

Regional Dimension of the Political Process in Ukraine: Transformation or Formation?

The author reviewed peculiarities of the political process at the national and regional levels. Three stages of the evolution of the political process in Ukraine have been distinguished. Special aspects of forming the regional political process under conditions of decentralization have been singled out.

Keywords: political process, political actor, region, political party, regional political process, decentralization.

Регіональний формат політичного процесу в Україні: трансформація чи формування?

Розглянуто особливості політичного процесу на національному та регіональному рівнях. Виділено три етапи еволюції політичного процесу в Україні. Проаналізовано чинники, які сприяють децентралізації в Україні. Виокремлено особливості формування регіонального політичного процесу в умовах децентралізації.

Ключові слова: політичний процес, політичний актор, регіон, політична партія, регіональний політичний процес, децентралізація.

Traditionally, while characterizing any political process we distinguish such levels as: national, regional and supranational etc¹. However, in real political life the major focus is on the national level of the political process, and the remaining levels in national political science are considered rather hypothetically. At the same time the best practices of the democratic European countries testify that political life at the regional level is not a simple typeface of the national level. Correspondingly, any regional political process must be examined in plurality and presuppose a wide range of similar and different directions/vectors, peculiarities as to the bulk of current political actors and combinations of their correlation etc. Herewith, the regional format of the political process is inherent not only to federative states, but also to unitary countries,

¹ Political process // Political Encyclopedia. Ed. board: Yu. Levenets (head), B. Shapoval and others. – Kyiv: Parliament's publishing house, 2012. – P. 596.

where decentralization/devolution has been implemented. The aim of the current paper is to give consideration to the current state and prospects of the regional political process in Ukraine.

We interpret any political process as a line of development of the society (national level) or a certain part of the society (regional level), as a result of cooperation between political actors, who get an excellent degree of political support at elections with the help of the government institutions. In this definition the main emphasis is made on the essence of the political process – it is not just the development, but in fact a direction of the development of the society as a result of cooperation between political actors. It means that the vector of development is not a solid straight line from point “A” to point “B”, but it can undergo changes, thus the society has an opportunity to move in one direction for some period of time and make adjustments to its development over another period of time. The point, when the change takes place, is the elections. The importance of elections can hardly be fully evaluated, but in our case it can be measured, first of all by the fact that it determines the circle of political actors, who gain people’s support and develop into the representative institution. Due to this the elections estimate the authority of every political actor, which is characterized by the number of votes gained at the elections; secondly, parties/blocs or individual politicians (in case of single mandate electoral districts) in the course of elections represent their own model of social development for a certain period of time and in case of getting to the parliament both we and they can speak of support given for these programs. As a rule such programs contain fixed key markers of further social development. The final version of the program/vector of social development will be determined on the basis of the governmental program. In case of a single-party majority government this program will be at most corresponding to the electoral program of the party-winner. In case of the coalitional majority government the program will become a result of a compromise between the coalition partners and consequently to a certain degree may differ from the peculiar program of every coalition member. In case of a minority cabinet the governmental program will presuppose a compromise with the programs of the parties, which will provide support to the government during each voting in the parliament, in fact not being a part of the government. Oppositional parties as well have a range of instruments to adjust the vector of social development in-between the elections, however this ability is presupposed by a number of variables and can be variable in time. Next correction of the social development direction depends on effectiveness/successfulness of the government’s/governmental parties’ activity and/or opposition’s activity, which is represented in the electoral estimation/support for the party’s/parties’ programs.

In case of democratic societies both federative and unitary ones we may encounter different political processes at the national and regional levels. The national level of the political process is observed within the boundaries of a state, consequently, a regional one within the boundaries of a region. Space determines a corresponding circle of problems/tasks. The example is the decision on BREXIT/UK leaving the EU taken at the national level in 2016 and a distinct

position of Scotland, which has been declared by a ruling National Party of Scotland as to the referendum concerning leaving the UK and preserving its membership in the EU in 2017. Other examples are antagonistic attitude towards Islam people's dress code (women wearing hijabs, burkas etc.), parameters of constructing religious institutions in different FRG lands and so on. As a rule any regional political process, which is different from the national one, is presupposed by a special composition of political actors at the regional levels in comparison to the national one. Correspondingly, it is revealed in special agendas and political practices. In this context political actors at the national and regional levels may coincide/be the same (in the political processes of Scotland, Wales and the United Kingdom as a whole act national political parties, however at the level of the Northern Ireland there are no national parties, but exclusively regional ones).

