

DOI: 10.26565/2220-8089-2019-36-02  
УДК 329.052

**Olena Bakumenko**

Associate Professor, PhD in Historical Science  
Ukrainian Engineering Pedagogics Academy,  
Universitetska Street, 16, Kharkiv, 61003  
[bakumenkolena1974@gmail.com](mailto:bakumenkolena1974@gmail.com),  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3108-6324>

**Olga Kashaba**

Associate Professor, PhD in Historical Science  
Ukrainian Engineering Pedagogics Academy,  
Universitetska Street, 16, Kharkiv, 61003,  
[olga.kashaba@ukr.net](mailto:olga.kashaba@ukr.net),  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0616-145X>

**Iryna Shcherbyna**

Associate Professor, PhD in Historical Science  
Ukrainian Engineering Pedagogics Academy,  
Universitetska Street, 16, Kharkiv, 61003,  
[shcheririna63@gmail.com](mailto:shcheririna63@gmail.com),  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3007-2446>

## HISTORIOGRAPHICAL AND THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CONCEPT OF «POLITICAL OPPOSITION»

*In a democratic society with longstanding traditions, a stable rule of law, political opposition is regarded as a natural phenomenon, because it is an indispensable component, an indicator of democracy and rule of law, the basis of civil society development.*

*The Euro-integration and Euro-Atlantic aspirations of modern Ukraine require the formation of democratic standards and civilized relations between the authorities and the opposition. At the same time, the development of political processes in our country testifies to the complex nature of this interaction. The urgency of the topic is due to the fact that the institutionalization of the opposition in Ukraine is not yet complete. The result of underdevelopment was the ideological and organizational immaturity, the unstructuredness of today's opposition.*

*The article deals with the historiographical and theoretical analysis of the concept of «political opposition». The evolution of ideas about political opposition and its importance in society is investigated. Methodological approaches to the concept of «political opposition», its role in relations with the authorities and participation in the formation of a democratic society are considered, the place and role of the opposition in the political process of modern Ukraine are determined.*

*The historiographical analysis of political and legal scholars gives reason to claim that there is a wide range of approaches to defining the concept of «political opposition». However, common in these scientific reconnaissances is the granting of high-status political opposition along with the power structures and placing great responsibility on it for the nature of the political regime and the civilization of the political process in the state.*

**Key words:** *opposition, political process, democracy, parliamentarism, political struggle.*

**Бакуменко Олена Олексіївна**

доцент, к.іст.н.,  
Українська інженерно-педагогічна академія,  
вул. Університетська, 16, Харків, 61003,  
[bakumenkolena1974@gmail.com](mailto:bakumenkolena1974@gmail.com),  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3108-6324>

**Кашаба Ольга Юріївна**

доцент, к.іст.н.,  
Українська інженерно-педагогічна академія,  
вул. Університетська, 16, Харків, 61003,  
[olga.kashaba@ukr.net](mailto:olga.kashaba@ukr.net),  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0616-145X>

**Щербина Ірина Володимирівна**

доцент, к.іст.н.,  
Українська інженерно-педагогічна академія,  
вул. Університетська, 16, Харків, 61003,  
[shcheririna63@gmail.com](mailto:shcheririna63@gmail.com),  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3007-2446>

## ІСТОРИОГРАФІЧНИЙ ТА ТЕОРЕТИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ПОНЯТТЯ «ПОЛІТИЧНА ОПОЗИЦІЯ»

*У демократичному суспільстві зі сталими традиціями, стабільним правопорядком політична опозиція розцінюється як закономірне та природне явище, адже вона є неодмінним компонентом, індикатором демократичної та правової держави, основою розвитку громадянського суспільства.*

*Євроінтеграційні та євроатлантичні прагнення сучасної України вимагають формування демократичних стандартів і цивілізованих відносин між владою та опозицією. Водночас розвиток політичних процесів у нашій державі засвідчує про складний характер цієї взаємодії. Актуальність теми зумовлено й тим, що інституалізація опозиції в Україні не завершена до сих пір. Наслідком нерозвиненості стала ідейна та організаційна незрілість, неструктурованість сьогоднішньої опозиції.*

*Проводиться історіографічний та теоретичний аналіз поняття «політична опозиція». Досліджено еволюцію уявлень про політичну опозицію та її значення у суспільстві. Розглядаються методологічні підходи до поняття «політична опозиція», її ролі у взаємовідносинах із владою та участі у становленні демократичного суспільства, визначено місце і роль опозиції у політичному процесі сучасної України.*

*Історіографічний аналіз політико-правових учень дає підстави стверджувати про наявність широкого спектру підходів до визначення поняття «політична опозиція». Проте спільним у цих наукових розвідках є надання політичній опозиції високого статусу поряд із владними структурами та покладання на неї великої відповідальності за характер політичного режиму і цивілізованість політичного процесу в державі.*

