimes that emerge within capitalist societies facing social exclusion due to the consequences of economic individualism (Ganji J., Pshevorskyi A., 2007).

Notwithstanding these noteworthy instances from history, the fully totalitarian or fascist rule is scarce in contemporary times. Numerous authoritarian regimes during the twentieth century faced challenges in maintaining complete control over their societies, leading to the emergence of intriguing regional patterns.

Personalistic dictatorships are typified by leaders who wield near-absolute authority, with other state institutions experiencing significant weakening and existing primarily in name only. The judiciary operates under direct orders from the dictator, while the legislature, typically dominated by the leader's party, functions as a mere puppet. In numerous instances, the dictator makes no pretense of adhering to constitutional procedures and rules.

The armed forces within such regimes are deliberately "coup-proofed" or intentionally weakened to ensure they do not pose a threat to the leader's authority (Aiyar S., 2000). All other branches of the state become reliant on the dictator and may be directly subordinated to their command. Given the unchecked nature of the dictator's power, these forms of governance are prone to elevated levels of corruption.

Throughout the Cold War, a significant number of national governments in Eastern Europe, as well as certain countries in Asia, were governed by a single political party. In numerous instances, these regimes developed into totalitarian systems that exerted absolute authority over their respective societies. However, there were instances where the role of the secret police was less pervasive, and citizens were not subject to constant surveillance.

One-party regimes are spearheaded by a dominant party that holds substantial power. While an official leader may be in charge, a collaborative effort among various political elites is required to formulate and execute government policies.

Prominent illustrations of one-party rule can be found in the Communist Party of China, the Communist Party of Vietnam, and the Singapore People's Action Party (Bans V.Y., Volchyk, S.L., 2010). Extensive research indicates that one-party systems generally exhibit superior economic growth and development compared to personalistic or military junta systems. The emphasis on consensus-building in policy formulation ensures that policy outcomes remain stable and are not subject to the arbitrary decisions of a single dictator.

Remarkably, the Middle East continues to exhibit a prevalence of monarchical systems of government. While some of these monarchies have experienced revolutions leading to their overthrow (e.g., in Iraq, Iran, Egypt, and Libya), many others have endured (Levytsky S., 2010). The European colonial powers regarded monarchy as a stable form of governance, well-suited for the process of nation-building.

Moreover, inspiration was derived from the prevalence of traditional dynastic governance structures that were historically prominent in the region. Monarchies, characterized by rule under a royal family, function in a manner reminiscent of a one-party regime, involving multiple individuals in deliberation, consultation, and decision-making processes. Consequently, the political outcomes of monarchies have exhibited a degree of predictability, contributing to their endurance as one of the most enduring forms of government.

The enduring stability of authoritarian rule in the Middle East has prompted scholarly investigations aimed at elucidating the mechanisms through which regimes, despite possessing relatively affluent populations, manage to avert the emergence of a discontented middle class demanding democratic rights and representation. Some scholars have attributed this phenomenon to the presence of valuable natural resources that obviate the need for stimulating productivity or levying taxes (Brownlee J., 2007). Specifically, this pertains to resources such as oil, natural gas, and diamonds.

The economic shortcomings experienced by the communist regimes in Eastern Europe, coupled with the Soviet Union's eventual incapacity to sustain them through military and financial assistance, culminated in their collapse from 1989 to 1991 (Brownlee J., 2007).

Following the conclusion of the Cold War, numerous authoritarian regimes experienced a downfall, prompting certain political scientists to express optimism regarding the potential obsolescence of authoritarianism. In the past few decades, the emergence of an educated middle class, coupled with the influence exerted by student movements and organized labor, contributed to the proliferation of democracies. Democratic principles gained traction across various regions, fostering a prevailing perception of democracy's triumph.

However, as time passed, it became evident that the earlier optimistic assessment was misguided. In the aftermath of the global financial crisis of 2007-2008, not only did authoritarian regimes assert themselves more forcefully, but numerous democracies regressed towards authoritarian tendencies.

