

UKRAINE'S PARTY SYSTEM AND EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE

Palinchak M. M., Leshanych M. M.

INTRODUCTION

In modern political science there are two basic approaches to defining the party system associated with relation to the environment. The essence of the first approach is that the party system is defined as both the relationship between the parties and the relationship of the parties with the government and other political institutions of the country. Proponents of this approach include in the definition of the party system the relationship of parties with various political and social institutions, as well as the interaction between parties and citizens of the country, whose interests the parties are meant to represent. In other words, the definition of the party system includes the environment surrounding the party system. This approach, in our view, can be described as understanding of the party system in the broadest sense, in which the party system is characterized not only by the relationship of the parties themselves, but also by their interaction with the government and other elements of the political system, and the citizens.

The essence of the second approach is that the party system is seen as a relationship between parties, without the inclusion of relations with other political and social institutions in the concept of the party system. In this approach, the “environment” is not included in the definition of the party system. This approach can be described as understanding of the party system in the narrow sense of the word. Thus, the party system is a set of existing relations between political parties for struggle for power or cooperation, influence on the government and its implementation.

1. Internal structure, ideology, alliances, types of the party

According to M. Duverger, who represented this approach, in each country the number of parties, their internal structure, ideology, relative size, alliances, types of opposition acquire some stability over a more or less long period. This stable ensemble forms a system of parties. Under the party system M. Duverger understood all the parties of the country, operating on the basis of relatively stable relations¹.

M. Duverger believed that the party system is formed by the interaction of multiple and complex factors, both general and specific. To the general

¹ Дюверже М. Политические партии / Пер. с франц. Москва : Академический Проект, 2000. 538 с.

factors he attributed socio-economic, ideological and technical. The specific ones include the influence of the political regime and the electoral system².

We believe that the party system can be defined as the totality of all existing parties in the country, their relationships and interconnections in the form of competition or cooperation, which contribute to the formation of efficient feedback between society and the government. The party system is an institutional system (order) of political parties operating in the country.

We shall now consider the concepts of institutionalization, institutionalization of a political party and institutionalization of the party system.

In general, institutionalization means the process of forming some new government and public institutions as sustainable forms of organizing people's activities, the process of fixing norms, rules, statuses and roles, bringing them into a system that is able to act to meet public needs. Institutionalization is the process of forming a set of rules that define the context of human coexistence and interaction³. Formation of institutions, their strengthening, stabilization and rooting in society are a set of events, which are commonly called institutionalization⁴.

Thus, institutionalization is a process that results in the emergence of an institution, in our case political parties and party systems. In addition, institutionalization involves the consolidation, rooting and stabilization of existing institutions in society. The concept of institutionalization involves the consolidation of a particular practice or area of public relations in the form of law, social norms and the accepted procedure.

The process of institutionalization of political parties can be interpreted as the transformation of political parties from ordinary associations into full-fledged constitutional and legal institutions. Institutionalization of political parties is a recognition of their necessity, positivity, functionality by both the government and society⁵.

Party institutionalization is manifested, first of all, in the constitution, i.e. the basic principles of the status of political parties are included in the constitution; secondly, in legislative institutionalization, as a result of which the legal status of parties is further regulated by law⁶.

² Исаев Б.А. Теория партий и партийных систем : учебное пособие. Москва : Аспект Пресс, 2008. 367 с.

³ Меркель В., Круассан А. Формальные и неформальные институты в дефектных демократиях. *Политические исследования*. 2002. № 2. С. 18–35.

⁴ Зазнаев О.И. Вторая молодость «долгожителя»: концепт «политический институт» в современной. Проблемы политической науки. Казань : Центр иннова. технологий, 2005. 235 с.

⁵ Исаев Б.А. Теория партий и партийных систем : учебное пособие. Москва : Аспект Пресс, 2008. 367 с.

⁶ Зеленько Г. Співвідношення процесів правової та політичної інституціалізації політичних партій: українська практика. *Партійна система сучасної України*:

According to T. Bevz, the main objectives of legal institutionalization of political parties should include: 1) legal consolidation and clarification of the political parties' status, their role and place in the political system; 2) achieving by legal means the organizational stability of political parties and their active participation in political life; 3) determining the procedure of the parties' interaction with public authorities and other public associations; 4) creating conditions that ensure government control over the activities of political parties⁷.

Thus, we can identify the following main areas of legal regulation of political parties: 1) determining the place and role of political parties in society and the state; 2) the procedure for the establishment and dissolution of political parties; 3) ensuring effective participation in electoral processes; 4) financing of political parties.

2. Institutionalization of political parties

Institutionalization of political parties is often directly related only to their legal design and regulation. At the same time, one cannot ignore the fact that a party is, first of all, a political institution.

Thus, the concept of party institutionalization has a broader meaning, which includes the process of creating the institution of a political party. Therefore, it is incorrect to equate legal regulation of political parties with their institutionalization. Political and legal institutionalization are different forms of one process. Therefore, legal institutionalization of political parties means the process of formation of normative types of their activities by the government, while political institutionalization is the process of their structural and functional formation and development as institutions that have their own systemic qualities of a political institution. According to K. Janda, party institutionalization is the degree to which the party materializes into something concrete in the public consciousness and, as a result, exists independently of its own leaders, regularly engaging in meaningful patterns of behavior⁸.

That is, according to G. Zelenko, a political party can only be considered a full-fledged political institution if the it performs typical political party functions with various degrees of effectiveness (becomes parliamentary or

еволюція, тенденції та перспективи розвитку : Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції, 24–25 листопада 2011 р. Київ : ІПіЕНД, 2012. С. 205–221.

⁷ Бевз Т. Інституціоналізація політичних партій як процес. *Наукові записки Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І.Ф. Кураса НАН України*. 2011. № 3(53). С. 31–45.

⁸ Джанда К. Сравнение политических партий: исследование и теория. Современная сравнительная политология. Хрестоматия. Москва : Московский общественный научный фонд, 1997. С. 84–143.

remains outside parliament). This is manifested in its interaction with various political actors, institutions, attitude of citizens (confidence level), as well as purely formal features, such as party infrastructure, strength, etc.⁹

The main functions of political parties (which actually make them institutionalized organizations) include the struggle for power in representative bodies through participation in elections and in executive bodies for the implementation of election programs. If the party does not perform these main functions, then it can be referred to as a sub-institution or a pseudo-institution.

Regarding the analysis of the institutionalization of political parties and the party system, the Ukrainian researcher A. Kolodiy makes the following reservations. Firstly, institutionalization cannot be equated with a close but not identical notion of stabilization, especially if the latter is understood simply as the long-term existence of certain parties and/or party blocs. Institutionalization is a much broader concept; it is impossible without the recognition and appreciation of a particular practice or organization by society. Secondly, institutionalization cannot be understood as the formalization of parties or their official recognition through registration and legalization. It is necessary to take into account formal and informal institutionalization, their possible coincidence or, conversely, multivectority, when legally established democratic rules of the formation and functioning of parties (as well as any other organizations and institutions) are leveled under the pressure of informal rules of the game of the opposite content recognized in influential social circles. Thirdly, it is necessary to distinguish between the institutionalization of parties and the institutionalization of party systems: although the former creates the basis from which the latter begins, party institutionalization plays an important role in party systems institutionalization, so these processes are not identical¹⁰.

The institutionalization of the party system begins with the existence of interaction between parties. In the process of party system institutionalization, relations between parties must be real, which can actualize in cooperation, rivalry, competition, struggle between parties, coalition formation, informal agreements (for example, not to criticize each other during the election campaign, etc.). Moreover, the institutionalization

⁹ Зеленько Г. Співвідношення процесів правової та політичної інституціалізації політичних партій: українська практика. *Партійна система сучасної України: еволюція, тенденції та перспективи розвитку*: Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції, 24–25 листопада 2011 р. Київ: ІПіЕНД, 2012. С. 205–221.