**Ключові слова:** опозиція, політичний процес, демократія, парламентаризм, політична боротьба.

**Бакуменко Елена Алексеевна**

доцент, к.ист.н.,  
Украинская инженерно-педагогическая академия,  
ул. Университетская, 16, Харьков, 61003,  
[bakumenkolena1974@gmail.com](mailto:bakumenkolena1974@gmail.com),  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3108-6324>

**Кашаба Ольга Юрьевна**

доцент, к.ист.н.,  
Украинская инженерно-педагогическая академия,  
ул. Университетская, 16, Харьков, 61003,  
[olga.kashaba@ukr.net](mailto:olga.kashaba@ukr.net),  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0616-145X>

**Щербина Ирина Владимировна**

доцент, к.ист.н.,  
Украинская инженерно-педагогическая академия,  
ул. Университетская, 16, Харьков, 61003,  
[shcheririna63@gmail.com](mailto:shcheririna63@gmail.com),  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3007-2446>

## ИСТОРИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ И ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ ПОНЯТИЯ «ПОЛИТИЧЕСКАЯ ОППОЗИЦИЯ»

*В демократическом обществе с установившимися традициями, стабильным правопорядком политическая оппозиция расценивается как закономерное и природное явление, ведь она является неременным компонентом, индикатором демократического и правового государства, основой развития гражданского общества.*

*Евроинтеграционные и евроатлантические стремления современной Украины требуют формирования демократических стандартов и цивилизованных отношений между властью и оппозицией. В то же время развитие политических процессов в нашем государстве свидетельствует о сложном характере этих взаимоотношений. Актуальность темы обусловлена еще и тем, что институционализация оппозиции не завершена до сих пор.*

*Проводится историографический и теоретический анализ понятия «политическая оппозиция». Исследуется эволюция представлений о политической оппозиции и ее значение в обществе. Рассматриваются методологические подходы к понятию «политическая оппозиция», ее роли во взаимоотношениях с властью и участию в становлении демократического общества, определяется место и роль оппозиции в политическом процессе современной Украины.*

*Историографический анализ политико-правовых учений дает основание утверждать о наличии широкого спектра подходов к определению понятия «политическая оппозиция». Однако общим для научных исследований является придание политической оппозиции высокого статуса наряду с властными структурами и возложение на нее большой ответственности за характер политического режима и цивилизованность политических процессов в государстве.*

**Ключевые слова:** оппозиция, политический процесс, демократия, парламентаризм, политическая борьба.

The basic condition of a democratic society is pluralism of opinions, diversity of positions and interests of political subjects. This fact raises the problem of the relationship between the forces in power and those who control the actions of existing power and seek it. Therefore,

a necessary attribute of democracy is political opposition, which forms alternative directions of development of society and constitutes constant competition with the ruling elite, facilitates the improvement of feedback between citizens and public authorities. It means that in the society there is a process of civil harmonization of interests of different

social groups, the creation and activity of political parties, movements and public organizations is not forbidden, freedom of thought, views, independence of the media are provided, the mechanism of restraints and counterbalances in the structure of power relations is working. It is through this diversity of balances and counterweights between the various political institutions that social progress is achieved. The absence of political opposition within the political system creates the conditions for the formation of totalitarian regimes. Thus, the presence of opposition forces in society is seen not as an exception, but as a necessity for the normal development and functioning of a democratic political system.

The Euro-integration and Euro-Atlantic aspirations of modern Ukraine require the formation of democratic standards and civilized relations between the authorities and the opposition. At the same time, the development of political processes in our country testifies to the complex nature of this interaction. The relevance of the topic is also since the institutionalization of the opposition in Ukraine has not been completed so far. The result of underdevelopment was the ideological and organizational immaturity, lack of structure of today's opposition. The importance of analyzing the concept, content, typology, structure, and functions of the political opposition is also caused by the ignorance of most ordinary citizens, and sometimes some political figures who do not have a clear understanding of this political institution, respectively, are not able to build adequate relations with the opposition, which really contributed to the democratization of society. That is, both current political practice and lack of theoretical development require and actualize consideration of problems related to the formation of political opposition in Ukraine and legitimization of its activities. Political opposition, as an integral component of a democratic society and the rule of law, has been, and continues to be, an ongoing subject of study for many foreign and domestic scholars. The main works in this area are the studies of R. Dahl, J. Sartori and H. Linz. Significant attention to this issue was also paid by A. Kirshheimer, R. Makridis, D. Elers, R. Pannet, K. Paleski.

