

Anastasiia Morhun

National Institute for Strategic Studies, Ukraine

SCIENTIFIC COMPREHENSION OF WAYS OF RESEARCHING POLITICAL REGIME IN UKRAINE: MODERN TENDENCIES

It is extremely important for further development of any country to determine a political regime, as it defines the interconnection between a state and political actors as well as the ways and mechanisms of power distribution and the nature of relations existing between hierarchical actors and political and non-political institutions.

The spectrum and scope of researches performed by domestic and foreign scientists are considerable, nevertheless these are insufficient to be used in practice and improve the fulfilment of the state's functions.

Works of domestic researchers are focused only on studying how changes are brought about in post-communist countries. Usually, these materials lack a clear-sighted and comprehensive analysis that would include political and sociological surveys that would describe political, social, and economic development of a country in chronological order.

Since the approval of the Constitution of Ukraine, the democracy has been chosen as the state's motion vector. Nevertheless, for our country question of defining democracy is still open, as well as determining the specifics of "Ukrainian Democracy". As nowadays, the scientists who are researching political regime in Ukraine see eye to eye only on the following: the political regime in Ukraine is not democratic.

Keywords: political regime, transition, transformation of the political regime in Ukraine, democracy.

It is extremely important for further development of any country to determine a political regime, as it defines the interconnection between a state and political actors as well as the ways and mechanisms of power distribution and the nature of relations existing between hierarchical actors and political and non-political institutions.

Nowadays, the political science in Ukraine not only considers but also describes the perspectives of the development of various potential political processes in the country. There were numerous factors that encouraged us to comprehend the research of the political regime in Ukraine from the scientific point of view, including internal and external factors. Considering available resources and external threats or, on the contrary, relying on outside support, a country chooses which way it will move during its transition. For instance, speaking about transition to democratization, D. Rustow, describing one of the internal factors of transition in such a way, wrote that to establish democratic institutions in any country it is the national unity that is required at first¹.

However, this factor is exactly not the only one. The political elites that elaborate the development strategies and, certainly, some external factors including geopolitical environment and international processes etc. are essential. For instance, the Ukrainian researchers think that the Ukrainian democratic choice has been mainly influenced by the dissolution of the USSR, support of the international community including the European Council and globalization².

Each country has its own pace of development and chooses its own motion vector to be convenient for it. In some countries, certain instruments accelerate the development, while in the others they suppress the social and political growth. According to the M. Weber's definition, any model of a political system is some kind of a reference and pattern this system seeks to follow. With the above-mentioned in view, the democracy is also no more than an ideal pattern. Thus, the compliance of a country's political regime with its characteristic features determines the democracy index of this country³.

¹ Раствоу, Д.А. (1996). Переходы к демократии. Попытки динамической модели. *Полис*, 5.

² Колодій, А. (2009). *Основи демократії*. Підручник для студентів ВНЗ. Львів: Астролябія.

³ Вербер, . Избранные произведения. *Библиотека Гумер*. <http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Sociolog/vebizbr/index.php>

A remarkable specific feature of the transition of post-Soviet countries is mainly their movement towards democratization not from authoritarian political regime but from totalitarian one. Another characteristic feature that can be indicated is a certain formality of the democracy resulting from a specific development of post-Soviet countries. What is meant here is that in spite of having democratic attributes including elections, democratic institutions and the freedom of speech etc., the highest ranks and other political actors are unfair and biased.

Ukraine is developing too slowly and always faces different challenges and crises. To accelerate the state development and to avoid new threats to the political and national security of Ukraine it is necessary to elaborate an efficient development strategy on the basis of the result to be achieved that is the democratic political regime and civil society in the state governed by the rule of law. To achieve the goal set it is important to understand clearly what the democratic political regime is as well as what features and advantages it has. These questions can be answered through getting acquainted with practices of those countries that have already become democratic and, in particular, those the historical development of which is similar to that of Ukraine (those that developed within an empire and under authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, or had not had their own statehoods for long periods of time, or transformed slowly etc.). Through studying the specifics of the development, it will be possible to elaborate the plan of transition from nondemocratic political regimes to democratic ones and adapt them to the Ukrainian environment and, as a result, to get our own development strategy resulting finally in a free and strong democratic society in a democratic country.