¹⁰ Колодій А. Багатопартійність і демократизація: висхідні та низхідні тренди в роки незалежності. *Партійна система сучасної України: еволюція, тенденції та перспективи розвитку*: Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 24–25 листопада 2011 р. Київ: ІПіЕНД, 2012. С. 133–149.

of the party system reduces the uncertainty of political results (the predictability of socio-political processes).

S. Mainwaring and T. Scully (1995) were among the first to attempt to define the concept of “institutionalization of party systems”. They defined party system institutionalization as “a process by which a practice or organization becomes well established and widely known, if not universally accepted. Actors develop expectations, orientations, and behavior based on the premise that this practice or organization will prevail into the foreseeable future”¹¹.

Thus, party system institutionalization can be defined as a process that results not only in the formation of political parties as full-fledged institutions of the political system, but also in gaining stability (institutionality) of relations and ties between the parties themselves. According to Y. Plyais, “the building of an effective party system, which is a set of legal parties operating in the country, can not be constructed if it does not have the necessary building materials (building blocks)”. It follows that without the parties as building blocks, there can be no question of building a party system. The characteristic attributes of the party system institutionalization are the stability of rules and norms that determine the activities of political parties and inter-party competition. Party system institutionalization is a process by which models of inter-party competition and cooperation become a common, everyday, predictable phenomenon, stable over time¹².

Thus, the structure of electoral competition results is formed, which is characterized by such parameters as size (number of parties in parliament) and form (party strength and configuration of the ruling coalition). If this structure is reproduced over several electoral cycles, then such a party system can be considered consolidated (or institutionalized)¹³.

The analysis of the processes of institutionalization of political parties and party systems should focus on the study of their criteria. The very concept of “criterion” can be defined as a feature on the basis of which the assessment, analysis and comparison are carried out, as well as the degree of development of a certain phenomenon or process is identified. In practice, a criterion cannot be rigid or unambiguous because of the possibility of change of conditions. The criterion should

¹¹ Mainwaring S., Scully T.R. *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*. Stanford University Press, 1995. 578 p.

¹² Пляйс Я. Партии и партийные системы в современной России. *Власть*. 2003. № 12. С. 19–24.

¹³ Гайворонский Ю. Консолидация партийных систем в контексте трансформации электорального пространства и политических режимов. На примере стран Балканского региона. *Полития*. 2014. № 2. С. 141–154.

be sufficiently detailed to include certain components or units that allow “measuring” limits of the social and political reality. In addition, the institutionalization of political parties and party systems cannot be judged by only one criterion. Instead, a set of criteria that can give a fair assessment of political reality should be applied.

In order to identify the criteria for party systems institutionalization, it is necessary to first analyze the criteria for the institutionalization of political parties, as the process of institutionalization of the party system involves the institutionalization of political parties. However, it is quite difficult to clearly distinguish the criteria of institutionalization of political parties from the criteria of institutionalization of party systems, which in fact it is one process. It should be noted that the criteria may be conditional, as some categories may be part of others.

S. Huntington, who studied the institutionalization of political institutions, identifies four criteria for this process:

- adaptability (both functional and to the environment challenges). The more adaptive the organization, the higher the level of its institutionalization, and vice versa. Adaptability is an acquired characteristic of a political organization that depends on the influence of the environment and the age of the organization. The more demands coming from the environment and the older the organization, the more adaptive it is;

- complexity (it is determined by the presence of various elements, subsystems and functions that provide stability). The more complex the organization, the higher the level of its institutionalization; an organization that pursues many goals is more able to adapt to the loss of any of the goals than an organization that pursues one goal;

- autonomy (existence independently of other social groups). Autonomy is the structural independence of a party from other institutions and organizations operating inside or outside the country;

- cohesion (coordination of the elements within the organization). The more cohesive the organization, the higher the level of its institutionalization, and vice versa¹⁴.

These criteria can be attributed both to the institutionalization of political parties and the party system as a whole. It should be noted that Huntington’s criteria are universal and difficult to measure.

The problem of distinguishing the criteria of institutionalization of parties and party systems was studied by such well-known scholars as

¹⁴ Хантингтон С. Политический порядок в меняющихся обществах. Москва : Прогресс-Традиция, 2004. 436 с.

R. Rose and T. Mackie¹⁵, V. Randall and L. Svasand¹⁶, A. Meleshevich¹⁷, S. Mainwaring and T.R. Scully¹⁸ (17), K. Janda¹⁹ and others.

For example, R. Rose and T. Mackie believe that “a party is institutionalized if it participated in more than three national elections. If the party failed to achieve this, it cannot be called strengthened. It is ephemeral”. Thus, the party’s participation in elections and the frequency of this participation can be taken as a criterion for institutionalization. At the same time, the party should not just participate in the elections, but be able to overcome the threshold / gain the necessary number of votes²⁰.

The main socio-political divisions that have influenced the evolution of the party system of Ukraine at different stages of its development include: a) the division in coordinates of communist / democratic forces at the initial stage of the Ukrainian statehood formation; b) socio-economic division (poor / rich); c) support / opposition to the ruling regime; and d) socio-cultural division. According to Ukrainian experts, the actualization of the socio-cultural division is connected with the activity of regional political elites that formed their election messages and slogans on the basis of contrasting the values of Western and Eastern Ukraine in order to reap electoral dividends.

It should be noted that before the 2004 presidential election, the socio-cultural division, although reflected in the election results, was one of the factors structuring the party system. At the same time, during the 2004 election campaign it became a major factor influencing its configuration. Thus, the distribution of votes in the parliamentary elections of 2006, 2007, 2012 and the presidential elections of 2010 repeated the configuration of voting in the 2004 presidential elections²¹.

¹⁵ Rose R., Mackie T.M. Do Parties Persist or Fail? The Big Trade-Off Facing Organizations. When Parties Fail: Emerging Alternative Organizations / Ed. by K. Lawson and P. H. Merkl. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

¹⁶ Randall V., Svasand L. Party institutionalization in new democracies. Party Politics. 2002. Vol. 8. № 1. P. 12–24.

¹⁷ Meleshevich A. Party Systems in Post-Soviet Countries: a Comparative Study of Political Institutionalization in the Baltic States, Russia and Ukraine. New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

¹⁸ Mainwaring S., Scully T. R. Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America. Stanford University Press, 1995. 578 p.

¹⁹ Janda K.. Political Parties: A Cross-National Survey. New York : The Free Press, 1980. 178 p.

²⁰ Rose R., Mackie T. M. Do Parties Persist or Fail? The Big Trade-Off Facing Organizations. When Parties Fail: Emerging Alternative Organizations / Ed. by K. Lawson and P. H. Merkl. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

²¹ Трансформація партійної системи: український досвід у європейському контексті / За ред. Ю. Якименка. Київ : Центр Разумкова, 2017. 428 с.

After the Revolution of Dignity (2013–2014) and the snap presidential elections, the Ukrainian Parliament decided to return to the Constitution as amended on December 8, 2004. The form of government again became president-parliamentary.

The change in the forms of government could not but affect the format of the party system and electoral processes. The parties most connected with the President and the Prime Minister of Ukraine, such as the Party of Regions (V. Yanukovich), the All-Ukrainian Union “Fatherland” (Y. Tymoshenko), the People’s Union “Our Ukraine”, and the Political Party “Our Ukraine” (V. Yushchenko), PP “People’s Front” (A. Yatsenyuk), PP Petro Poroshenko Bloc “Solidarity” (P. Poroshenko), had the greatest influence in different periods. The weight of the elections also changed depending on whether these were parties of the “first” or “second” order²².