The lack of a regulatory framework and traditions of the political opposition in our country caused considerable interest in research on this topic by domestic scientists. Today, attention to the problems of the political opposition has gained particular relevance. Basically, this interest is determined by modern

events in the political life of Ukraine, the need to institutionalize the opposition and the process of democratization, a wide range of definitions of the concept of opposition in political science and practice. This topic is being studied by N. Vinichuk, O. Dnipro, I. Zhdanov, I. Zaritskaya, V. Kipiani, I. Kogut, R. Pavlenko, N. Piskaryova, I. Polishchuk, T. Pecheritsa, F. Rudich, S. Tikhomirov, D. Cymbal and others. In their works, scientists violate a wide range of issues, which include: the problem of political opposition in the context of the transformation processes taking place in Ukraine; the relationship of opposition with the emergence and resolution of political conflicts in society; preconditions for the emergence of political opposition in Ukraine, its social base; characterization of different types, evaluation of their requirements; the need to choose a basic model of opposition research, etc.

The analysis of scientific works and publications shows that some aspects of this problem are being actively studied by researchers, but it is still unresolved and needs further study.

The purpose of our research is to understand the political opposition as an institution of democracy and the subject of the political process in modern society. The achievement of this goal is due to the need to solve the following tasks: to analyze the evolution of ideas about political opposition and its importance in society; determine the place and role of the opposition in the political process of modern Ukraine.

The problem of opposition has always taken a prominent place in the writings of political notionalists. There are several basic stages of forming the concept of opposition:

1. philosophical and ethical stage – comprehending the phenomenon of opposition and laying the prerequisites for the entry of dissent and protest as a political action in society (times of antiquity and the Middle Ages);

2. rational stage – a natural legal justification for the resistance to power (modern time);

3. Institutionalization stage of political opposition in democratic states (from the middle of the 19th century to the present) (Гошовська Ващенко, Кальніш 2013: 19-20).

The term «opposition» is defined by political science as a counteraction, resistance to the existing state power, confrontation to its strategic course, with the aim of changing it to another, which satisfies the opposition political forces (Шемшученко, Бабкіна, Горбатенко,

2004: 428). In political science, the term «opposition» is most often used to describe one of the institutions of modern parliamentarism (Рудич 2015: 7).

For the first time, the legal opposition appears in the ancient world, where, in the system of polis democracy, the national assembly and tribunes fulfilled the function of the opposition. The basis of these institutions was economic autonomy, the right to have private property, is the basis of civil society.

From 494 BC in ancient Rome there was an institute of plebeian tribune. Its main function is to limit the arbitrariness of the patricians who were officials in the society; the fight for equality of rights between plebeians and patricians. Subsequently, this institution begins to play an important role in the political system of the ancient Roman state (Масловська 2012: 73).

No less significant in the history of ancient Rome was the Stoic opposition, whose members were thinkers, philosophers. They promoted moral resistance without the use of physical force. This protest was directed against the tyranny of the Roman rulers. Subsequently, representatives of the Stoic opposition were represented in the Senate, but were unable to stand in the fight against tyranny. The demise of democratic policies and the cruel laws of the Roman Empire put an end to the existence of legal political opposition.

Ancient Greek thinkers in their studies analyzed the causes of the emergence of the opposition, the importance of its existence for creating conditions of balance and counterweights.

Aristotle, analyzing the political relations of the time, tried to understand the causes of social conflicts and looked for ways to prevent them. The contradiction, according to the thinker, lay in the «sense of inequality», which «creates the thirst for coups». Non-alternative, one-man boards, he called shaky (Чичерин 2001: 37).

In discussing state power, Plato did not allow the thought of the uncontrolled power, the lack of responsibility for the actions of politicians and rulers. At the same time, the philosopher has a negative attitude to coercion and suppression, as methods of support for the rule of law established by the state (Совгиря 2007: 27).

Analysis of the concept of «opposition» in the Middle Ages was marked by contradictory trends. For example, scholastic dogmatics were attentive to attempts at independent thinking, views that were not heretical, were declared

heretical. T. Aquinas, analyzing the divine origin of power, identifies two cases where protests are possible: 1) when the ruler violates God's command because God is the supreme ruler; 2) when they order to do something that the ruler's power does not extend to (Чичерин 2001: 37).

At the same time, the UK is laying the groundwork for forming the legal basis of parliamentarism. In 1215, the Great Charter of Liberties initiated the right of society to resist the royal power (Масловська 2012: 74).

Prominent thinkers of the Renaissance also sought to explore the phenomenon of political opposition. But by the beginning of the eighteenth century, most of them regarded it only as a declarative right to resist power. Instead, J. Locke substantiates the legitimacy of resistance. He does not deny the possibility of changing a ruler as if he was not a saint and abuses power by using it illegally (Совгиря 2007: 27). These reflections of the philosopher coincide with the appearance in the United Kingdom in 1679 of the «Habeas Corpus Act», a document that expanded and guaranteed the rights and freedoms of the citizen.