In Ukraine a region is treated to be as a part of the country's territory, which is distinguished by a totality of natural or historically proven economic and geographical conditions and national ethnic composition². Traditionally regions correspond to oblasts as administrative-territorial units. Though, we have experienced another regional division of Ukraine during various sociological polls, marketing estimations etc. (a region is usually treated as a totality of a range of oblasts). The essence of evaluation of a region as a special format of political process presupposes considering parameters of division authorities between the center and regions, determination/totality of main political actors, concurrences or differences in vectors of development. Crucial influence on it is exerted of course by electoral and party systems.

In the process of formation and development of the regional level of the political process in Ukraine several stages may be singled out. First of all, we must define the period covering the collapse of the USSR and formation of sovereign Ukraine as an independent stage. The process of disintegration of a formally federative, but in fact unitary state, created a certain authoritative vacuum not only at the level of relations with Moscow and every union republic, but also within the very union republics, including Ukraine. Primarily, it was predetermined by the fact that republican centers were of formal nature or nominal and could not rapidly take charge of full power. A display of this became the 1990 elections to the local government authorities, especially in 3 regions of Western Ukraine. According to the outcomes of the elections two-thirds of Lviv Regional Council were representatives of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHG), People's Movement of Ukraine (Narodnyi Rukh Ukrainy – NRU) and the Ukrainian Youth Association (Spilka Ukrainskoi Molodi – SUM), i.e. political parties oppositional to the CPSU. Correspondingly, in Ivano-Frankivsk region the opposition in the regional council controlled 78,7 %, and in Ternopil region the opposition represented almost a half of all deputies³. This case was characterized not only by different points of view and orientation of deputies, but

² Region // Political Encyclopedia. Ed. board: Yu. Levenets (head), B. Shapoval and others. – Kyiv: Parliament's publishing house, 2012. – P. 628.

³ Muravskiy O. The 1990 Electoral Campaign to the Verkhovna Rada of the Ukrainian SSR and Local Government Authorities: Peculiarities of West-Ukrainian Region [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?

meant a qualitative variation in the format of political actors at the national and regional levels, when the national level was represented by party nomenclature and stood for preservation of the USSR, while a defined regional level backed up creation of independent Ukraine. It was convincingly demonstrated by the phenomenon of the Halych Assembly – common sessions of Lviv, Ternopil and Ivano-Frankivsk regional councils (all in all there were two mutual sessions). During the first session on February 16, 1991 the decision on “The Unity of Ukrainian Lands” was made. It concerned that Ukraine must be unified. The basis for its sovereignty was the Unification Act signed by the Ukrainian People’s Republic (UNR) and the West Ukrainian People’s Republic (ZUNR) on January 21, 1919. Also there was taken the decision concerning embracing additional issues to the all-Union referendum on March 17, 1991 (format of regional referendums). Correspondingly, in these three regions 90% of respondents voted for the state independence of Ukraine. On June 27, 1991 the heads of three regional councils urged the Verkhovna Rada of the Ukrainian SSR to prevent signing another new Union treaty at the session of the Verkhovna Rada. At the second assembly on September 5, 1991 working groups concerning the issues of drafting bills on the bodies of executive power and local self-government authorities at the regional level were created. Thereafter, it was presupposed to develop fundamental legal principles for establishing a unitary state with powerful regions.

Thus, we reckon that at this stage regional councils in Lviv, Ternopil and Ivano-Frankivsk regions as well as national-democratic parties, which gained the majority, had quite opposite vision of the vector of development of Ukraine. In this case it should be underlined that a distinctive format of regional political process was in a specific perspective of the vector of development for the whole Ukraine, not for a region or regions. Systematic cooperation, which determined a line of development, was stipulated by various political actors: at the national level the CPU’s representatives predominated, in the abovementioned regions oppositional political groups had the upper hand, being united around the People’s Movement of Ukraine (NRU). In the instant case all political actors were national. That is why we should speak of the national political process and quite relative format of the regional political process.

After the successful referendum on independence and elections of the President of Ukraine the process of Ukrainian state formation has started on the basis of the republican construction. Its specificity lied in the fact that Ukraine “came into a great inheritance” in the form of the institutions, which were Soviet as to their nature, predominance of national-communists within the ruling class, adapted presidential-parliamentary system of governance. Under these conditions such new institutions as political parties and elections could not play a crucial role in the change of the government construction and were integrated into the system of relations between the government and property on the basis of a “great compromise” as E. Wilson noticed. Consequently in economic and political life a key role was played not by formal, but informal institutions and practices. It resulted into formation of a hybrid political regime. In the context of our research the most important among its all numerous peculiarities are assertion

of a high level of centralized power, especially subordination of oblasts/potential regions to the president of the state/Presidential administration.