3. The development of the party system in Ukraine

Thus, the current form of government in Ukraine (semi-presidential form of government in a president-parliamentary format) has a positive effect on the development of the party system and multi-party system in general. At the same time, despite the fact that Ukraine is a semi-presidential republic, where the government should be formed on a party basis, the president still remains a dominant figure in the political system. Therefore, the presidential elections in Ukraine have a decisive influence on the distribution of socio-political forces in the country and on the party system, and thus on the distribution of forces in parliamentary elections.

The legal basis/framework for the activities and functioning of political parties in Ukraine includes the Constitution of Ukraine, the Law “On Political Parties in Ukraine”, laws of Ukraine on elections of deputies of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, the President of Ukraine, deputies of local councils, the Law “On Amendments to Some Laws of Ukraine on Preventing and Combating Political Corruption” (which stipulated government funding for political parties), laws on decommunization and a number of other laws related to decentralization reform and other reforms in Ukraine (civil service, police, prosecutor’s office, establishment of the Independent Agency for Prevention of Corruption, etc.).

The analysis of legislation which creates legal framework for political parties in Ukraine, leads to the following conclusions:

First, the legislation on the functioning of political parties has changed quite often, thus changing the conditions of party competition, which

²² Манайло-Приходько Р. Регіональний вимір розвитку та функціонування партійної системи України : дис. ... канд. політ. наук : 23.00.02 «Політичні інститути і процеси». Львів, 2018. 292 с.

ultimately had a negative impact on the institutionalization of political parties and the party system. This is especially true of the legal and regulatory framework for electoral processes.

Changes in the legislation on political parties were influenced by the following factors: the emergence of new institutions (National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption (NAPC), National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine), decentralization reforms, government funding of parties, changes in election legislation, etc. For example, according to M. Karmazina, the law “On Political Parties” was amended 13 times during 2014–2017²³.

Secondly, a legislative mechanism for strengthening the role of parties in socio-political life has not been created and has not become a reality in Ukraine, unlike in the countries of the European Union. The fact is that Ukraine was not the only country where political parties did not enjoy adequate popularity at the initial stage of democratic transit. Other countries were also in this situation. To solve this problem, they created a legislative mechanism to strengthen the role of parties in political life, which was based on laws that determined the participation of parties in the electoral process, government funding of political parties, government formation and political responsibility.

Thus, in fact, artificial conditions were created under which voters had no alternative but to perceive parties solely as tools for exercising government power. Over time, as A. Maleshevich emphasizes, with the help of such factors as free and fair elections and political responsibility, parties have taken their rightful place in the minds of political actors and voters, as well as in the political system of the countries²⁴.

Third, the non-compliance with current legislation regulating the activities of political parties, and irresponsibility for its violation.

For example, the operation of the following parties has not been suspended: a) parties that have not participated in electoral processes for 10 years; b) parties that have not created cells in two thirds of the regions of Ukraine; c) parties that do not have the appropriate number (according to the Law on Political Parties, the minimum number of party members must be 10 thousand); d) parties that did not submit reports on financial activities to the NAPC, etc.

As a result, Ukraine has become the country with the largest number of parties registered in comparison with the countries of the European Union.

²³ Кармазіна М. Політичні партії в Україні 2014–2017 рр. Київ, 2018. 168 с.

²⁴ Мелешевич А. Проблеми інституціоналізації та перспективи розвитку партійної системи України. *Партійна система сучасної України: еволюція, тенденції та перспективи розвитку*: Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції, 24–25 листопада 2011 р. Київ : ППіЕНД, 2012. С. 46–64.

As of January 2018, the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine registered 354 political parties.

The following main areas for improving the legislation on the activities of political parties may be recommended:

1. To introduce innovations that regulate the participation of parties in electoral processes. According to the current legislation, a party that has not participated in the election of the President of Ukraine or the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine for 10 years, may be liquidated. This norm promotes only formal participation in electoral processes. In our opinion, it is necessary to clearly define what results the party should achieve in the elections (parliamentary, presidential or local) to keep their registration.

2. To decide on regional parties using either of the following models: model of the party system 1: given the existence of a number of regional party organizations, to allow the functioning of regional parties at the legislative level, limiting their participation only in local elections; model of the party system 2: to ban and terminate the activities of regional party organizations, allowing the existence of only national parties.

3. To legalize parties of national minorities that live compactly within certain territories.

4. To solve problems in the development of intra-party democracy, expand the powers of local branches to participate in elections, e.g. to nominate candidates. It is now the prerogative of the party's head office, which incapacitates local cells, suppresses initiative, causes political corruption and leads to local party projects that allow local leaders who have not agreed to run with the party's central body to run for office under another party brand.

5. To change the electoral system to a proportional one with open party lists at both national and regional/local levels.

6. To prohibit the formation of personal parties, as their existence has a negative impact on the process of the party system institutionalization.

7. To improve the procedure for monitoring the activities of parties and expand the list of sanctions that can be applied to parties; to provide effective mechanisms to prevent the abuse of government resources for political purposes, including for the needs of election campaigns.

8. To amend the conditions for the registration of political parties.

The electoral system of Ukraine. Electoral systems are considered to be the most effective mechanism for influencing the party system. Since the declaration of independence of Ukraine, elections to the Verkhovna Rada have been held 7 times: in 1994, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2007, 2012 and 2014. All of them were regulated by different election laws.

The first parliamentary elections in Ukraine were held under the majority system of absolute majority, which, in the opinion of Ukrainian researchers,

proved ineffective and did not contribute to the structuring of the party system²⁵.

The system of elections to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine changed dramatically in 1997 with the introduction of a mixed electoral system²⁶ and in 2004 with the establishment of a proportional electoral system²⁷.

The parliamentary elections of 1998, 2002, 2012 and 2014 were held according to the mixed system of the 1998 model with certain modifications. The 1997 election law introduced a mixed electoral system, in which 225 deputies were elected on a proportional system of closed national party lists with a 4% threshold, and the other 225 in single-member constituencies under a majority system. Since 2012, electoral blocs have been barred from voting and the threshold has been raised to 5%²⁸.

Elections to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine in 2006 and 2007 were held under a proportional electoral system with a 3% electoral threshold and closed party lists. This involved significant differences both in organizing and holding elections and in the electoral activities²⁹. A similar system operated in the 2006 local elections.

It should be noted that on July 14, 2015, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine adopted the Law “On Local Elections”, which established a proportional system for elections to the Verkhovna Rada of Crimea, regional, district, city, district councils in cities, with fixing the electoral list of candidates in territorial constituencies. This is a completely new election formula, which takes into account the preferences granted to candidates in the electoral lists of parties when allocating parliamentary seats³⁰.

Thus, the constant change of the electoral legislation has a destructive effect on the development of the party system of Ukraine in the context of its institutionalization, as well as generates political corruption. The political practice of young democracies (CEE countries) shows the need for the formation of established electoral legislation that promotes the stability of the party system and other political institutions of society.

²⁵ Про вибори народних депутатів України : Закон України від 18 листопада 1993 р. Ужгород, 1993. 42 с.

²⁶ Про вибори народних депутатів України : Закон України від 24 вересня 1997 р. Київ : Парламентське видавництво, 1997. 27 с.

²⁷ Закон України «Про вибори народних депутатів України» (25 березня 2004 р.). *Все про вибори*. Київ : КНТ, АТІКА, 2004. 219 с

²⁸ Закон України «Про вибори народних депутатів України» (із змінами і доповненнями станом на вересень 2012 року). Київ : Алерта, 2012. 160 с.