During the Renaissance and the Reformation, the first theoretical developments on the opposition in Ukraine appeared. They belong to representatives of the educational elite – Latin-Polish thinkers. Among them are prominent figures of European scale: the philosopher and scientist Yuriy Drohobych, the poet Pavlo Rusin from Krosna, the writer and public figure Stanislav Orikhovsky and others. Humanists have strongly advocated the evolutionary development of the opposition, believing that social conflicts lead to the mutual destruction of people and cultures. Following the concepts of social contract theory, intellectuals emphasized the contractual nature of royal power, its election and accountability to citizens (Шелест, Якубовський 1996: 88-89).

Important stages in the development of the opposition in Ukraine are marked by the activity of Orthodox brotherhoods, the work of polemic writers. Scientists at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy have argued that rhetoric, oratory, is a political weapon for both the ruler and the opposition.

In the eighteenth century, the concept of political opposition continued to be understood. At this time, the concept of political and parliamentary opposition is beginning to form in political and legal thought. Therefore, this phenomenon of political life acquires signs of institutionalization.

For the first time, as a political institute, opposition begins to take shape in the UK. The civil war of 1648 – 1688 split the conscious society into supporters of the king (Tory) and defenders of parliamentarism (the Whigs). This laid the foundations for the formation of the party system. Subsequently, these groups become Liberal and Conservative parties. The glorious revolution of 1648 – 1688 ended with the collapse of absolutism, and the Bill of Rights, adopted in 1689, legally enshrined the right of the opposition to participate in the parliamentary struggle and take a seat in the legislature.

In 1749, British Lord G. Bolinbrook formulated the constitutional principle of the opposition. Systematic criticism and control of the government's activities were allowed, the opposition had to ensure that the government's actions were in line with the Constitution and had to come up with alternative proposals to address social and political problems. It was Bolinbrook who substantiated the principle that defines the sphere of loyal activity of the opposition. The content of this principle was to ensure a constant balance of branches of power, control and criticism from the opposition forces of the government, making proposals aimed at reforming state-legal institutions ( Масловська 2012: 74-75; Совгіря 2007: 25).

Such views contributed to the formation of a positive image of the opposition. Activity in the political process became a natural phenomenon. After all, during the Enlightenment, dramatic social and political changes took place, which laid the foundation for the formation of a new type of consciousness, outlook and socio-political and economic relations, namely: the collapse of absolutist monarchies, the formation of structures of civil society, the development of institutions of democracy, where public political activity the need for the phenomenon of opposition power, control and criticism from the opposition forces of the government, making proposals aimed at reforming state-legal institutions (Масловська 2012: 74-75; Совгіря 2007: 25).

The phenomenon of political opposition gains the greatest scope during the French Revolution of 1789. The rise of the struggle of the population for their social and political rights, revolutions, the spirit of France affected the moods in other European states. The development of various political clubs and secret societies is unfolding. All of them had opposition signs, because they set as their goal

the implementation of changes in the existing system.

The nineteenth century gave a vigorous impetus to the development of democratic foundations. They have increasingly become the norm in the political systems of Western European states. Thus, the opposition began to be understood by researchers as a specific political institution that criticizes and influences, interacts with it, proposes alternative programs, and ultimately struggles to seize power. Exactly in this context that the constructive nature of the opposition was viewed by representatives of liberalism, J. St. Moth, T. Jefferson, A. de Tocqueville.

The second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was a major milestone in the development of Ukrainian political thought. This was facilitated by the works of M.P. Drahomanov and M.S. Grushevsky.

The prominent European encyclopedic scientist M.P. Dragomanov stressed that the will of the majority is at the heart of democracy. But this does not mean that the majority should ignore the interests of the minority. Lack of coherence of interests, balance of forces creates a dictatorship. M.P. Dragomanov considered the natural right of people to pluralism of thought. Diversity of views, civilized discourse, constructive criticism, according to the scientist, lay the foundations for the search for truth (Скакун 1993: 62-63). The Ukrainian thinker has substantiated such a model of political opposition, in which its institutional interaction with the system of public administration depends on the nature and methods of government activity. Raising the issue of protection of national interests, M.P. Dragomanov, in essence, defended the interests of such a minority as the national opposition. Among the ways to solve it, he called the elimination of economic inequality. Defending the right to criticize existing orders, M.P. Drahomanov demanded political amnesty for representatives of opposition figures in power (Масловська 2012: 77).

The Ukrainian historian and political figure M. Hrushevskyi in his work «Constitutional Issue: Ukrainianness in Russia», while analyzing the basic principles of state building, emphasizes the right of the minority to defend their rights and represent them in parliament. The scientist does not get past the problems of relations between the deputy and the voter. These relationships should be based on the principle of mutual responsibility and mutual respect. At the same time, M. Hrushevsky stresses that the opposition should not neglect

his principles for the sake of resolving the «everyday» orders of his constituents (Журавський 2001).