Taking the above-mentioned into account, it is important and urgent to get acquainted with foreign practices of political transitions as well as transitions of countries the history of which is similar to that of Ukraine and to study the Ukrainian way of political regime transformation profoundly.

The research of political regimes is rather common among domestic and foreign scientists. Among the most famous representatives of the above-mentioned direction of the Ukrainian political science are the following: A. Kolodii, A. Kruhlashov, N. Latyhina, O. Maiboroda, Yu. Matsievskiy, M. Mykhalchenko, N. Rotar and others. Referring to foreign researchers one cannot but mention such authors as V. Bans, Z. Brzezinski, L. Diamond, S. Larsen, S. Lipset, G. O'Donnell, A. Przeworski, D. Rustow, W. Reisinger, A. Stepan, S. Huntington, Ph. Schmitter and others.

The works of domestic researchers including O. Babkina, Ye. Bystrytskyi, I. Voronov, V. Horbatenko, O. Dolzhenkov, S. Kataiev, O. Kutsenko, M. Mykhalchenko, L. Nahorna, V. Polokhalo, O. Romaniuk, F. Rudych, D. Tkach, O. Fisun, V. Khodakivskiy, O. Khoroshylov, V. Tsvietkov, V. Tsvykh and others are focused on transformational aspects of studying political regimes, transitology, transition periods and modern conditions in the countries that are transforming etc.

However, it is worth mentioning that the works of domestic researchers are characterized by the fact that they studied only how changes were being brought about in post-communist countries, while their Western colleagues focused on the transition of post-communist countries. Such a conclusion can be made not only due to numerous works dedicated to the subject mentioned but also on the basis of the problem-oriented periodicals including *Journal of Democracy*, *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*¹.

Upon the dissolution of the USSR, Ukraine immediately declared itself as a democratic country and got the features of a democratic political regime. Nevertheless, scientists “caught on to” the formality of this definition almost at once.

V. Polokhalo was one of the first domestic authors who started discussing the determination of the political regime in Ukraine. He characterized the Ukrainian political regime as neo-totalitarian.

He described the features of his post-communist neo-totalitarianism that, to his mind, characterized most of post-Soviet countries. The characteristic features of neo-totalitarianism are the following:

- Most people are removed from power while still being dependent on it in many aspects;
- Citizens are subject to rules and norms unilaterally, and the state fulfils its obligation without any control;
- There are no real guarantees of the declared human rights, and an individual feels helpless before officials;

¹ ШИПУНОВ, Г. Особливості становлення транзитології як напряму політичної науки. *Електронний науковий архів бібліотеки Національного університету «Львівська Політехніка»*. <<http://ena.lp.edu.ua:8080/bitstream/ntb/7875/1/24.pdf>>

- the public property is secretly appropriated and distributed due to clientistic relations;
- the corrupted political power, shadow economy and criminal world are combined;
- the nomenclature and corporate clans rule supreme, and the oligarchy and authoritarianism exist side by side.

- oligarchs apply democratic norms and procedures in a utilitarian manner¹.

Almost all listed features have somehow been inherent in the Ukrainian society for the whole period of the Ukrainian development since its independence to the Revolution of Dignity that made citizens more active and involved in the political processes.

Some researchers (V. Bortnikov, O. Fisun, O. Derhachov) disagree with V. Polokhalo and define the political regime in Ukraine as neo-patrimonial. They describe the characteristic features of neo-patrimonial regime as follows: the right to rule is conferred to a person other than a position; the president rules the state apparatus and is above the state laws; the system is completely subject to personal relations, dependency and loyalty; some issues are declared not for social obligations to be fulfilled but for personal fortune and power to be augmented².

These researches are more recent and frankly speaking the features mentioned can be observed through present. Whereas the political system changed, the “backslapping” is still present, and decisions are rather often taken in order to get personal benefits and more powerful competencies.