²⁹ Закон України «Про вибори народних депутатів України» (25 березня 2004 р.). *Все про вибори*. Київ : КНТ, АТІКА, 2004. 219 с.

³⁰ Закон України «Про місцеві вибори» (2015). URL: <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/595-19>

In our opinion, it is advisable for Ukraine to introduce a proportional electoral system of open regional lists, to allow electoral blocs to participate in electoral processes by raising the electoral barrier, and to change the formulas for converting votes into seats. Such a system will allow for an equal representation of Ukraine's regions at the level of the highest representative body of power, and, unlike the majority part of the current electoral system, will make elections more democratic and transparent..

Foreign policy factor. Its effect is associated with decisions, positions of government institutions of other states, intergovernmental associations, international organizations, as well as with the activities of foreign political parties, non-governmental organizations and political technologists. For example, in the period of 2010–2013, the activities of the Party of Regions and the CPU were completely subordinated to the relevant persons from the state leadership of Russia.

Such influence is especially important in places of compact residence of national minorities near the state border of Ukraine, stimulating the activities of ethnic parties. Ethnic parties are formed by a combination of the following factors: compact residence of a national minority, external factor and politicization of ethnicity. The Russian parties of the former Autonomous Republic of Crimea (ARC) and the Hungarian parties of Zakarpattia can serve as examples. In this case, parties can be used as a means of realizing the foreign policy goals of other states, although, again, ethnic parties are regional-type parties that influence electoral competition only in one or more regions of Ukraine³¹.

Regional factor. As we noted above, the presence or absence of regional party organizations is one of the criteria for the institutionalization of political parties and the party system.

According to Y. Yakovenko, the reasons for regionalization were both objective and subjective. The objective reason for regionalization was the real differences in the identities and socio-cultural orientations of the citizens of Ukraine, confirmed by sociological research. The subjective factor was the conscious use of these differences by political actors, the segmentation of the electorate on socio-cultural grounds, and politicization of social division that is the most favourable for them. As a result, such “regionalization” of parties did not contribute to social integration, but to the realization of the completely opposite goal of differentiation of society³².

This situation arose due to the fact that the vast majority of Ukrainian political parties failed to form a stable social base grounded on the division

³¹ Трансформація партійної системи: український досвід в європейському контексті / За ред. Ю. Якименка. Київ : Центр Разумкова, 2017. 428 с.

³² Там само.

of society by socio-economic characteristics, property stratification, and to represent the interests of a certain social class thus separating their electorate from supporters of other parties.

The analysis of the peculiarities of the development and functioning of the Ukraine's party system should involve the periodization of its evolution on a national scale.

In Ukrainian political science, the problem of distinguishing the periods (stages) of the party system evolution remains debatable. Researchers are not unanimous in determining the main periods of development, because one or another scientific periodization is conditional and depends on the principle or criteria underlying it.

The process of multi-party development in Ukraine has been going on for over 25 years. During this time, the party system has undergone significant changes, as a result of which its current form differs significantly from the original. Relevant research appeared almost simultaneously with the emergence of the phenomenon of multi-party system in Ukraine. Models of development of the Ukraine's party system are presented in the works of A. Bilous, O. Boiko, A. Kolodiy³³, M. Karmazina³⁴, V. Lebediuk, V. Leshchenko, Y. Ostapets³⁵, B. Raikivskiyi, Y. Shveda³⁶, N. Shestak³⁷, Y. Yakymenko³⁸ and others.

The authors study various aspects of the formation of parties and the party system, offer their own periodization of their development, which often differs significantly. In our opinion, the interpretations of the periodization of the Ukraine's party system evolution are different for subjective reasons, i.e. the choice of different criteria for periodization by scholars (parliamentary electoral cycles, changes in the legal field of the parties, changes in the political regime, etc.). Such criteria include the

³³ Колодій А. Багатопартійність і демократизація: висхідні та низхідні тренди в роки незалежності. *Партійна система сучасної України: еволюція, тенденції та перспективи розвитку*: Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції, 24–25 листопада 2011 р. Київ : ІПіЕНД, 2012. С. 133–149.

³⁴ Кармазіна М. Українська багатопартійність: становлення і розвиток. *Наукові записки Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І.Ф. Кураса НАН України*. 2012. № 3 (59). С. 4–87.

³⁵ Остапеч Ю. Електоральні процеси на Закарпатті у контексті загальнонаціональних виборів. Ужгород : «Ліра», 2016. 412 с.

³⁶ Шведа Ю. Партії та вибори: енциклопедичний словник. Львів : Видавничий центр ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2010. 750 с.

³⁷ Шестак Н. Еволюція партійної системи України в умовах трансформації соціальних і політичних структур : дис. ... канд. політ. наук : 23.00.02 «Політичні інститути і процеси». Львів, 2015. 252 с.

³⁸ Трансформація партійної системи: український досвід у європейському контексті / За ред. Ю. Якименка. Київ : Центр Разумкова, 2017. 428 с.

parliamentary elections, the configuration of the party system according to the M. Duverger models, organizational and legal criteria, etc. The use of individual criteria did not allow for proper characteristics of the peculiarities of the party system.

The use of a comprehensive criterion for periodization was proposed in the article “Ukrainian Multi-Party System: Formation and Development” by M. Karmazin. The author emphasizes that, distinguishing the boundaries of periods, it is necessary to take into account multiple factors that determine party formation. These include: the specific mechanism of party formation; features of party leadership; the evolution of the ideological “face” of the parties; party funding; key moments in the history of parties; and transformation of party functions³⁹.

Summarizing the study of the periodization of the Ukraine’s party system development, Y. Yakymenko proposed to identify three main approaches to characterizing the periods in the party system of Ukraine: a) changes in political parties (creation, merger, acquisition); b) changes in the format of the party system; c) key factors in the environment of the party system that influenced the parties themselves and relations between them (including the nature of the political regime, the type of electoral system, constitutional and legal design, changes in the social structure of society, the relevance of social divisions, etc.)⁴⁰.

4. The party system in general in Ukraine

Having outlined the format of the party system in general, we shall characterize its development according to the periods identified in this study.

The first period – 1991–2004. The emergence of elements of multi-party system in Ukraine at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s was determined primarily by the socio-economic and political conditions prevailing in Ukraine at that time. An important factor influencing the party formation at the beginning of the period was the so-called founding elections, with which the creation of a real multiparty system in Ukraine is associated.

According to V. Gelman, founding elections play a threefold role in the process of democratic transitions, including in the post-communist countries of Eastern Europe: 1) institutional, i.e. they establish a system of political institutions within which electoral competition develops; 2) behavioral, i.e. they form preferences and patterns of behavior of voters, thereby

³⁹ Кармазіна М. Українська багатопартійність: становлення і розвиток. *Наукові записки Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І.Ф. Кураса НАН України*. 2012. № 3 (59). С. 4–87.

⁴⁰ Трансформація партійної системи: український досвід у європейському контексті / За ред. Ю. Якименка. Київ : Центр Разумкова, 2017. 428 с.

determining the contours of the new party system; 3) transformational, i.e. they create a basis for legitimation of new political regimes and significantly limit the possibility of returning to the old or transition to new undemocratic forms of government⁴¹.

The 1990 and 1994 parliamentary elections and the 1991 and 1994 presidential elections in Ukraine can be considered founding elections. The founding elections took place in a pact transition and resulted in the rise to power of a renewed communist elite due to the introduction of the post of the president, who was elected in national elections and the introduction of majoritarian system of elections to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine⁴².