The beginning of the twentieth century was marked by the expansion of suffrage and the introduction in many countries of the institute of election of officials. These processes could not but be reflected in further theoretical analysis of the concept of «political opposition». Democratic tendencies have boldly stepped on European countries, making politics more open to the public. Therefore, the opposition is beginning to be seen as a compulsory and indispensable attribute of political relations. Scientists analyze a wide range of issues, from understanding the essence and function to the typology of the opposition. Much attention is paid to the study of the role of the opposition in transitive societies, the peculiarities of the existence and functioning of the opposition under different political regimes.

One of the first attempts at theoretical analysis of political opposition, during this period, was the work of M. Duverger's *The Political Parties* (1951). He regarded the existence of organized opposition as a feature of democratic political systems. However, the reference to contemporary research into the phenomenon of opposition in Western political science begins in 1957, when O. Kirkheimer's article «The weakening of opposition in Western democracies» was published. It gave impetus to further research on the subject. The reason for writing the article was a decrease in the level of opposition in most Western democracies in the mid-twentieth century (Дюверже 2000).

Edited by R. Dahl in 1966. A collection of articles «Political Opposition in Western Democracies» has been released. He developed new theoretical postulates that were later developed by scientists in monographs. R. Dahl's contribution to the study of the problems of political opposition is so thorough that today the analysis of the phenomenon of the opposition without studying its heritage does not make sense (Даль 2002). In 1965, the London School of Economic and Political Sciences began publishing the journal *Government and Opposition*. In 1966, the work of G. Ionescu and I. de Madariaga «The Opposition as a Political Institute» was published. A tendency has been formed to increase the number of works that have been studying various aspects of the political opposition (Гошовська, Ващенко, Кальниш 2013: 18).

Since the last third of the last century, scholars have turned to the study of the opposition in the context of political transformation, although here the political opposition has played an important, but not leading role.

H. Linz and A. Stepan proposed a new classification of types of political opposition. In the future, all thorough research into the opposition takes place in the field of transitology. Important contributions to its study have been made by T. Karl, G. Kitchelt, D. Rostow, and F. Schmitter. It is worth noting a number of Polish researchers who have thoroughly analyzed and systematized the scientific-theoretical and practical experience of models of opposition to Western democracies based on the methodology of R. Dahl, A. Leiphart, J. Sartori and others. Among them are E. Zvizhkovski, V. Skrydlo, M. Jagelski, K. Voitovich, Z. Cheszeiko-Sohaski, K. Paleki, P. Sekula and others.

Analysis of scientific research allows to determine the meaning of the concept. The opposition is viewed in a narrow and broad sense. In the broad sense, it means countering, fighting against any dominant power, as well as the group or groups of people who lead that struggle. In this case, the opposition is seen as a form of public protest. In the narrow, it is a political party, coalition, or movement that is a parliamentary minority but may come to power in the next election. We view such political opposition as a political institution.

The connection between the opposition as a political institution and the opposition as a form of social protest is interdependent, if society recognizes the right of every citizen to protest, provides this right to freedom of speech, political action, etc., then there is an opportunity to create a certain institution of democratic political system - the opposition (Камаба 2016: 23-29).

There are many reasons for political opposition. It is both the internal contradiction of society, and the social stratification that causes social disparity, and the neglect of the principle of social justice, and the crisis in relations between the population and the authorities.

Political practice and science define different types and forms of political opposition as a form of social relations:

- in relation to the system of power, they distinguish between systemic opposition (which shares the basic values, principles and goals of the existing political system, but denies the methods of policy implementation) and extra-

systemic (which agrees not only with the actions of the authorities but also with the foundations of the socio-political system in country);

- by the nature of the requirements determine the radical opposition (applies both parliamentary and non-parliamentary methods of pressure and, as a rule, rejects any compromises with the current government), moderate (applies mainly methods of parliamentary pressure, resorts to «political bargaining» on fundamental issues) and loyal opposition (ready to support the government, may agree with it and even make concessions);

- the nature of actions distinguish constructive opposition (the actions of the opposition are aimed at improving the quality of political governance, encouraging the authorities to reform) and destructive (its actions are aimed at creating obstacles in the activities of governmental structures);

- the opposition is characterized by its place in the spectrum of political forces as left, right, centrist;

- distinguish parliamentary by place of activity (these are political forces that are represented in parliament but are not part of the government and do not support it (Ткаченко 2007: 40-45). Traditionally, parliamentary opposition is formed and acts directly within the supreme legislative body of state power. It is fully involved in the exercise by Parliament of its functions. In doing so, it seeks to achieve two goals: 1) to become a parliamentary majority, 2) to gain control of the executive branch. Having a parliamentary opposition does not necessarily mean that it is organized in parties. In particular, subjects of parliamentary opposition may be a party, bloc of parties, factions, or individual members of parliament) and non-parliamentary opposition (of many types, for example, its forms may be: individual citizens, political parties not represented in parliament, the media, interest groups and pressure groups, public and cultural organizations, corporations, trade unions and more. The non-parliamentary opposition performs two main functions: 1) questions and denies the legitimacy of the parliament and its ability to carry out political changes, 2) articulates, combines controversial issues, problems that were ignored, rejected by the parliamentary opposition and various parties) (Вінничук 2007).