An important contribution to the development of the political science and, in particular, to the Ukrainian democratization and transition research was made by A. Kolodii who represented the sociological trend of researches in the political science. The main idea of this trend is that to overcome previous crises and to ensure an efficient transition, post-authoritarian states require something more than just legal norms. Such domestic authors as V. Bebyk, O. Borovskyi, V. Bortnikov, I. Nedokus, P. Oleshchuk, V. Romanova, H. Shypunov, P. Shliakhtun, V. Yakushyk and others share this opinion in their works.

Getting acquainted with practices of the Western researchers, A. Kolodii offered 5 event scenarios for Ukraine based on the American political experts' transition model:

1) the consolidation of a current political system; a slow but permanent movement towards more mature forms of democracy;

2) the acquisition by the system of “delegative” features, i.e. features of a formal democracy where the general population's involvement is limited to periodic voting, and it is the state that has the whole power. This system may be transformed into authoritarian one;

3) the emergency of a new form of non-democratic rule through taking power by right radicals and / or establishing a one-man rule;

4) the anarchy (and criminalization) within the political system and economy resulting in a long-lasting period of political instability;

5) the reversion to a previous single-party regime on the pretence of the reestablishment of the “Soviet rule of people” if the extreme left come to power. Certainly, the first alternative is the most preferable for Ukraine. However, the probability of the development of events according to the fifth scenario is the least as, first of all, the democratization (whatever form and speed of development it can have) incarnates an important tendency of the political development of countries in a modern world. Only one of the scenarios listed provides for a step-by-step movement towards the democracy. All others, in one form or another, lead to the authoritarian rule³.

On analyzing the scenarios mentioned above we can state that all of them previously were and are still probable enough in terms of further development of Ukraine. In the period between the Orange Revolution and the Revolution of Dignity, the social mood was very close to the election of right radicals, and Yanukovich became the President because the society thought that the state needed a “strong hand” and it almost led to the one-man rule. Back then, there has been observed the system criminalization that gave rise to the social discontent in November 2013. In its turn, the situation in the East of Ukraine perfectly reflects the development of the part of the state by the last scenario offered by Mrs. Kolodii, namely,

¹ Полохало, В. (1998). Політологія посткомуністичних суспільств в Україні та Росії. *Політична думка*, 2.

² Фисун, А. (2007). Концепция неопатримониализма в современной политической теории: уроки для четвертой волны демократизации. Харьков: Ойкумена. *Альм. Сравнит. Исслед. Полит. Ин-тов., соц.-эконом. Систем и цивилизаций*, 5.

³ Колодій, А. (1999). До питання про політичний режим в Україні (спроба транзитивного підходу). *Думки з приводу. Авторський проект Антонін Колодій*. <<http://political-studies.com/?p=101>>

the reestablishment of the “Soviet rule of people” managed by an external aggressor. As of today, the question whether Ukraine will be able to move towards democratization and acquire the features of more mature forms of democracy or the society will lose its chance and continue as a “delegative democracy” to which it is accustomed remains outstanding.

While defining the political regime, A. Kolodii tends to agree with G. O’Donnell and Ph. Schmitter who refer Ukraine to transitional societies with nonconsolidated and non-pure democracy where an old political regime is destroyed and the new one cannot be considered as stable yet¹.

An important question in the political science has been raised by another domestic political expert O. Maiboroda who emphasized the complicity of the formation of the state’s national identity and functioning of its institution and explained this as follows: “for the whole period of the existence of Ukraine as a state, the policy of its authorities has sought to facilitate privatization of the former national property by legislative and administrative means and to create favourable conditions for new big owners for them to run their business at the expense of the national budget. On turning the state into a tool in their hands, the Ukrainian oligarchs focused not on the language and cultural revival of the ethnic core and its consolidation but on promotion of their own interests only without taking care about the main task which is the social integration and mobilization for the common goal to be achieved².