Individuals experiencing displacement, unemployment, inflation, and debt became more vulnerable to the rhetoric and allure of authoritarian leadership styles, particularly those with populist characteristics (Kalleo D.P., 2001).

However, in the modern world, the misuse of democratic institutions has emerged as a significant challenge, with authoritarian regimes employing them as a facade to conceal their authoritarian nature. While many of these regimes still hold elections, the fairness and

competitiveness of these electoral processes are compromised, leaving little doubt about the predetermined outcome (Egorov G., Guriev S., Sonin K., 2006).

Fewer regimes are currently conducting phased elections that result in implausible victories. In certain instances, dictators permit opposition groups to achieve apparent success, creating an illusion of democratic governance. An illustration of this can be observed in Venezuela, where Nicolas Maduro allowed the opposition to secure nearly one-third of the votes in the 2018 presidential election (Bitar S., Lowenthal A., 2015).

In the majority of authoritarian regimes, a token opposition is permitted to exist, but numerous members of the opposition face imprisonment or persecution. Furthermore, voters are subjected to disinformation campaigns aimed at undermining opposition candidates, thereby securing the triumph of the ruling government.

Although the majority of authoritarian regimes have established constitutions, they provide limited freedoms to their citizens, both in theory and in practice. While individuals may express their opinions on trivial matters, open discussions on many topics are strictly prohibited. Such restrictions often result in severe consequences for those deemed to pose a threat to national security or undermine the regime's stability.

The scope for civil society to function is significantly constrained within authoritarian regimes. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that receive foreign funding are often required to register with the state and undergo surveillance to detect any perceived illicit activities (Beetham D., 1993).

The press is a frequent target of authoritarian regimes. While media outlets are typically not fully state-owned, journalists and media professionals encounter limitations on their freedom of expression and are subject to restrictions on their ability to criticize the government. Violating these boundaries can result in imprisonment, harassment, threats, fines, or the revocation of their licenses (Stotsky Ya. V., 2011). In other instances, the regime employs tactics to ensure that media outlets providing favorable coverage align with the regime's biases.

Authoritarian regimes in the present era do incorporate institutions such as legislatures, political parties, and the judiciary, but their authority and influence are severely limited. While a legislature may be present, its members are often political loyalists who seldom vote against the leader or the ruling party.

Although "electoral autocracies" may exhibit a semblance of opposition in their legislatures or a partial degree of judicial independence, it is important to recognize that these measures often



serve as a mere façade of democracy, strategically employed to preserve the regime's domestic and international legitimacy (Chabanna M.S., 2002).

Within authoritarian regimes, the presence of judges and courts does not ensure their independence from the executive branch. This lack of independence is often manifested through a practice known as "telephone law," where autocratic leaders directly instruct judges, sometimes through literal phone conversations, on how to decide politically sensitive cases.

Telephone law is a prominent characteristic of authoritarian regimes, enabling affluent and influential individuals to bypass conventional rules and regulations for personal gains (Skrypniuk, 2020).

The prevalence of autocracy over democracy in many countries has significantly influenced the levels of support for democracy following periods of authoritarian rule (Huntington, 1991). Researchers argue that individuals who have been raised in autocratic systems are often subjected to educational approaches that prioritize rote memorization over critical thinking, thereby shaping their perspectives to align with the regime's preferences. This upbringing can impact their willingness to embrace democratic values and principles.

In the twenty-first century, authoritarian regimes have adeptly capitalized on the anxieties of citizens within both established and emerging democracies, presenting a formidable challenge to democratic systems. This period has witnessed the emergence of a phenomenon known as "digital authoritarianism," whereby authoritarian regimes employ information technology as a means to preserve or strengthen their authority. These regimes utilize tactics such as disseminating misleading or confusing information, distracting the populace, and imposing restrictions on accessing information from sources beyond their control (Pridham, 2002).

Furthermore, nations have effectively harnessed the power of the internet to disseminate disinformation and propaganda strategically, intending to amplify political divisions within democratic societies and erode public trust in democratic institutions.