By its nature, the opposition is the bearer of alternative ways of social development. The effectiveness of political opposition depends on a range of functions. The system of functions

inherent in the opposition as a political institute is quite extensive. We can differentiate the functions of political opposition by their scope into internal and external ones.

Internal organizational functions of the opposition include the formation of the organizational structure of the institution of political opposition (leadership, functionaries, support group), rotation of the opposition top, style of opposition management (authoritarian or democratic). Ideological functions contribute to the creation of the ideal of the socio-political system, the development of programs of activity and the formation of goals of political struggle. The financial function creates the conditions for the political opposition to be effective through the formation of sources of funding.

External functions of political opposition can be divided into areas of focus:

- Ensuring the integration and consolidation of society, removing civil dissatisfaction, mobilizing society – a social function;

- supporting the development of a democratic model of the political system, political stabilization, opposing one political view and ideas to others, blocking political decision-making, influencing the efficiency of state structures, criticizing government decisions – political function;

- transfer of socio-economic requirements to the political system, lobbying of economic interests - economic function;

- communication, information, adaptation - cultural function.

The functions of conflict resolution, socialization, evaluation function remain common to all spheres of implementation.

Opposition functions in the highest legislative body: participation in lawmaking; control; recruiting a new political elite. The extent of their implementation depends on the traditions of political practice, but democratic countries of the West are characterized by a narrowing of powers to perform control activities. Performing the control function is the main activity of parliamentary opposition in the countries of modern democracy. The forms and means of control are very varied: to participate in the work of committees and special commissions, to make oral and written requests, to use interpellations and blocked voting, to declare a vote of confidence (no confidence), to veto legislative acts, to announce impeachment (Ірха 2010).

The main factors behind the institutionalization of political opposition are the form of government; party system; election

system; the structure of the higher legislative body; political culture of society.

Institutionalized opposition in a state with a parliamentary form of government operates within the legislature, and its main actors are political parties. In this case, the power-opposition vector is clearly defined and runs between the two main political forces. One of them, after losing the election, automatically acquires the status of opposition. In countries with presidential and mixed government, there is a division of power and opposition across several vectors: the executive and legislative branches, the pro-government party and the opposition party, the faction of the upper house and the fractional majority of the lower house, and no single source of opposition can be identified. Factors such as party and electoral systems are interrelated: the type of electoral system (majority, proportional or mixed) influences the formation of a particular party system (two-party or multiparty), which in turn determines the division between governmental and opposition forces. Under the two-party system, the status of the opposition gains second hand in election results. Under the multi-party system, the opposition is a political party or several parties that are not members of the ruling coalition. Within a higher legislature, such a division occurs between factions and chambers if the parliament is bicameral. A loyal and democratic political culture promotes the preservation of traditions, including those belonging to opposition activities (Кашаба 2016).

Modern political science, based on an analysis of the institutionalization of the opposition and its impact on the legislative process, identifies four basic models of political opposition:

1. The Westminster model (common in Australia, Great Britain, India, Ireland, Canada, New Zealand), in which the role of parliamentary opposition is formalized, but in practice the opposition has little influence on the political course of the country.

Today, in the UK, a party with at least two seats in parliament receives official parliamentary opposition status and public funding for its operation. Each year, the House of Commons allocates a minimum of 20 business days when the opposition factions, not the ruling majority, formulate the agenda, defining a range of issues to discuss. The Opposition Leader Institute was also introduced for the first time in the UK. The leader of the opposition is the legislator-appointed leader of the lower house group, which actually

represents the political party, which is the second largest number of seats in the chamber.

Legal recognition of the opposition in the United Kingdom involves the formation of an opposition (shadow) government (a shadow Cabinet of Ministers), which has a fairly wide range of rights and powers. For the first time an opposition shadow Cabinet of Ministers was formed in 1937 in England, after the adoption of the «Crown Ministers Act». In 1960, the opposition Cabinet of Ministers was formed by the People's Party in Germany, and in 1981 – in France. In Spain, the opposition government was formed by the People's Party in April 2008, in the Czech Republic in 2006 by the Social Democratic Party, in Italy by the Party of Democrats in 2008. The activities of the opposition Cabinet of Ministers are carried out in parallel with the activities of the official government and are aimed at the prospect of gaining power.