O. Fisun studies how neoclassical forms of democracy function. The article “Perspectives of Consociation Democracy” written by Fisun and co-authored by U. Movchan says that the constitutional transition reflects the problems in the Ukrainian society related to both general structural and historical background and the structure of the existing political elite selection. In other words, within the given context, it is the combination of an objective background and a subjective political choice. Thus, what are meant here is the inverse logics of a political transition in general. One of the elements of this inverse logics is the institutions of democracy and, in particular, those of electoral democracy in Ukraine that started functioning before the rational and bureaucratic transformation of the state and creation of the apparatus of a modern state that appeared during the early Modern Period in the West that had been witnessing the democratization of rationalized bureaucratic structures from the end of the 19th till the beginning of the 20th century³.

Analyzing the democracy as a political regime seeking to be perfect, the Ukrainian researcher N. Latyhina notes that not many political thinkers of the past and present consider the democracy to be an absolute value. According to N. Latyhina, the democracy as the basis for the state administration becomes effective only when there are common interests and fundamental values recognized by most of the civil society. The minority agrees to a temporary rule of the majority not only because it hopes to be included to the majority one day but also because certain common interest, rights and freedoms prevail over those of small groups. This is exactly what makes the democratic and parliamentary administration viable and efficient. The democracy starts decaying when common values no longer exist in a civil society and when the main principles and goals are not recognized by the general population and some political parties or other institution of a civil society seek to cooperate with the state not as much as to become the state⁴.

Nevertheless, despite the fact that the spectrum and scope of researches performed by domestic scientists are rather big, these usually consider different aspects of the “social transition” concept separately and here it is worth underlining an evident absence of the clear-sighted and comprehensive analysis that would include political and sociological surveys of domestic scientists that would describe ups and downs of political and social & economic development of the country on different stages of social transformations in Ukraine in a chronological manner⁵.

¹ Колодій, А. (1999). До питання про політичний режим в Україні (спроба транзитивного підходу). Думки з приводу. *Авторський проект Антонін Колодій*. <<http://political-studies.com/?p=101>>

² Майборода, О. (2016). *Трансформація політичних інститутів України: Проблеми теорії і практики*. Монографія. Київ: ІПіЕНД імені І.Ф. Кураса НАН України.

³ Фісун, О.А., Мовчан, У.І. (2012). Перспективи консоціальної демократії. Харків: *Політична теорія. Вісник ХНУ імені В. Н. Каразіна, 1013*.

⁴ Латигіна, Н. (2009). Основні критерії, принципи та рівні здійснення демократії. Київ: *Політичний менеджмент, 3*.

⁵ Рафальський, О., Кармазіна, М., Майборода, О. (2016). *Політична наука в Україні 1991-2016. Теоретико-методологічні засади і концептуальні підсумки вітчизняних досліджень*. Київ: Парламентське видавництво, 39-61.

To sum all above-mentioned up, it is worth saying that domestic researchers pay much attention to the political regime transformation in Ukraine and its aspects, but their works do not provide us with profound answers to the following questions: how were these changes brought about and what did / will they result in? It is important to note that at the time when the Russian Federation and other countries endanger the national security of Ukraine all the time, the study by the Ukrainian scientist of transformational processes remains on the theoretical level only. Ukraine faces a profound crisis in almost all fields of its life. An armed conflict is witnessed in our territory and the Autonomous Republic of Crimea where the loss of territory resulted mainly not from the military forces' failure but from the weakness of authorities that had not been able to become desirable for the population of the Crimean peninsula. Thus, it is necessary to find answers not only on the question "Why?" but also "How" and "By what means?" including: "How can the burning issues be dealt with", "By what means can the society be made involved in political processes and how can the political awareness be raised to avoid the enemy propaganda?", "How can the authorities' credibility be raised and what must these authorities be?".

The Western researchers were a bit more attentive to the transitology within both their own states and the countries with post-totalitarian history. Among popular researches of the transition from nondemocratic political regimes to democratic ones, there can be noted the works of the following authors: Z. Brzezinski, L. Diamond, S. Larsen, A. Lijphart, J. Linz, S. Lipset, G. O'Donnell, R. Putnam, A. Przeworski, D. Rustow, W. Reisinger, S. Huntington, Ph. Schmitter and others.