In accordance with the Constitution Ukraine is a unitary country, whose territorial and administrative division is based on the grounds of unity and integrity of the state territory, combination of centralization and decentralization in executing state power, balance and social-economic development of the regions, taking into account their historical, economic, ecological, geographical and demographic peculiarities, economic and cultural traditions (article 132).⁴ At the same time, the Constitution gives the accent to the national level including corresponding government/power institutions and level of local self-government, which must be implemented by territorial communities in the procedure, specified by the law, both directly and through local self-government administrations: village, town, city councils and their executive bodies (article 140).⁵ Regional level was not individually/specially underlined or emphasized in the Constitution.

The attempts to introduce changes into the system of government, which reshaped a presidential-parliamentary one into a premier-presidential system over 2006-2010, added contradictions and conflicts into the construction, but under the conditions of preserving political institutions, which were old as to their essence and functional load among which the crucial role belonged to the informal institutions and practices, but did not result in broadening of powers of oblasts/potential regions. The above-mentioned construction immanently corresponds to the elections and party systems. One should especially emphasize the significance of the all-national electoral district, which substantially mitigated regional/oblast component. The majority of experts reckon that political parties as well were characterized by a high level of centralization and weak inner democracy. As a result the national political parties' leaders took a rigid control over the activity of regional party organizations concerning the whole range of issues, including nominating candidates at all levels of representative institutions. In this context Ukrainian experience confirmed but not disproved the conclusion, that only parties with well-developed inner democracy are able to initiate and develop democracy, correspondingly the parties with a low level of inner democracy cannot show that. Differences in the national level and the level of regions/oblasts lied in party preferences or personal ones in combination with party affiliation. From this perspective we can even speak of sub-regional peculiarities, when similar party-political advantages were inherent to several regions. It is perfectly illustrated by maps of party-political preferences during parliamentary and presidential elections. At the same time when we refer to three Halych regions we can speak of a number of common electoral advantages. Herewith, in a program-essential perspective national agenda predominated. Consequently, the very political process remained national and only conventionally had a regional form.

⁴ The Constitution of Ukraine (amended and revised). – Kyiv: Atika, 2006. – P. 50.

⁵ The Constitution of Ukraine (amended and revised). – Kyiv: Atika, 2006. – P. 54.

Attention to the regional level significantly increased in the process of preparation and discussion over the project/model of administrative-territorial reform, proposed by Ukrainian vice-prime minister of administrative reform R. Bezsmertnyi in 2005, which were represented in the draft law of Ukraine “On Territorial Division of Ukraine”. Another burst of civil attention to the essence of the region and its place and role in social and political life was commenced due to President Poroshenko’s idea, and then concept of decentralization of Ukraine⁶. Though, the main attention in the document is focused on the issues of formation and development of territorial communities, where it goes that the aim of the Conception is “determination of directions, mechanisms and deadlines of formation of effective local self-governance and territorial organization of governance to create and support full-bodied inhabitable environment for citizens, to provide top-quality and available public services, to establish institutions of direct people power, to meet interests of citizens in all spheres of life within the corresponding territory, to coordinate the interests of the state and territorial communities”. Thus, on the one hand we can speak of the fact that introduction of governmental initiatives including territorial reform are stipulated by a search for the answer/ solution of the current problem/problems or the answer for the challenges, which implicitly determine these issues. On the other hand, declarations of the desire to move the country towards the idea of European integration made by the Ukrainian government will necessarily predetermine consideration of standards and demands of the EU concerning decentralization and outlining a corresponding status of a region between the national governmental level and the system of local self-government.

We suppose that Ukraine now faces inevitability, but not a necessity to form politics of the local/regional level by means of this or that variant of decentralization. It is presupposed by a number of factors. Traditionally we can divide them into internal or national, inherent exclusively to our country and external or general, which have a universal/global influence on a large number of countries.

First of all, retreat from the authoritarian construction of the Soviet society and post-Soviet Ukraine together with a gradual introduction of democratic principles, taking into account a high level of declarativity in the actions of political actors, step by step lead to enhancement of democratic practices. Formation of a real citizen does not predetermine the situation of their regulated participation in social processes (on the Maidan, volunteering – yes, but criticism of public prosecution office, courts, political power – is unacceptable “especially under conditions of war”). Civil society, which is being formed and developed, is logically implementing its activity first of all at the local level. Correspondingly, development of the civil society requires space and this space starts from below – at the regional level.