II. The French model, when the role of the opposition is insignificant both in practice and institutionally. Parliamentary opposition has little or no influence on political processes. Its terms of reference are to ensure that all parliamentary factions are represented in a proportionate manner in the direction of parliament, to ensure the effective functioning of temporary committees of inquiry in order to collect and provide Parliament with information on certain facts and events. The opposition is empowered to send oral and written requests to members of the government, to enter into debates with government representatives; apply to the Constitutional Council to review the constitutionality of laws.

III. German model (widespread in Germany, Austria, etc.), in which the role of the opposition is not as formalized as in the Westminster model, but the traditions of political practice and the development of civil society institutions allow the opposition to actually influence decision-making in practice. The opposition has the right to influence the agenda of the parliament; appoint a significant number of senior positions in the standing committees; veto government-initiated bills. In addition, 1/3 of the Bundestag members can challenge any law in the Constitutional Court, which they believe is contrary to the Constitution.

IV. The Scandinavian model (Denmark, Norway, Sweden) is characterized by significantly lower rights of opposition than in all other models. The opposition has the right to participate in the activity of the legislative

committees and in the adoption of the agenda (Льницька 2011: 80-81; Романюк 2004).

Modern political science and the experience of developed democratic countries testify that strong opposition is the key to the stability of the state. The existence of the opposition creates a balance in the political system and protects the country not only from authoritarian extremes, but also simply from the influence of subjective factors in making important decisions by the government, parliament and other governmental institutions.

Since Ukraine's independence, the opposition has become an integral part of the political system. Almost all the leading political forces during this time managed to visit both in power and in opposition. In addition, since 1997, Ukraine has some experience in operating «opposition governments».

The main criteria for opposition in Ukraine is counteraction, resistance to government policy, which can be expressed either in the presentation of alternative ways of developing society, or in opposing the existing system of power in general, speaking out against the Constitution, the political system as a whole. Within its framework, two directions can be distinguished – opposition to the content of politics and opposition to methods of its implementation.

Other criteria include: claims or aspirations to gain power; a certain degree of organization, since it must in any case be about an «organized group of entities» and a common interest; systematic and institutionalized.

The authorities and the opposition in modern Ukraine have mostly one root. The factions of the opposition parties and blocs are composed of representatives of large and medium-sized businesses, for whom the main value of the deputy's mandate is to protect this business by political means, to try to prevent or redistribute property. Like the authorities, the Ukrainian opposition tends to favor backstage ways of political activity. Like the authorities, the opposition tends to be aggressive towards its opponents and is unlikely to abandon methods of forceful pressure on them.

The way out of the current situation in the state-building in Ukraine is to institutionalize the opposition, to give it a statutory status. Indeed, some opposition parties today have difficulty defining their place in the «power-to-opposition» coordinate system, making their opposition rather anti-personal, directed against individuals, such as the president, the prime minister, rather than their programmatic positions, ideologies and more. All these

negative factors lead to the fact that, in addition to non-constructive relations with the authorities, the opposition cannot fully fulfill its functions in a democratic society.

Thus, it can be argued that the opposition, as a phenomenon of political life, has existed since ancient times as a way of protecting the socially significant interests of a particular section of society. The historical experience of mankind demonstrates numerous specific manifestations of confrontation both within the political elite and between the elite and decorated interest groups. Simultaneously with the emergence of the opposition, as a phenomenon of political life, began the theoretical development of this concept from the understanding of this phenomenon in ancient times, to its institutionalization in modern democratic societies. It is safe to say that prominent representatives of Ukrainian socio-political thought also made an important contribution to the theoretical development of the concept of political opposition. Today, political opposition is an integral part of the life of a democratic society. The democratization country in Ukraine must create and secure conditions for the free and unimpeded exercise of opposition activity, while at the same time the exercise of opposition activity cannot be a basis for giving the opposition the benefits or limiting their rights. The purpose of opposition activity is its participation in the development of a sovereign and independent, democratic, social and rule of law in Ukraine through the exercise of its rights and the exercise of its duties determined by law in the interests of the citizens of Ukraine and the state.

## REFERENCES

- Гошовська, В.А., Вашенко, Ю.Г., Кальнишин, Ю.Г. 2013. *Політична опозиція: навч. посіб.* Київ: Вид-во НАДУ.
- Шемшученко, Ю.С., Бабкіна, В.Д., Горбатенко, В.П. 2004. *Політичний енциклопедичний словник*. Київ: Вид-во Генеза.
- Рудич, Ф. 2015. «Політична влада та опозиція в Україні: спроба політологічного аналізу», *Наукові записки ІПіЕНД ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України* 2 (76): 5-25.
- Масловська, О. М. 2012. «Становлення поняття «політична опозиція» в зарубіжній та вітчизняній політико-правовій думці», *Наукові праці МАУП* 3 (34): 73-79.
- Чичерин, Б. Н. 2001. *Политические мыслители древнего и нового мира*. Москва: Гардарики.
- Совгиря, О. 2007. «Історія становлення поняття «парламентська опозиція» у політико-правовій думці», *Вісник Київського національного університету ім. Тараса Шевченка. Серія: Юридичні науки* 74-76: 23-27.