Elections to the Ukrainian Parliament in 1994 were held under an absolute majority system. At the time of the election, 26 political parties were registered. The Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU), restored in 1993, was the largest (80 thousand members). The left spectrum in the elections was also represented by the Socialist Party of Ukraine (30 thousand) and the Peasant Party of Ukraine (PPU), which represented mainly the interests of directors of state and collective farms. In January 1994, they merged into a single election platform. Left forces had the support of voters in Eastern and Southern Ukraine and partly in the central regions. Their main rivals were the National Democrats – the People’s Movement of Ukraine (PMU), which suffered another split due to a rift in the leadership (8 thousand), the Republican Party of Ukraine (RPU) (10 thousand), the Democratic Party of Ukraine (DPU) and the Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists (CUN) that had an influence in the Western regions of Ukraine, Kyiv and a number of central regions⁴³.

The third group included representatives of democratic (centrist) parties such as the Party of Democratic Revival of Ukraine (PDVU), the Liberal Party of Ukraine (LPU), and the Party of Labour (PL), which represented the interests of regional “business groups”.

The main social division that determined the structuring of the policy space since 1991 has been the division in the coordinates of the communist / democratic forces, typical of the transformation period. The configuration of the party system as a whole corresponded to this division. Thus, the main poles of the party system were the left (CPU, SPU, PPU) and right (PMU, RPU), the centrist parties being much inferior in power to the flanking parties.

⁴¹ Гельман В. «Учредительные выборы» в контексте российской трансформации. *Общественные науки и современность*. 1996. № 6. С. 46–64.

⁴² Остапеч Ю. Електоральні процеси на Закарпатті у контексті загальнонаціональних виборів. Ужгород : «Ліра», 2016. 412 с.

⁴³ Касьянов Г. Політичний досвід самостійної України. *Державотворчий процес в Україні (1991–2006)*. Київ : Наукова думка, 2007. С. 160–237.

In the run-up to the 1998 parliamentary elections, the most relevant social division was socio-economic, which contributed to significant support for the left and the popularity of center-left ideology.

The 1998 parliamentary elections were held under a mixed electoral system: 225 deputies were elected in single-member constituencies and the other 225 on lists of candidates from political parties or electoral blocs. In this way, parties, along with majority candidates, became the main actors in the electoral process. Moreover, party lists were closed, and the electoral threshold was 4%. Of the 53 parties registered by the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine (as of January 14, 1998), 21 parties and 9 electoral blocs with 19 parties participated in the elections in the multi-member constituency. Thus, 40 political parties participated in the elections on party lists. In total, 48 parties out of 52 registered took part in the election process, including single-member constituencies⁴⁴.

The most numerous parties that participated in the parliamentary elections include: Agrarian Party of Ukraine (APU) – 200 thousand, Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU) – 140 thousand, Peasant Party of Ukraine (PPU) – 72 thousand, SPU – 34 thousand, People’s Movement of Ukraine (PMU) – 60 thousand, Social Democratic *Party of Ukraine* (united) (SDPU(o) – 16 thousand, People’s Democratic Party (PDP) – 7.5 thousand, Party of Greens of Ukraine (PGU) – 6 thousand, All-Ukrainian Association “Community” (Hromada) – 4 thousand, and Ukrainian National Assembly (UNA) – 1 thousand (according to the data from the CEC official website)⁴⁵.

In the elections of March 29, 1998, seven parties and the EB SPU and PPU (Electoral bloc of the Socialist Party and the Peasant Party) won in a multi-member constituency, and shared 225 seats: CPU took 84 (24.65%), PMU 32 (9.4%), EB SPU and PPU 29 (8.5%), PGU 19 (5.4%), PDP 17 (5.01%), Hromada 16 (4.6%), PSPU (Progressive Socialist Party of Ukraine) 14 (4.04%), SDPU (o) 14 (4.01%) seats correspondingly⁴⁶.

The results of the 1998 parliamentary elections created a tripolar party system: left – center – right.

Thus, the 1998 elections to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine reflected several trends in the influence of political forces. First, there was limited territorial support for national democratic forces, mainly in the Western region. Thus, voting in the Western region showed the great popularity of the people’s democratic forces, such as the PMU, EB “National Front”, ROP (Reforms and Order Party). While the PMU is a national party, such political forces as the ROP and the EB “National Front” can be called regionalized

⁴⁴ Офіційний сайт Центральної Виборчої Комісії. URL: <http://www.cvk.gov.ua>

⁴⁵ Там само.

⁴⁶ Там само.

parties in the Western regions. That is, their electoral support and influence is territorially localized in the regions of Western Ukraine.

Second, the left and center-left forces won the election, due to the sharp social stratification in Ukrainian society and the impoverishment of the majority of the population. Moreover, the EB SPU and PPU received the greatest support in the Central region, and the CPU in the Russified industrial areas of Eastern and Southern Ukraine.

Third, a feature of the 1998 elections was the emergence of the phenomenon of political parties in one region. Abnormal voting for such parties was recorded in Zakarpattia (SDPU (o) won 31, 17% of votes), Dnipropetrovsk (Hromada won 35, 34% of votes) and Sumy (PSPU won 20, 89% of votes) regions. It is due to this vote that these parties overcame the 4% threshold nationwide.

Fourth, pro-Russian political parties and blocs (EB "SLOn" (Social-Liberal Association, PP "Soyuz" (Union)) had support only in the ARC (PP "Soyuz" won 10.68% of votes, EB "SLOn won 1.63% of votes), Sevastopol in particular (PP "Soyuz" won 2, 25% of votes).

Fifth, the pro-government political party PDP had approximately the same electoral coverage (insignificant percentage) all over Ukraine.

The 2002 parliamentary elections were held under a mixed electoral system similar to that used for the 1998 parliamentary elections in Ukraine.

Of the 127 political parties registered by the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine as of December 1, 2001, 21 parties and 12 electoral blocs that included 42 political parties, became subjects of the election process. A total of 62 political parties took part in the elections⁴⁷.

The structuring of political forces for the elections took place not within individual parties, but in the format of personal blocs, which significantly increased the rating of political forces. In our opinion, the formation of electoral blocs took place under the influence of the following factors: business interests, loyalty / opposition to the President of Ukraine, administrative resources. But the personification of politics and of electoral choice eventually had a negative impact on the institutionalization of the party system.

In this period political parties were formed in the following ways: 1) by separation from the CPU; 2) on the basis of opposition movements and associations of citizens that emerged in the process of perestroika (PMU, PGU); 3) due to splits in existing political organizations (PSPU, SDPU (o)); 4) in an administrative way (APU, NDP, PIEU (Party of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs of Ukraine), KPU (renewed), All-Ukrainian Union "Justice" and others); 5) to protect the interests of financial and industrial groups

⁴⁷ Офіційний сайт Центральної Виборчої Комісії. URL: <http://www.cvk.gov.ua>

(PP “Labor Ukraine”, LPU, PP “Democratic Union”, PNEDU (Party of National Economic Development of Ukraine)); 6) as political projects of individual politicians (personal parties).

Analyzing the process of institutionalization of the party system of Ukraine in 1991–2004, it is necessary to focus on the study of the legal framework of political parties, which included: the Law of Ukraine “On Associations of Citizens” (June 16, 1992), the Law of Ukraine “On Political Parties in Ukraine” (2001), laws on elections of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine and the President of Ukraine.

Prior to the adoption of the Law on Political Parties, their activities in Ukraine were regulated by the Law of Ukraine “On Associations of Citizens” (June 16, 1992). Art. 1 of this Law states that a political party is an association of citizens – supporters of a national program of social development, whose main purpose is to participate in the development of state policy, the formation of government, local and regional governments and to be represented in self-government bodies.