Secondly, the Revolution of Dignity profoundly revealed crisis of the post-Soviet centralized country with all its attributes, including a centralized budget. Nowadays all understand

⁶ The Concept of the Reform of the Local Self-Government and Territorial Organization of Government in Ukraine [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: www.zakon3.rada.gov.ua

that the state is not able to uncover and solve all numerous local problems from the center. Moreover, speaking of the list of the most current problems the government will always give preference to the problems of the center or within some individual regions and put away for later or solve local problems according to the left-over principle. Besides, excessive centralization enhances political risks, when political responsibility for the regional problems is put on the central authorities and corresponding “ruling” political forces.

Thirdly, even a small broadening of powers for regional structures, enlargement of funding or local budget revenues caused great hopes and expectations among local bodies of authorities and population in the regions. For instance, budget of Lviv city has been changing in the following way: 2010 – 2,4 billion UAH; 2014 – 2,9 billion UAH; 2015 – 3,8 billion UAH; 2016 – 5,9 billion UAH (enlargement in 2016 in comparison with the previous year is 67%).⁷ At the same time the development budget has rapidly increased, thus if in 2015 it was 684 million UAH, then in 2016 it was almost 1,6 billion UAH. It gave an opportunity to plan a number of important project using city budget funds. Lviv region budget in 2015 was 6 619 231,7 UAH, and in 2016 it was 9 039 757,5 UAH. New approaches were mostly revealed in expenditures on reconditioning of roads: thus, if in 2014 133 million UAH were planned in the budget on these purposes, then in 2015 they spent 1 billion 155 million UAH. For 2016 almost the same sum has been planned. At the same time formation of united territorial communities together with their governing institutions, elected on democratic basis (at the end of December 2016 in Lviv region there were 24 united territorial communities), attracted much attention among wide national groups to their first experience, which was in equal measures both successful and failing. All local/regional structures look forward to the further steps in the process of decentralization, which is becoming a trend of political development. And this “jinn” would not be so easy to conceal.

Fourthly, the situation in the East in the region of combat operation focused attention on the issues of “special status of the occupied territories”. Another additional and very powerful irritant became the Minsk Agreements, which predetermine the search for the model of relations between the center and occupied districts in Donetsk and Luhansk regions. Kyiv together with political parties in the country will not consent to a proposal of factual federalization of Ukraine, what is promoted by the Russian Federation and what the governments of the occupied districts in Donetsk and Luhansk regions are striving for. But to preserve the current model of communication between the center and region will not be possible. That is why we must bargain for the search, adjustment of a compromised variant, which will predetermine a new model of relations between the center and regions.

Fifthly, Ukraine is an ethnically heterogeneous country. A big number of ethno-lingual groups live densely, like the Hungarians in Zakarpattia region, the Rome in Chernivtsi region, the Gagauz people in Odesa region and so on. Every ethno-lingual group has some common and

⁷ City budget [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://city-adm.lviv.ua/public-information/budget>

numerous distinctive characteristics and problems. Consequently, it is impossible to solve these problems in accordance with the same centralized patterns. At the same time it is impossible to avoid or postpone solution of these problems in future. Public recognition of the necessity to grant national and territorial autonomy to the Crimean Tatars made by the parliament and president of Ukraine in May-July 2016 can be interpreted not only as a long overdue, but also as a forced interruption of a traditional chain. On December 2016 took place the meeting of the representatives of the Hungarian minority in Zakarpattia, which brought up an issue, concerning territorial autonomy for the Hungarian minority⁸. The experience of many countries shows that under these conditions the authority can easier take control over the situation due to proposition and implementation of their own project of decentralization and not just store up problems.