During the early 2000s, China embarked on an endeavor to construct a robust digital framework that would enable it to control the information accessible to its populace, thereby safeguarding the stability of its government.

The construction of the "Golden Shield" infrastructure, also referred to as the Great Firewall encompassed a centralized network of interception points for Internet traffic. Through this system, the Chinese government gained the capability to selectively restrict access to foreign websites and limit Chinese-language accessibility to popular online platforms (Chandel, S., 2019).

Consequently, platforms like Twitter, Google, Facebook, YouTube, and virtual private networks (VPNs) were effectively blocked.

Presently, there is growing momentum in the efforts to counter the influence of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). In 2021, both democratic governments and private entities increasingly recognized the moral, human rights, and national security implications associated with engaging with a Chinese regime that has exhibited increased domestic repression and assertiveness on the international stage in the past decade (Chandel, S., 2019).

Central to the process of restoring democracy is a comprehensive comprehension of the underlying essence of this notion. In its optimal manifestation, democracy represents a system of governance founded upon the collective will and consent of the governed, inclusive institutions answerable to all members of society, a steadfast commitment to the rule of law, and unwavering respect for fundamental human rights (Andriychuk, T., 2012).

It represents an intricate network of interdependent structures wherein those wielding authorities are held accountable through rigorous scrutiny from both internal and external sources, such as an autonomous judiciary, an impartial media, and a vibrant civil society (Arblaster, E., 2005).

It necessitates a receptiveness to power shifts, wherein competing candidates or parties engage in fair competition to attain governance for the betterment of society at large, rather than solely for their interests or those of their supporters. It establishes an equitable environment that allows all individuals, irrespective of their birth or background, to exercise their universal human rights and actively engage in political affairs and decision-making processes (Ball, T., Degger, R., 2005).

Democratic nations possess common interests in equitable trade and security, as their propensity to adhere to agreements and norms renders them more dependable partners in these realms. Their institutional structures and popular backing render them more foreseeable and favorable environments for both public and private investments (Seidentop, L., 2001). While no democracy is flawless, they all derive advantages from their fundamental capacity to adapt to evolving circumstances, modify policies, and introduce new leadership with minimal disruption to the overall system.

Democracy did not abruptly emerge in its contemporary form but rather experienced a strengthening process through various historical periods, characterized by challenges and significant milestones. The culmination of World War I and the triumph of the Allies played a pivotal role in delegitimizing ancient systems such as monarchy, aristocracy, and oligarchy.

The military defeat of Italy and Germany during World War II further discredited fascism, just as the economic and political collapse of the USSR undermined the credibility of Soviet communism (Vakhman, M., 2013). Similar failures also contributed to the gradual decline of military dictatorships in Latin America during the 1980s and 1990s (Danilyuk N.M., 2009).

These ideological and institutional transformations were accompanied by shifts in economic institutions. The prevalence of heavily centralized economies under state control provided political leaders with the means to reward their allies and penalize their adversaries through access to economic resources. However, the transition to more decentralized market economies has resulted in a decline in the power and influence wielded by top government officials (Holovaty M.F., 2011).

Furthermore, certain conditions that were conducive to the successful operation of a market economy also facilitated the growth of democracy. These conditions included accessible and reliable information, relatively high levels of education, ease of personal mobility, and the presence of a robust legal framework. As market economies expanded and the middle class expanded and gained influence, there was a rise in public support for these conditions, often accompanied by calls for greater democratization.

With the gradual improvement in the economic well-being of significant portions of the global population, the prospects for the long-term survival and prosperity of newly established democratic institutions increased.

During the 20th century, certain countries managed to sustain democratic systems even in the face of significant diplomatic, military, economic, or political challenges, including the initial years of the Great Depression. The resilience of democratic institutions in these countries can be attributed, at least in part, to the presence of a prevailing culture characterized by widely shared democratic beliefs and values within their societies. These beliefs and values are typically instilled in individuals from earlier generations, becoming deeply ingrained in their perceptions of the self, nation, and the global community (Inglehart, R., Welzel, C., 2005).