Article 15 stated that in order to register a political party, the founders must submit an application with the signatures of at least 1,000 citizens of Ukraine who have the right to vote. This rule of law made it possible to register a large number of parties at the initial stage of party formation. The Law “On Associations of Citizens”, despite a number of shortcomings, had a number of positive features as it determined the mechanism of the creation, registration and principles of political parties⁴⁸.

The Law of Ukraine “On Political Parties in Ukraine” (April 5, 2001) almost completely reproduced it. The first chapter “General Provisions” defines the concept of the party, stipulates the rights of citizens who form a political party, and indicates the guarantees of political parties.

According to Article 3 of the Law on Political Parties in Ukraine, parties can be created and operate only with an national status. Thus, the Law does not provide for the possibility of registration and operation of regional parties. These norms were critically assessed by the Venice Commission. The latter, in particular, noted that the relevant provision “is a legal obstacle to the formation of parties that would focus on regional issues”⁴⁹.

The second chapter “Membership in Political Parties and Their Entities” emphasizes that only a citizen of Ukraine can be a member of a political party of Ukraine. Also, a citizen of Ukraine may be a member of only one

⁴⁸ Закон України «Про об’єднання громадян» (16 червня 1992 р.). *Голос України*. 1992. 18 липня.

⁴⁹ Закон України «Про політичні партії в Україні». *Все про вибори*. Київ : КНТ, АТІКА, 2004. С. 41–51.

party. Judges, prosecutors, law enforcement and the Security Service officers may not be members of political parties.

To register a party, there must be a decision to establish a political party, adopted at the constituent congress with the signatures of 10,000 citizens of Ukraine who have the right to vote, gathered in 2/3 districts, 2/3 regions of Ukraine, Kyiv and Sevastopol and no less than in 2/3 of the districts of the ARC. The registration of the party is carried out by the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine, which makes a decision within 30 days after the submission of documents. In the new political realities, the ARC and Sevastopol are not subject to the jurisdiction of Ukraine. Accordingly, the requirement of the law regarding these territories is invalid⁵⁰.

The third chapter “Registration and Rights of Political Parties” sets out requirements for the process of registration and guarantees the freedom of opposition.

The fourth chapter “Funds and Other Property of Political Parties”, in our opinion, is ineffectual, because it does not lay the foundations for regulating the financial activities of parties.

The fifth chapter, “State Control of Political Parties”, stipulates that the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine and the Central and District Election Commissions exercise control over the activities of the parties. Violation of the laws of Ukraine by the parties entails such measures as a warning to prevent illegal activities or a ban on a political party.

In our assessment of the first period of development of the Ukraine’s party system, we agree with the statement of the Ukrainian researcher N. Shestak that the institutional conditions for the functioning of political parties and the party system in general were unfavorable according to classical standards. This is due to a number of factors. First, the presidential-parliamentary form of government does not contribute to the strengthening of multi-party system and the formation of powerful political parties. Rather, it produces a party system of domination or strengthens one or two parties close to the president. Secondly, the mixed electoral system in the context of Ukrainian political practice does not have a positive impact on the structuring of the country’s party space, as majority deputies either join the presidential faction or support it as non-partisan deputies after entering parliament. Third, the lack of norms in the “Law on Political Parties in Ukraine”, which regulate the financing of political parties, had a negative impact on party formation. Fourth, the conditions of the transformation process (suspended transit) do not strengthen the party system, because the stage of democratization, in fact, is not over. There appeared significant

⁵⁰ Закон України «Про політичні партії в Україні». *Все про вибори*. Київ : КНТ, АТІКА, 2004. С. 41–51.

tendencies towards authoritarianism and oligarchism, and the confrontation between the government and the opposition has intensified⁵¹.

Thus, we can identify the following conditions and factors that during 1991–2004 determined the formation of the party system of Ukraine:

a) the post-communist nature of the transformation of Ukrainian society, the absence of historical parties and traditions of political self-organization of citizens;

b) the transitional nature of the economy, the emergence of new social strata of the population, significant property stratification, falling living standards;

c) inseparability of politics and business, lobbying of corporate interests in government bodies through party structures, institution of financial-industrial groups and their influence on the emergence and activity of political parties; struggle between groups of corporate economic interests for influence on the President and the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine through representation in government;

d) incompleteness of the process of legal institutionalization of the system of state power and the national political field, significant political and legal uncertainty of the status, role and conditions of political parties, their relations with the government, among themselves, etc.;

e) distrust of political parties as subjects of politics, orientation of citizens to personalized forms of politics (charismatic leaders) to the detriment of the institutional one;

g) small numbers and weak influence of political parties, lack of proper public support.

The second period – 2004–2014. The process of formation of new parties and the configuration of the party system were significantly influenced by the presidential elections of 2004, parliamentary and local elections of 2006, snap parliamentary elections of 2007, presidential and local elections of 2010 and parliamentary 2012 elections.

The falsification of the results expressing the citizens' will in the 2004 presidential election led to mass actions of civil disobedience, known as the Orange Revolution. The elections led to the formation of a number of political parties: PP "People's Union" Our Ukraine" (later – PP "Our Ukraine"), Civil Party "Pora", PP "Third Force", PP "New Democracy", the European Party of Ukraine, PP "Union of Leftists" and others. Parties were created in support of two Maidans – the "orange" in Kyiv and the "white and blue" in Donetsk, or as a third force.

⁵¹ Шестак Н. Еволюція партійної системи України в умовах трансформації соціальних і політичних структур : дис. ... канд. політ. наук : 23.00.02 «Політичні інститути і процеси». Львів, 2015. 252 с.

During this period, there were significant changes in the legal framework for the functioning of political parties. According to the amendments to the Constitution of December 8, 2004, which entered into force in full after the election of the Parliament in March 2006, the parties were given the right to form a coalition of parliamentary factions. The powers of the coalition included the formation of the Cabinet of Ministers (except for the positions of Minister of Defense and Minister of Foreign Affairs). Thus, a model of government organization introduced in Ukraine significantly increased the role of parties in the process of formation and implementation of public policy. Parties became the main subjects of influence not only on the legislative but also on the executive branch, and indirectly (through the parliamentary majority) on the judiciary⁵².

Simultaneously with the amendments to the Constitution, new laws were adopted on elections of people's deputies of Ukraine (March 2004) and on elections to local self-government bodies (April 2004). Under the new laws, representative bodies were elected in a multi-member constituency on the basis of lists of political parties (blocs). As a result of constitutional and legislative changes, parties became the only mechanism for the formation of Parliament and local governments (except for village and settlement councils).

The elections to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine in 2006–2007 were held under the inertial influence of the Orange Revolution, and thus the “orange forces” won. However, misunderstandings in the winners' camp eventually led to the appointment of Viktor Yanukovich as Prime Minister of Ukraine.

According to Y. Yakymenko, the main (and most politicized) social division during the fourth period was the socio-cultural division, reflected in two sets of ideas of citizens (based on their language preferences and cultural traditions) and, accordingly, political sympathies⁵³.

The party system, from 2006 to 2010, can be called a system of moderate pluralism in a two-bloc format. The poles of such blocs were formed by the largest political forces – the Party of Regions and the Yulia Tymoshenko Bloc.

The 2006 elections to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine differed significantly from the previous ones for the following reasons. First, they were conditioned by the new election law, which established a proportional system of closed lists with a 3% electoral threshold. Second, there was the inertia of the 2004 presidential election: political forces were largely

⁵² Закон України «Про внесення змін до Конституції України». *Урядовий кур'єр*. 2004. 10 грудня.