D. Rustow was one of the first who started studying the transitology. He raised the following question namely "How do states transit from one regime to the other one? and Why do some democracies dissolve while others continue developing. In his article "*Transition to Democracy: Toward a Dynamics Model*", D. Rustow specified the national unity as the main factor and the precondition for the transition to democracy¹.

The domestic political experts underlined that the first works on the transition to democracy are too ideology-driven as they came to light in the period of the "cold war", and their authors did not doubt that the capitalism would win a victory over its ideological opponent – the communism.

In September 1989, the President of the American Association of Political Sciences L. Pai put the refinement of the general transition concept and the comparative analysis of post-authoritarian regimes on the agenda. The end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s saw the tendency to optimistic evaluation of transitions to democracy. A set of scientific surveys was the grounds for such evaluation. The authors of that period thought that the democracy and market economy can be built on ruins of any non-democratic regime through following a certain set of rules and being consistent while acting².

That period was characterized by the concept of post-communist countries inclusion into a global democratization. G. DiPalma and his supporters (A. Przeworski, S. Huntington, Ph. Schmitter, G. O'Donnell, J. Linz and others) considered existing changes in post-socialist countries to be one of the components of global democratization³.

However, over the years people understood that the "global democratization" is a utopia similar to "communism" within its ideal meaning. Failures to establish democratic institutions resulted in the appearance of works focused on studying the "democratic backsliding", "electoral authoritarian regime" "authoritarian diffusion", democratic stagnation and post-democracy, "delegative democracies" as well as the typology of nondemocratic regimes etc.⁴

Basing on the historical analysis, an American political expert and sociologist S. Huntington articulated 3 waves of democratization and 2 backsliding waves that further facilitated the development of the section for studying democracy on the basis of the wave approach.

According to his theory, the first wave of democratization (1820-1926) reflected the spread of the parliamentary regime, multiparty systems and franchise in different countries and, in particular, in countries of the Western Europe and North America. The backsliding (1926-1942) resulted in totalitarian regimes in their different forms including "fascism", "stalinism", "nazism" and the reversion of some

¹ Rustow, D (1970). *Transition to Democracy: Toward a Dynamics Model. Comparative Politics, Vol. 2, № 3.*

² Стойко, О.М. (2016). *Трансформація політичних інститутів у сучасних перехідних суспільствах.* Монографія. Київ: Ін-т держави і права ім. В. М. Корецького НАН України.

³ DiPalma, G (1990). *To craft democracies: An essay on democratic transitions.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

⁴ Стойко, О.М. (2016). *Трансформація політичних інститутів у сучасних перехідних суспільствах.* Монографія. Київ: Ін-т держави і права ім. В. М. Корецького НАН України.

countries to authoritarian regimes. The first wave saw 29 democracies, and during the backsliding period 12 countries backed out of democracy.

The second wave of democratization (1942-1962) was marked by the victory over fascism, anticolonial movement, and breakup of the colonial system, modernization of countries that became independent of the colonists as well as by developing and absolute democratization in some of them. That period saw 36 democracies. The backsliding wave (1960-1975) was characterized by the establishment of the authoritarian one-man rule in a number of countries. 6 countries backed out of democracy.

The third (global) wave of democratization (that began in 1975) was marked by the fall of authoritarian regimes in Greece, Portugal and Spain (in 1974, 1975 and 1977 respectively). Later, it spread over Latin America and some Asian countries. And the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Peru, Turkey, the Philippines and South Korea embarked on a path towards democracy¹.