Sixthly, within the society the comprehension that the change of the current model of the political life/development presupposes not only transformation of main state institutions, but already acting political parties in Ukraine is becoming widespread. The researchers evaluating 350 registered for now political parties⁹, fairly raise a question of incompatibility of Ukrainian political parties with the main indicator of classical/modern parties as the institute of democratic society. This promotes the search for corresponding definitions: protoparties, transitive parties and so on. The 2015 regional elections showed that in relations between the center and regions exist lots of problems. There are various ways of their solution, but among the inevitable ones must be: spread of inner-party democracy and enhancement of powers and authority of regional party structures. The changes in electoral legislation during the 2015 elections made regional party structures invite personalities, who are authoritative at the corresponding level, giving preference to governable party members (during the 2015 elections the percent of non-affiliated candidates in party lists balanced from 16% (All-Ukrainian Union "Batkivshchyna") to 100% (Yedynyi Tsentr)¹⁰. It has resulted in wider deputies' "freedom" during public speaking, voting and acting. Thus, democratization starts from below. Further modification of the electoral legislation at the national and regional levels will in future "promote" inter-party democracy.

We suppose that another important factor is a general tendency to evolution of the state institution. Plenty of western political scientists track the origin of a modern state model to 1648 when the Westphalia Tract was signed. Just then the notion of sovereignty and conception of a national territorial state was elaborated. It recognized a universal principle of full sovereignty of power/state across the whole territory. Another stage of development of a modern state model

⁸ Transcarpathian Hungarians wish for territorial autonomy // 7 days info [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: 7dniv.info/politics/83803 – zakarpatsk-ugorc-hochut-teritorialnoi-avtonomii/htm

⁹ A list of civil formations: Political parties [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: http://ddr.minjust.gov.ua/uk/ca9c78cf6ec6db5c-05f0604acdbdec/politychni_partiyi/

¹⁰ Among candidates at the 2015 local elections a proportion of non-party candidates was: Petro Poroshenko's Bloc – 84/66; All-Ukrainian Union "Batkivshchyna" – 84/14; All-Ukrainian Union "Svoboda" – 84/24; Civil movement "Narodnyi Kontrol" – 54/31; Hromadianska Pozytsiia – 72/62; Nash Krai – 77/73; Samopomich – 84/57; Yedynyi Tsentr – 7/7.

was in the 18th century and was connected with constitutionalism. The grounds for changes became the contribution made by J. Locke and Ch. Montesquieu as to the format of relations between the state and society and necessity to limit the states' rights by law what will guarantee citizens' rights. Correspondingly, there was a change of a sovereign from the monarch to the people, formed culturally, historically and ethnically. As a result of this the people became the political subject. Political structure of the mentioned model of the society was represented by a centralized national state, which predetermined unity of three elements: territory, people and sovereign power. After the WWII the main emphasis in government's activity was made upon provision of stable economic development and raising the well-being of the people. The desire to ensure stable economic growth contributed to enhancement of deregulation policy, development of monetary economics along with the concept of a minimal state and its limited interference into life of the society. In general at the edge of the 20th and 21st centuries the consequences of the following factors became tangible: 1) policy of deregulation and elimination of various barriers, conducted by the governments in economically well-developed countries, started the process of opening national economics and spread of the basics of free trade, what in its turn improved the conditions for enterprises' and capitals' international activity, providing them with an opportunity of an unlimited access to assets, markets and consumers all around the world; 2) collapse of the Soviet model of the society finally liquidated political barriers before economic globalization; 3) information revolution became an additional factor of the process of globalization over the national borders; 4) formation of a number of international institutions like the EU, IMF, OSCE and many others, which gained a part of powers and authorities of the national states and the right to take universal decisions and norms obligatory for implementation by national states along with formation and development of international civil structures (ranking companies: Standart & Poors, Moody's, Fitch Ratings; "Freedom House", "Reporters without Borders" and others), which exert a considerable impact on the situation in countries as well. By this, taking liabilities, which appeared on the basis of the international norms and agreeing to consider products made by international non-government structures, national states at their own will in fact pass/passed over a part of their national sovereignty. Correspondingly, the government of a national state received substantial restrictions both from below and from above. In general it gave the grounds to state that in the first decade of the 21st century there is a crisis of a modern model of a national state and speak of search for an absolutely new model of a state in any other form of the institutional construction, including new procedures of government organization. One of the outcomes of the globalization process was an increase of the regions' role. Nowadays, their subjectivity is discussed not only within federal constructions of administrative-territorial division, but also in unitary (the United Kingdom, Spain, Italy and others) countries. What impact does it have on Ukraine: 1) we must comprehend general logics and stage-by-stage approach of the state institution. We may suppose that in course of its development Ukraine will have to pass through them; 2) determining an

optimized model for modern Ukraine, which is focused on joining the EU, we must look not to historical constructions, which have already been disappearing, but to up-to-date ones, i.e. to a model of a post-modern democratic country; 3) various formats of assistance, provided to Ukraine from the side of European countries will necessarily contribute to restoration of similar/universal institutions and procedures in Ukraine, and correspondingly to implementation of the processes, which may be just imitation of the existing patterns. By this, development of democracy, movement to the European Union will surely demand decentralization and formation of regional/local politics.