In countries where the democratic culture is lacking or insufficiently developed, as was the case in the Weimar Republic of Germany in the aftermath of World War I, the resilience of democracy is significantly compromised. In such contexts, periods of crisis tend to heighten the susceptibility to regression toward undemocratic regimes (Onishchuk, M., 2003).

While variations of the American presidential system were frequently embraced in Latin America, Africa, and other regions of the developing world, it is noteworthy that in some instances, the military orchestrated coups d'état that transformed the presidency into a dictatorship. On the

other hand, European nations, during their democratization processes, adopted their versions of the presidential system (Onishchuk, M., 2003).

The English parliamentary system represents a unique model wherein it incorporates a prime minister who is accountable to parliament, alongside a ceremonial head of state. The latter can be a hereditary monarch, as observed in Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, and Spain. Alternatively, the head of state can be a president elected by the parliament or by another designated body established explicitly for this purpose. France, however, deviates from this pattern by adopting a hybrid system that combines elements of both parliamentary and presidential systems in its fifth constitution, established in 1958 (Pshevorsky, A., 2005).

In the majority of established European and English-speaking democracies, political authority is concentrated within the central government, which possesses the constitutional authority to delineate the restricted powers and territorial divisions of subnational entities like states and regions. These unitary systems significantly contrast with federal systems, where power is constitutionally shared between the central government and the governments of relatively autonomous subnational entities. Among the democratic nations that have embraced a federal system, alongside the United States, are Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Spain, Canada, and Australia (Tsvetkov V.V., 2007).

Electoral mechanisms exhibit significant variation across democracies. Certain democratic systems partition their territories into electoral districts, with each district entitled to a single seat in the legislature. This seat is awarded to the candidate who garners the highest number of votes within that district. Conversely, proportional representation systems aim to establish a closer correlation between the proportion of votes garnered by a political party and the proportion of seats it obtains in the legislature (Kolodiy M.M., 2005).

Due to the absence of bias towards larger parties, proportional representation often results in the presence of three or more parties in the legislature. Consequently, the formation of a coalition government comprising two or more parties becomes a common requirement to secure legislative backing for government policies.

Variations in electoral systems and other factors contribute to the diversity among democracies in terms of whether laws and policies can be enacted by a single, relatively united party with a legislative majority, as observed in the UK and Japan. Alternatively, in countries such as Switzerland and the Netherlands, consensus among multiple parties with divergent perspectives is often necessary to reach an agreement on legislative matters (Tsvetkov V.V., 2007).

Detractors of consensus systems contend that they enable a minority of individuals to obstruct policies they disagree with and complicate the process of forming governments and enacting legislation. Conversely, advocates argue that this fosters broader public endorsement for government policies, ultimately enhancing the legitimacy and perceived significance of democracy. It is important to highlight that a nation's fundamental political institutions should be tailored to its particular circumstances and historical context.

In contemporary representative democracies, the attributes of an ideal democracy, to the extent they are present, are actualized through diverse political institutions. One of the most crucial among these is the institution of representation, wherein significant public decisions and policies are enacted by elected officials who are answerable to the electorate for their conduct (Kabanets O.S., 2010). Other significant institutions encompass the conduct of free, fair, and regular elections.

In such elections, citizens have the opportunity to engage as both voters and candidates, subject to potential limitations such as age and residency requirements. Freedom of speech and expression are also pivotal aspects. Individuals possess the ability to openly express their opinions and beliefs on a broad spectrum of politically pertinent subjects without the apprehension of reprisal. Equally significant are independent sources of information that operate outside government control and are safeguarded by legal provisions ensuring their right to disseminate information. Furthermore, all citizens possess the right to seek out and utilize such sources of information. Additionally, citizens retain the right to establish and participate in autonomous political entities, encompassing parties and interest groups.