S. Huntington distinguished 27 variables determining the democratization process and outcomes. One of the approaches includes three models of democratization of the “third wave” countries namely: 1) “transformation”; 2) “substitution” and 3) “shift”. Another S. Huntington’s approach includes three models of transition:

1) a classic linear model (the Great Britain, Sweden): the limitation of the monarchical power and the empowerment of citizens and a parliament are experienced step by step; at first, the subjects receive civil (personal), then – political, and later – social rights; electoral qualifications are limited and removed on a step-by-step basis; a parliament becomes the highest legislative body and controls a government;

2) a cyclic model (in many countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa): presupposes the interchange of democratic and authoritarian regimes whereas the political elites have a formally positive attitude towards democracy; in this case the rulers elected by people either pretend to be military officers or usurp power being rather afraid of losing it and facing an increasing unpopularity and a strong counteraction of the opposition; this model shows that the internal preconditions of democracy are not mature enough and, in particular, that the democracy slightly rooted itself in the predominant political culture;

3) dialectic model (Spain, Portugal, Greece): like a cyclic model, it is marked by unstable transitive political regimes but the transition to democracy is ensured under the influence of internal preconditions that are already mature for it (industrialization, numerous middle class, rather high educational level of citizens, rationalization and individualization of mass consciousness etc.); the accumulation of these and other factors causes a rather quick and sudden crash of authoritarian regimes; and this (following some changes) results in a stable and viable democracy.

It should be realized that the concept offered by S. Huntington is not an explanatory model for all cases of the regime change and democratic transitions that had happened or are happening in a modern world. Thus, over the last decades, some political regimes moved in the opposite to democratic direction (for instance, some post-Soviet states)².

At the end of 1990s scientists started discussing the essence of the modern “third wave” of democratization. There was an outstanding question whether the third wave was over, or the new phase began or an overlong process was still lasting. In his article “Is the “third wave” of democratization over?” L. Diamond stated that the “third wave” of democratization “approached to a certain end-point” and to promote further “global movement towards democracy” it is necessary to prevent the third backsliding wave of democratic disasters”. With this in view, the “consolidation of new liberal democracies” and strengthening and liberalization of “electoral democracies for their institutions to become a real value for wider and wider sections of the population” are required³.

Some Western political experts adhered to the opinion that Ukraine was a state with “delegative democracy” defined as not absolute democracy where the undeveloped political culture results in the people’s passive attitude to political events in the state, and the authorities pursue their authoritarian policy under the umbrella of democratic features⁴.

Along with the abovementioned, it is worth emphasizing those political experts T. Kuzio and T.

¹ Хантингтон, С. (2003). *Третья волна: демократизация на исходе XX века*. Москва: Росспэн.

² Годлевська, В.Ю., Денисюк, А.В. (2016). Дослідження процесів демократизації останньої чверті XX століття. Київ: *Гілея. науковий вісник, вип. 105*. <<http://ir.lib.vntu.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/11999/Hodlevska%20%20Denysiuk.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>>

³ Даймонд, Л. (1999). Прошла ли «третья волна» демократизации? *Полис, 1*.

⁴ Меркель, В.А. Круассан (2002). Формальные и неформальные институты в дефектных демократиях. *Полис, 1, 2*.

Carothers described Ukraine as a “hybrid state” with the competitive authoritarian regime defined as the regime with two tendencies including: the supremacy of oligarchs under the umbrella of centrist parties in a parliament and the opposition’s attempts to restrain oligarchic clans. T. Kuzio considered the previous variant of the “delegative democracy” as appropriate to be applied to some parts of Ukraine and, in particular, to the South and East where citizens took an interest in policy only during elections. According to the definition of scientists, the hybrid state is characterized by the combination of traces of the old Soviet system with new economic and political institutions. The political process in a hybrid state is marked by stagnation; corruption and supremacy of elites that are of no use for the country and have little support of the population¹.

T. Carothers defined Russia, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Moldova as hybrid states too. These countries have the following common features:

- the citizens’ interests are either insufficiently considered or ignored;
- the low level of political involvement in the period between elections as in the “delegative democracy”;
- the frequent violation of legal norms;
- the results of elections are uncertain, and that is why elections have a low legitimacy;
- the low level of credibility to state institutions;
- imperfect functioning of the state in general.