Therefore, just first steps towards decentralization led to certain new phenomena, which provide grounds to interpret them as a tendency. Alternation of the electoral legislation at the 2015 elections culminated not only in active engagement of authoritative people by regional party organizations (what was not largely influenced by the central party leadership), but also in determination of a different format of party representatives in regional councils. If up to 2015 we could trace factual identity of party preferences by electorate in Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk and Ternopil regions, then after the elections of 2015 we observe some differences. For instance in Lviv and Ternopil regional councils there are such party factions as: P. Poroshenko's Bloc "Solidarnist", All-Ukrainian Union "Batkivshchyna", All-Ukrainian Union "Samopomich", All-Ukrainian Union "Svoboda", A. Hrytsenko "Hromadianska Pozytsiia", UKROP, Narodnyi Kontrol, Narodnyi Rukh Ukrainy (NRU) and O. Liashko "Radykalna Partiiia" (in Ternopil region only deputies from the NRU are not represented in the council). However, in Ivano-Frankivsk regional council there are such factions: P. Poroshenko's Bloc "Solidarnist", All-Ukrainian Union "Batkivshchyna", All-Ukrainian Union "Samopomich", All-Ukrainian Union "Svoboda", UKROP and "Volia". As in regional councils we do not have a formalized institution of majority and minority/opposition, but we may speak of factual votings, especially concerning principal issues, like budget. Thus, in practical terms the minority/opposition is represented by All-Ukrainian Union "Samopomich" and "Svoboda"¹¹. On the contrary, in Ivano-Frankivsk regional council deputies affiliated with the All-Ukrainian Union "Svoboda" are not only represented by the head of the council O. Sych, but together with P. Poroshenko's Bloc "Solidarnist" arrange all principal votings. The development of the process of decentralization led to the spread of party representation at the local self-government level, what before could not be called a traditional practice. On December 18, 2016 in Lviv region took place elections to 6 unified territorial communities. These elections in comparison with the previous ones more stimulated participation of parties in struggling for power. Thus, All-Ukrainian Union "Batkivshchyna" nominated 117 candidates, All-Ukrainian Union "Svoboda" – 67, Nalyvaichenko's movement "Spravedlyvist" – 58, NRU – 55, UKROP – 55, P. Poroshenko's Bloc "Solidarnist" – 54, O. Liashko "Radykalna Partiiia" – 53, "Samopomich" – 51, A. Hrytsenko's "Hromadianska

¹¹ During voting for the Lviv region budget on December 22, 2016, 100% of All-Ukrainian union "Samopomich"-affiliated deputies was absent, while All-Ukrainian organization "Svoboda"-affiliated deputies were equally shared: 50% were absent and 50% abstained.

pozytsiia” – 49, Ukrainska Halytska Partiiia – 49, Narodnyi Kontrol – 25, Yevropeiska partiia Ukrainy – 24, Konhres Ukrainskykh Natsionalistiv – 13. Consequently, all this will promote formation of new unified territorial communities, and different agenda.

Therefore, we suppose that the process of decentralization, commenced after the Revolution of Dignity, can determine formation of a political process, which would be different from the national regional political process. The grounds for the following conclusion are: 1) formation of regional/oblast spaces with another financial base on a par with a national political space; 2) growth of autonomy in political activity, carried out by regional/local structures; 3) formation of peculiar combinations of inter-party relations across regions towards Kyiv.

At the same time, it is necessary to state that a variant of peculiar directions of political development can threaten political stability within the system of relations at the center-region/regions level. It does not cause precautions under conditions of consolidated democracy, when all political actors adhere to the principles of democracy and differences in the programs have nothing to do with a cardinal direction of the development of the society (economic, political, social reforms), but the emphasis is on more social or market priorities and corresponding subordinates. The above-mentioned differences between the national and regional levels in democratic countries cannot lead to the conflict, and even if they appear the society acquires a series of protective mechanisms and instruments. However, in the societies, which are undergoing transformation, or hybrid ones, different formats of national and regional political processes may lead to acute contradictions and conflicts. As an example we can name the conflict between Nagorno-Karabakh region and Baku in Azerbaijan, between Transdnister region and Chisinau in the early 90-s in Moldova etc.