Historical evidence reveals that democracy encompasses several characteristics that are widely regarded as desirable by individuals, irrespective of their fundamental political beliefs. Firstly, democracy serves as a safeguard against the rule of oppressive and cruel autocrats, ensuring that power is not concentrated in the hands of a few individuals. Secondly, countries governed by democratic systems tend to exhibit higher levels of prosperity compared to those under non-democratic regimes. Thirdly, democracy has a propensity to facilitate comprehensive human development, as evidenced by advancements in areas such as health, education, personal income, and various other indicators. Moreover, democracy empowers individuals to protect their fundamental interests by guaranteeing their basic rights and granting a broader range of personal freedoms when compared to alternative forms of governance.

Nonetheless, it is crucial to acknowledge that democracy places a significant responsibility on both individual citizens and society as a collective entity, concerning their actions and decisions.

Despite the numerous advantages associated with a market economy, it has led to substantial disparities in economic and social resources, encompassing wealth, income, education, and social status. As individuals with greater resources often exploit their advantages to influence the political system in their favor, the persistence of such inequalities presents an ongoing challenge in achieving a satisfactory level of political equality. These challenges become more pronounced during periods of economic downturn, which tend to exacerbate poverty and unemployment.

In certain countries, a combination of factors, including substantial state intervention in the economy, contributed to pervasive corruption among government officials. Additionally, inadequate legal systems in these states left civil rights vulnerable and susceptible to exploitation by political elites and criminal elements.

Considering these circumstances, there is a possibility that the remarkable momentum of democratization observed in the 20th century may not be sustained indefinitely. In certain countries, authoritarian systems are likely to persist, while others that have recently transitioned to democracy may struggle with weak and vulnerable democratic institutions. Furthermore, some countries may experience a regression from democratic governance and revert to authoritarian rule.

Nevertheless, despite these challenges, there is an overall trend favoring democratization. This form of government offers avenues for personal growth and enables citizens to advocate for their political, economic, social, cultural, and other rights and freedoms.

Democracy is founded upon the principles of the rule of law, which entails the equal application of laws to all individuals and institutions, including the government. Democratic systems typically incorporate legal provisions that safeguard essential human rights, such as freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and the right to a fair trial. These rights are enshrined in constitutions and safeguarded by independent judicial systems.

Promoting political pluralism is a key aspect of democratic societies, allowing for the existence, competition, and participation of numerous political parties in the political process. The legal framework ensures fair electoral procedures and equitable opportunities for all parties involved. Democratic states prioritize the separation of powers among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government. The legal system supports this separation by implementing checks and balances to prevent the misuse of power.

Furthermore, laws facilitate access to information, encourage public participation, and establish mechanisms to hold public officials accountable for their actions. This legal framework

enhances transparency, fosters civic engagement, and reinforces the democratic ideals of openness, inclusivity, and accountability.

It is crucial to acknowledge that the aforementioned legal aspects are generalizations, and the specific legal frameworks and practices can vary significantly among countries. The presence of particular legal characteristics does not guarantee the establishment of a fully democratic or authoritarian regime, as political realities and the enforcement of laws can differ substantially.

## **5. Conclusion**

Applying rigorous methodologies, the author analyzes the formation and progression of authoritarian and democratic political regimes, primarily focusing on the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The distinct characteristics and peculiarities of each regime are examined independently, while also exploring their reciprocal impact on each other and society at large in numerous prominent nations. This comprehensive examination enables the identification of specific detrimental aspects and serves as a cautionary guide for future endeavors in addressing and rectifying shortcomings. Moreover, it highlights strategies for fostering further democratization and shaping the trajectory of global development across countries worldwide.

It is essential to acknowledge that in certain instances, an authoritarian regime may employ the mechanisms and fundamental tenets of a democratic political system, thereby distorting and undermining the values it is intended to uphold for the benefit of the populace. Consequently, this erodes public trust in the democratic concept itself, as it becomes a tool for manipulation in the hands of these state leaders. In light of this, it is crucial to persist in the pursuit of ongoing democratization and to eradicate corrupt government officials who are entangled in self-serving notions of consumerism, thereby restoring integrity and promoting genuine democratic principles.