T. Kuzio’s work supplements the statement about the hybridity of Ukraine. In his work the author proves that over the period of L. Kuchma’s presidency Ukraine was the state where non-Soviet political culture prevailed with: the centrists (ruling parties) who held the control over monopolies; the Social Democratic Party of Ukraine (united) that is an analogue of the Communist Party of Ukraine in the Soviet times; the attempts to co-opt nongovernmental institutions for them to collaborate; impatience towards opposition; nonadherence to legal norms; the attitude to the Mass Media; the Security Service of Ukraine that started applying neo-Soviet methods for combating corruption again; valid principles of the Soviet national policy (supremacy of the Russian language, celebrations); anti-Americanism and anti-Western discourse; slogans about integration to the Euro-Atlantic structures serving as an umbrella for making advances to the West².

Conclusion: The study of transformation processes is an integral part of the further development of any state. Ukraine today is instable. This condition can lead to the collapse of the state and its disappearance from the political map, or strengthen its positions and lead to a completely new level of development. It depends on choice which we made today.

Since the approval of the Constitution of Ukraine, the democracy has been chosen as the state’s motion vector. Nevertheless, for our country question of defining democracy still is open, as well as determining the specifics of “Ukrainian Democracy”. As nowadays, the scientists who are researching the political regime in Ukraine see eye to eye only on the following: the political regime in Ukraine is not democratic. The works of domestic researchers are characterized only by the study of aspects of the course of change in the post-communist countries. Usually these materials do not have a purposeful comprehensive analysis that would include political and sociological intelligence that chronologically describe the processes of political and socio-economic development.

Political transit in Ukraine lasted for a long period of time and ranged from “formal democracy” moving from one extreme to another. But today we can capture the consequences of the indifference of citizens to political processes and uncontrolled activity of government.

Ukraine needs to formulate a clear development plan based on the experience of other countries that have passed similar way and build a developed democracy. Democracy in Ukraine should become real, not formal. This means that in addition to the experience of other countries Ukraine needs to learn and understand the peculiarities of “Ukrainian transit” and implement the latest knowledge in the construction of new forms of democracy, but such will suit people and will direct our country on the new high-quality democratic transit.

¹ Carothers, T. (2002). The End of Transition Paradigme. *Journal of Democracy*, 13(1).

² Кузьо, Т. (2004). Десять свідчень того, що Україна неорядянська держава. *Українська правда*. <<https://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2004/03/25/2998846/>>

References:

1. Rastou, D.A. (1996). Perekhody k demokratii. Popytki dinamicheskoy modeli [Transitions to the democracy: an attempt of dynamic model]. *Polis*, no. 5 [in Russian].
2. Kolodiy, A. (2009). *Osnovy demokratiyi. Pidruchnyk dlya studentiv VNZ* [Fundamentals of Democracy. Textbook for college students]. Lviv: Astrolyabiya [in Ukrainian].
3. Verber, M. Izbrannyye proizvedeniya [Selected works]. *Biblioteka Gumer*. <http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Sociolog/vebizbr/index.php> [in Russian].
4. Shypunov, H. Osoblyvosti stanovlennya tranzytolohiyi yak napryamu politychnoyi nauky [Features of the formation of transitology as a direction of political science]. *Elektronnyy naukovyy arkhiv biblioteki Natsionalnoho universytetu Lvivska Politekhniky* [Electronic scientific archive of the library of Lviv Polytechnic National University]. <<http://ena.lp.edu.ua:8080/bitstream/ntb/7875/1/24.pdf>>
5. Polokhalo, V. (1998). Politolohiya postkomunistychnykh suspilstv v Ukrayini ta Rosiyi [Political science of postcommunist societies in Ukraine and Russia]. *Politychna dumka*, no. 2 [in Ukrainian].
6. Fisun, A. (2007). Koncepcija neopatrimonializma v sovremennoj politicheskoy teorii: uroki dlja chetvertoj volny demokratizacii [The concept of neopatrimonialism in modern political theory: lessons for the fourth wave of democratization]. Kharkiv: *Ojkumena*, no. 5 [in Russian].
7. Kolodiy, A. (1999). Do pytannya pro politychnyy rezhym v Ukrayini (sproba tranzytyvnoho pidkhodu) [To the question of political regime in Ukraine (attempt of a transitive approach)]. *Dumky z pryvodu. Avtorskyy proekt Antonin Kolodiy*. <<http://political-studies.com/?p=101>> [in Ukrainian].
8. Mayboroda, O. (2016). *Transformatsiya politychnykh instytutiv Ukrayiny: Problemy teorii i praktyky* [Transformation of Political Institutions in Ukraine: Problems of Theory and Practice]. Monohrafiya [Monography]. Kyiv: IPIEND imeni I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrayiny [in Ukrainian].
9. Fisun, O.A., Movchan, U.I. (2012). Perspektyvy konsotsialnoyi demokratiyi [Perspectives of consocial democracy]. Kharkiv: *Politychna teoriya. Visnyk KhNU imeni V. N. Karazina*, no. 1013 [in Ukrainian].
10. Latyhina, N. (2009). Osnovni kryteriyi, pryntsyipy ta rivni zdiysnennya demokratiyi [Basic criteria, principles and levels of changing of democracy]. Kyiv: *Politychnyy menedzhment*, no. 3 [in Ukrainian].
11. Rafalskyi, O., Karmazina, M., Mayboroda, O. (2016). *Politychna nauka v Ukrayini 1991-2016. Teoretyko-metodolohichni zasady i kontseptualni pidsumky vitchyznyanykh doslidzhen* [Political Science in Ukraine 1991-2016. Theoretical and methodological principles and conceptual results of domestic research]. Kyiv: Parlamentske vydavnytstvo [in Ukrainian].
12. Rustow, D (1970). Transition to Democracy: Toward a Dynamics Model. *Comparative Politics*, Vol.2, №3 [in English].
13. Stoyko, O.M. (2016). Transformatsiya politychnykh instytutiv u suchasnykh perekhidnykh suspilstvakh [Transformation of political institutions in modern transitional societies]. Monohrafiya. [Monography]. Kyiv: In-t derzhavy i prava im. V. M. Koretskoho NAN Ukrayiny [in Ukrainian].
14. Di Palma, G (1990). *To craft democracies: An essay on democratic transitions*. Los Angeles: University of California Press [in English].
15. Hantington, S. (2003). *Tretja volna: demokratizacija na ishode XX veka* [The Third wave: democratization at the end of the twentieth century]. Moskva: Rossipjen [in Russian].
16. Hodlevska, V.Yu., Denysyuk, A.V. (2016). Doslidzhennya protsesiv demokratyzatsiyi ostannoyi chverti XX stolittya [Investigation of the democratization processes of the last quarter of the twentieth century]. *Hileya. Naukovyy visnyk. Vypusk 105* <<http://ir.lib.vntu.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/11999/Hodlevska%2C%20Denysiuk.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>> [in Ukrainian].
17. Dajmond, L. (1999). Proshla li «tret'ja volna» demokratizacii? [Was the "third wave" of democratization?]. *Polis*, no. 1. <http://www.polisportal.ru/files/File/publication/Starie_publicacii_Polisa/D/1999-1-3-Dimond_Proshla_li_3_volna_demokratizacii.pdf> [in Russian].
18. Merkel', V. A. Kruassan (2002). Formal'nye i neformal'ne instituty v defektnykh demokratijah [Formal and informal institutions in defective democracies]. *Polis*, no. 1, no. 2. <<http://www.politstudies.ru/files/File/2002/1/Polis-2002-1-Merkel-Kruassan.pdf>> [in Russian].
19. Carothers, T. (2002). The End of Transition Paradigme. *Jornal of Democracy*, no. 13(1). <<http://www.journalofdemocracy.org/sites/default/files/Carothers-13-1.pdf>>
20. Kuzo, T. (2004). Desyat svidchen toho, shcho Ukrayina neoradyanska derzhava. *Ukrayinska pravda*. [Ten evidence that Ukraine is a neo-Soviet state] <<https://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2004/03/25/2998846/>> [in Ukrainian].