⁵³ Трансформація партійної системи: український досвід у європейському контексті / За ред. Ю. Якименка. Київ : Центр Разумкова, 2017. 428 с.

perceived in terms of the results of their participation in the presidential campaign. Third, political forces used tried and tested topics of discussion and political technology. Fourth, unlike previous campaigns, the government had more public support than the opposition. Fifth, the entry into force of the amendments to the Constitution immediately after the parliamentary elections made the stakes much higher, almost the same as in the presidential election, as the influence of the Prime Minister, who was to be nominated by the parliamentary majority, increased⁵⁴.

The analysis of the results of the elections to the Verkhovna Rada, leads to the following conclusions:

1. The elections resulted in further polarization of the society. Ukraine remained divided not only geographically but also electorally: the South and East voted for the Party of Regions, Natalia Vitrenko's "People's Opposition" Bloc and the Communist Party of Ukraine, while the Center and the West voted for the Yulia Tymoshenko Bloc. At the same time, the pro-presidential bloc "Our Ukraine" won in three Western regions of Ukraine (Zakarpattia, Lviv and Ivano-Frankivsk). Such voting results indicate opposite value orientations of the Ukrainian population. For the East it is an alliance with Russia, the Russian language as the state language, etc. For the West it is orientation towards the European Union and European values. The same trend was maintained in the local elections. For example, in the election of deputies to regional councils, voters in the North, Center and West entrusted 35-44 seats in the councils to BYuT (66 in Kyiv region); in the West PUOU (PP "People's Union" Our Ukraine") received from 17 to 62 seats, and in the East and South the Party of Regions received 39-62 (120 seats in the Donetsk and 100 seats in the Luhansk regional councils)⁵⁵.

The main line of demarcation between political forces at the time of the election was determined in accordance with the support of the main candidates for President of Ukraine (Viktor Yushchenko and Viktor Yanukovich) in the 2004 election campaign. In general, as a result of the elections, no political force was formed that would gain national support.

2. The vote on March 26, 2006 can be called a protest. Those who voted for the Party of Regions supported the opposition, and those who voted for the Tymoshenko Bloc voted for the values of the Maidan, which, in their opinion, were not implemented. The ruling "People's Union Our Ukraine" party actually lost the election.

⁵⁴ Остапеч Ю. Електоральні процеси на Закарпатті у контексті загальнонаціональних виборів. Ужгород : «Ліра», 2016. 412 с.

⁵⁵ Манайло-Приходько Р. Регіональний вимір розвитку та функціонування партійної системи України : дис. ... канд. політ. наук : 23.00.02 «Політичні інститути і процеси». Львів, 2018. 292 с.

3. Citizens of Ukraine dispelled the myth of political technologists about their incompetence and the claims of some politicians about the impossibility of applying a proportional electoral system in Ukraine. Ukrainian voters allowed only five political parties and electoral blocs to get parliamentary seats. There were relatively few invalid ballots (over million), with 23 percent of the vote remaining at the 3% threshold.

4. The 2006 elections saw an acceleration of Ukraine's decom-munization trend. Given the old election threshold, the CPU would not have been able to enter the Verkhovna Rada. Thus, according to the level of its support, it moved to the category of small parties. At the same time, forces that positioned themselves as representatives of the communist movement (Natalia Vitrenko's Bloc "People's Opposition" and the Electoral Bloc "For Union") did not enter parliament.

5. An important result of the election was the confirmation of the crisis of the social development model introduced during the presidencies of L. Kravchuk and L. Kuchma. In the 2006 elections, the main political forces that embodied the previous regime could not get into parliament (Lytvyn's People's Bloc, the Opposition Bloc "Ne Tak!", Bloc of People's Democratic Party, "Revival" Party, the Peasant Party of Ukraine, Electoral Bloc "State – Labor Union"). Together, they received 5.41% of the vote.

6. Green parties were defeated in the elections. Despite acute environmental problems in Ukraine, their appearance was purely speculative (the Party of Greens of Ukraine won 0.65%, the Ukrainian Party "Green Planet" 0.38%, the Party of Ecological Rescue "EKO + 25" 0.47%, and the Party "Union. Chernobyl. Ukraine" 0.09% of votes).

7. The low rating of the "Our Ukraine" Bloc is explained by the fact that a number of political parties and blocs represented by leaders who supported V. Yushchenko in the 2004 presidential election participated in the 2006 election campaign on their own. These were the Civil Bloc "PORA – PRP", the Ukrainian People's Bloc of Kostenko and Plyushch, the Yuriy Karmazin Bloc and others. Their union would have won pro-presidential forces much greater number of votes.

8. The 2006 parliamentary elections demonstrated the organizational and staff weakness of most Ukrainian parties. Although the proportional electoral system determines the growing role and importance of party programs, parliamentary elections have shown an underestimation by the electoral actors of their own electoral programs. The election also showed the parties' significant dependence on the leader's personality. This manifested itself in the formation of personal blocks.

9. For the first time, the subjects of the electoral process were regional and ethnic parties that participated in the local elections in Zakarpattia and represented the interests of the Hungarian national minority in the region.

These were the Party of Hungarians of Ukraine (KMKS) and the Democratic Party of Hungarians of Ukraine⁵⁶.

After long conflicts in the camp of “orange forces” in the 2010 presidential election, Viktor Yanukovich won. This gave impetus to a new stage in the development of the party system and made significant changes in its configuration: 1) the rating of political forces that supported their leaders in the presidential election increased, e.g. S. Tihipko (PP “Labour Ukraine”, A. Yatsenyuk (PP “Front for Change”), A. Hrytsenko (PP “Civic Position”), O. Tyahnybok (All-Ukrainian Union “Svoboda”), etc.; 2) the importance of parties in the political system has decreased due to the repeal of the amendments to the 2004 Constitution and the restriction of the conditions of free political competition by the authorities; 3) tendencies appeared to the emergence of a dominant party – the Party of Regions; 4) the position of the parties that formed in the first half and mid-90’s of the twentieth century weakened.

The 2012 parliamentary elections significantly changed the format of the party system after the 2010 local elections at both national and regional levels. The main factors that significantly affected the course of the election campaign are as follows:

1. Criminal prosecution of opposition politicians, which ended with the sentencing of Yulia Tymoshenko on October 11, 2011 to 7 years in prison, and Yuriy Lutsenko on February 27, 2012 to 4 years in prison.

2. Adoption on July 3, 2012 of the Law of Ukraine “On the Principles of State Language Policy”, which gave “regional languages” official status, and thus continued to oppose the Ukrainian regions along the East-West axis.

3. The adoption of a new election law on November 17, 2011, which established a mixed electoral system, raised the threshold from 3% to 5% and prohibited party blocs from participating in elections. Such an electoral system was beneficial only to the pro-government parties – the Party of Regions and the CPU. As we know, the national democratic forces took part in the parliamentary elections as part of the electoral blocs.

4. For the first time in Ukrainian political history, the opposition united to participate in the election campaign in the format of the All-Ukrainian Union “Fatherland” (United Opposition). In total, the United Opposition included 6 parties: Fatherland, Front for Change, PMU, People’s Self-Defense,

⁵⁶ Шестак Н. Еволюція партійної системи України в умовах трансформації соціальних і політичних структур : дис. ... канд. політ. наук : 23.00.02 «Політичні інститути і процеси». Львів, 2015. 252 с.

For Ukraine, and Reforms and Order. Taken the unification of opposition forces, the decision to unite with the Party of Regions was made by PP “Labour Ukraine” (S. Tihipko) at its congress^{57, 58}.