## REFERENCES

- Aiyar, S. (2000). The problem of law's authority: John Finnis and Joseph Raz on legal obligation. *Law and Philosophy* 19(4): 475.
- Andriychuk T. (2012). Development of democracy in Ukraine: influence of political values, *Scientific Notes*. No. 4. P. 266.
- Arblaster E. (2005). Key ideas of democracy. *Democracy: anthology/comp.* O. Protsenko. K., XXVIII. P.432.
- Ball T., Degger R. (2005). Demokraticheskiy ideal: istoriya stanovleniya [democratic ideal: history of formation]. from the English of P. Tarashchuk. *Democracy: an anthology/comp.* O. Protsenko. -K., XXVIII.. P.775.
- Beetham D. *Liberal Democracy and the Limits of Democratization.* D. Held. Prospects for Democracy: North, South, East, West. Stanford, 1993.
- Brownlee J. (2007). *Authoritarianism in an Age of Democratization.* New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Bunce VJ, Wolchik SL. 2010. Electoral change and stability in competitive authoritarian regimes. *World Polit.* 62(1):43–86
- Calleo, D. P. (2001). *Rethinking Europe's Future.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chabanka M. (2002). Authoritarianism and totalitarianism. Imaginary similarity and essential difference. *Political Management.* No. 2, p. 87.
- Danyliuk N. (2009). Defining features of the authoritarian political regime: the role of "authoritarian followers" in its support. *Education of the region.* No 4. P. 5.
- Democracy: History, Theory, Practice* (2011). textbook. for students. higher education. zakl. and postgraduates-political scientists / M. F. Golovaty. - K.: DP "vid. Dom "personnel". P. 114
- Egorov G, Guriev S, Sonin K. (2006). Media freedom, bureaucratic incentives, and the resource curse. *Center for Democracy, Development and the Rule of Law (CDDRL) Work. Pap.* No. 71, Stanford Univ.
- Gandhi J, Przeworski A. (2007). Authoritarian institutions and the survival of autocrats. *Comp. Polit. Stud.*
- Huntington S. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century.* Norman and London, 1991. – C. 15.
- International IDEA, *Democratic Transitions: Conversations with World Leaders*, eds S. Bitar and A. Lowenthal (Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press, Forthcoming, 2015.
- Kabanets O. S. (2010). Historical prerequisites for the emergence and formation of democracy. *State and Law.* No. 48. P. 23)



- Kolodiy M. (2005). Features of the formation of representative democracy. Right. No. 7, p.152.
- Levitsky S, Way LA. (2010). Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press/
- Onishchuk M. (2003). Majority and minority: lessons of parliamentary democracy. Voice of Ukraine. p. 24.
- Petrishin O. V. (2014). Democracy as the basis of the legal, social state. Law Of Ukraine. No 5. p. 79.
- Pridham, G. (2002) EU Enlargement and Consolidating Democracy in Postcommunist States. Journal of Common Market Studies, 40, 5.
- Prshevorsky A. (2005). Transitions to democracy: liberalization and democratization // democracy: anthology / comp. O. Protsenko. Kyiv., XXVIII. - P. 654
- Seidentop, L. (2001) Give Power to the People The Spectator, 4 August, p. 18
- Shipunov G. V. (2014). Authoritarian political regime: Bulletin of Lviv University. No. 5. - p.333.
- Skripnyuk O. O. (2020). Modern authoritarian regime: characteristic features and manifestations. Juridical Science. No. 2. - p.20.
- Sonali Chandel. (2019). The Golden Shield Project of China: A Decade Later—An in-Depth Study of the Great Firewall. Sonali Chandel. IEEE, №4. C. 35.
- Stotsky Ya. (2011). Osnovy demokratiki [fundamentals of democracy]. IAPM. No. 3. P. 45.
- Sukhonos, V. V. (2000). The essence and functions of the state authoritarian regime in the conditions of transition to democracy (theoretical and methodological analysis). Legal Science. No. 2. - p. 94.
- Wahman, M. (2013). Opposition coalitions and democratization by-elections. Government and Opposition, 48 (1), 31