- Шелест, Д. С., Якубовський, О. П. 1996. "Політична опозиція в Україні: традиції і сучасність" *Політична опозиція: теорія та історія, світовий досвід та Українська практика*. Київ: Навчально-методичний кабінет вищої освіти України.
- Скакун, О. Ф. 1993. *Драгоманов как политический мыслитель*. Харків: Основа.
- Журавський, В. 2001. "Розвиток доктрини українського парламентаризму в ХІХ – на початку ХХ ст.", *Право України* 5: 37-41.
- Дюверже, М. 2000. *Политические партии*. Москва: Изд-во Академический проект.
- Даль, Р. 2002. *Поліархія: Участь у політичному житті та опозиція*. Харків: Каравела.
- Кашаба, О.Ю. 2016. "Політична опозиція як суб'єкт політичного процесу", *Вісник ХНУ ім. В.Н.Каразіна. Серія «Питання політології»* 29: 23-29.
- Ткаченко, Т. 2007. "Опозиція як політичний інститут і форма суспільного протесту", *Політичний менеджмент* 5: 40-45.
- Вінничук, Н. 2007. "Типологія політичної опозиції", *Політичний менеджмент* 3: 51-55.
- Ірха, К. 2010. "Класифікація функцій політичної опозиції в демократичному суспільстві", *Грані* 3 (71):103-106.
- Ільницька, У. 2011. "Парламентська опозиція як інституційний аспект контрольної функції парламенту", *Українська національна ідея: реалії та перспективи розвитку* 23: 76-85.
- Романюк, А. 2004. *Порівняльний аналіз політичних систем країн Західної Європи: інституційний вимір*. Львів: Вид-во Триада плюс.
- Maslovska O.M. 2012. "Formation of the concept of "political opposition" in foreign and domestic political-legal thought", *Naukovi pratsi MAUP* 3 (34):73-79 (in Ukrainian).
- Chicherin, B.N. 2001. *Political thinkers of the ancient and new world*. Moskau: Gardariki (in Russian).
- Sovgyrya, O. 2007. "History of the formation of the term "parliamentary opposition" in political-legal thought", *Visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu im. Tarasa Shevchenka. Serii: Yurydychni nauky* 74-76 (in Ukrainian).
- Shelest .D.S., Yakubovsky, A.P. 1996. "Political opposition in Ukraine: traditions and modernity", *Politychna opozytisia: teoriia ta istoriia, svitovy dosvid ta Ukrainska praktyka*. Kyiv (in Ukrainian).
- Skakun, O.F. 1993. *Drahomanov, as a political thinker*. Kharkiv: Osnova (in Russian).
- Zhuravsky, V. 2001. "The development of the doctrine of Ukrainian parliamentarism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries", *Pravo Ukrainy* 5: 37-41(in Ukrainian).
- Duverger, M. 2000. *Political Parties*. М .: Akademicheskyyi proekt (in Russian).
- Dahl, R. 2002. *Poliarchy: Political Participation and Opposition*. Kharkiv: Caravel (in Ukrainian).
- Kashaba, O.Y. 2016. "Political opposition as a subject of political process", *Visnyk KhNU im. V.N.Karazina. Serii «Pytannia politolohii»* 29: 23-29 (in Ukrainian).
- Tkachenko, T. 2007. "Opposition as a political institute and form of public protest", *Politychnyi menedzhment* 5: 40-45 (in Ukrainian).
- Vynnychuk, N. 2007. "Typology of political opposition", *Politychnyi menedzhment* 3: 51-55 (in Ukrainian).
- Irkha, K. 2010. "Classification of Functions of Political Opposition in a Democratic Society", *Hrani* № 3 (71): 103-106 (in Ukrainian).
- Ilnytska, U. 2011. "Parliamentary Opposition as an Institutional Aspect of the Controlling Function of Parliament", *Ukrainska natsionalna ideia: realii ta perspektyvy rozvytku* 23: 76-85 (in Ukrainian).
- Romaniuk, A. 2004. *Comparative analysis of political systems in Western Europe: an institutional dimension*. Lviv: Triada plus (in Ukrainian).

## REFERENCES

- Goshovska, V.A., Vashchenko, K.A., Kalnysh, Yu.G. 2013. *Political opposition: teach. tool*. Kyiv: NADU (in Ukrainian).
- Shemshuchenko, Yu. S., Babkina, V.D., Gorbatenko, V.P. 2004. *Political Encyclopedic Dictionary*. Kyiv: Genesa (in Ukrainian).
- Rudich, F. 2015. "Political Power and Opposition in Ukraine: An Attempt at Political Analysis", *Naukovi zapysky IPIEND im. I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy* 2 (76): 5-25 (in Ukrainian).