87 parties took part in the election process, of which the CEC included 21 parties in the ballot. According to the current legislation, the CEC announced the results of the 2012 parliamentary elections on November 11. 445 people’s deputies were elected, including: 185 deputies from the Party of Regions, 101 from Fatherland, 40 from UDAR, 37 from Svoboda, 32 from CPU, 3 from PP “United Center”, 2 from People’s Party, 1 from PP “Soyuz”, 1 from Radical Party of Oleh Lyashko and 43 self-nominated deputies. In 5 majority constituencies (94, 132, 194, 197, 223) the CEC recognized elections invalid due to numerous violations in the counting of votes. The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine recommended that the CEC hold repeat elections in these constituencies⁵⁹.

In regional terms, the election results were as follows: the Party of Regions won in 9 regions, the ARC and Sevastopol, and the All-Ukrainian Union “Fatherland” (United Opposition) in 15 regions and the city of Kyiv. As in previous elections, the East and the South voted for the Party of Regions, the West and the Center for the All-Ukrainian Union “Fatherland”. CPU, All-Ukrainian Union “Svoboda” and PP “UDAR” showed an equal result in Ukraine, in particular it concerns PP “UDAR”, except for the ARC, Galicia and Donbass⁶⁰.

As a result of the elections to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, a majority was formed on the basis of the Party of Regions, and the government was headed by Mykola Azarov. The decision of the Azarov government to suspend the process of European integration and the violent dispersal of a peaceful protest on Independence Square in Kyiv were the beginning of a mass confrontation between the citizens and the Yanukovych regime, known as the Revolution of Dignity. The consequence of these processes was the collapse of the Yanukovych regime, his escape to Russia, and as a consequence, the beginning of a new stage in the development of Ukrainian society and its party system.

The third period started in 2014. From 2014 to 2017, there were intense changes in the party environment due to the victory of the Revolution of Dignity, the renewal of power at central and local levels,

⁵⁷ Конончук С. Динаміка партійного представництва в Україні після Революції Гідності. Київ : ТОВ «Агенство Україна», 2016. 44 с.

⁵⁸ Остапеч Ю. Електоральні процеси на Закарпатті у контексті загальнонаціональних виборів. Ужгород : «Ліра», 2016. 412 с.

⁵⁹ Офіційний сайт Центральної Вибірчої Комісії. URL: <http://www.cvk.gov.ua>

⁶⁰ Там само.

Russia's aggression against Ukraine and its consequences, the beginning of European integration reforms and social-economic crisis. Within this period, presidential elections (2014), parliamentary elections (2014) and local elections (2015) took place, which determined the current configuration of the party system.

We shall consider the most important changes in the configuration of the party system, which were observed at this stage: a) removal from power and actual termination of the Party of Regions and its political satellites (CPU, etc.); b) creation of new parties by political leaders of the Maidan on the basis of already existing parties or their parts (PP "Petro Poroshenko's Bloc "Solidarity", PP "People's Front"), which legitimized their power status as a result of the elections; c) the pro-European orientation of the leading political forces that formed the majority coalition in the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine; b) the loss of the monopoly on the representation of the interests of the population of Eastern and Southern Ukraine by the successors of the Party of Regions; c) the increase of the influence of populist parties.

The self-organization of society to resist Russian aggression and counter separatism gave impetus to the formation of patriotic parties. They arose on the basis of public formations of Maidan participants (PP "Right Sector"), the Anti-Terrorist Operation participants in volunteer battalions (including PP "National Corps"), through the division of already established organizations (PP "National Movement" "Governmental Initiative of Yarosh" (DIYA)). Some of these parties were created in the traditional way, i.e. from above, with the support of financial-industrial groups, for example, PP "UKROP"⁶¹.

The snap parliamentary elections of October 26, 2014 and the positioning of political forces in them is associated with the Revolution of Dignity and the results of the snap presidential elections. The voting was not held in 27 majority constituencies of the temporarily occupied territories of Donetsk and Luhansk regions. The elections were held according to the electoral system established by the Law on Elections of Deputies of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine of 11 November 2011. The CEC registered 52 political parties as subjects of the election process. As we know, the electoral blocs were not allowed to participate in the elections according to the law⁶².

A number of newly formed political parties took part in the elections. These were PP "People's Front" (A. Yatsenyuk, formed on March 31, 2014),

⁶¹ Янішевський С. Локальні політичні проекти: чинники виникнення та перспективи політичної діяльності (за підсумками місцевих виборів-2015). URL: <http://www.niss.gov.ua/catalogue/8>

⁶² Офіційний сайт Центральної Виборчої Комісії. URL: <http://www.cvk.gov.ua>

PP “Petro Poroshenko Bloc” (P. Poroshenko, formed on July 27, 2014), PP “Right Sector” and Serhiy Tihipko’s Party “Strong Ukraine”.

The Party of Regions did not take part in the elections because it compromised itself during the Revolution of Dignity. It was reformatted into PP “Opposition Bloc” on the basis of rebranding of PP “Law and Order” (September 2014). It was composed of representatives of six political parties: Party of Development of Ukraine, PP “Ukraine – Forward!”, PP “Labor Ukraine”, Party of State Neutrality of Ukraine and PP “New Politics”.

The election was attended by “old party brands” known to voters: All-Ukrainian Union “Fatherland”, All-Ukrainian Union “Svoboda”, PGU, LPU, CUN, PP “Revival”, PP “Civic Position”, PP “Solidarity of Women of Ukraine”, etc.

The positioning of party and political forces on the eve of the 2015 local elections can be described as follows. First, the political parties that participated in or won the 2014 elections declared their subjectivity in the elections. These were: Petro Poroshenko Bloc “Solidarity”, PP The Union “Self-Reliance”, PP Opposition Bloc, All-Ukrainian Union “Fatherland”, All-Ukrainian Union “Svoboda”. These political forces were associated by voters with the events on the Maidan in late 2013 – early 2014, i.e. with the Revolution of Dignity.

Secondly, the remnants of the Party of Regions took part in the elections in the format of PP “Opposition Bloc”.

Third, PP “People’s Front” and PP “Right Sector” refused to participate in the elections for the reason of low rating. The CPU was not allowed to participate in the election process according to the order of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine for its non-compliance with the Law of Ukraine “On the Condemnation of the Communist and National Socialist Totalitarian Regimes in Ukraine and the Prohibition of the Propaganda of Their Symbols”. On December 16, 2015 its activities were suspended in court. PP “People’s Front” and PP “UDAR” (V. Klitschko) agreed with PPB “Solidarity” on joint party lists under the brand of the latter.

Fourth, as always, a number of party organizations took part in the elections aiming to prepare party brands for the upcoming elections, or simply to promote them (for example, Public Movement “People’s Control”, Political Party “UKRAINIAN ASSOCIATION OF PATRIOTS – UKROP”).

Fifth, a number of political parties were projects of well-known regional political leaders: PP “Serhiy Kaplin’s Party of Ordinary People” in Poltava, PP “Cherkasy Region”, PP “Trust in Deeds” in Odessa, PP “United Center” in Zakarpattia and others. Such political structures are called “political machines” (“electoral machines” or “party-electoral machines”).

Sixth, purely regional parties KMKS and DPHU took part in the elections. These parties are active only in Zakarpattia.

Seventh, a number of new or revived political parties took an active part in the elections: PP “Revival” associated with former representatives of the Party of Regions, PP “Our Land” associated with the Administration of the President of Ukraine, PP “UKROP” which is considered a project of oligarch I. Kolomoisky⁶³.

PP “Our Land” is a project of the Presidential Administration, which was created to collect the votes of those who lost pro-government parties since the 2014 parliamentary elections. Another task of this party project is to indirectly involve former loyal members of the Party of Regions in the pro-government majorities in local councils as they could not be openly included in the party lists of the ruling party.

CONCLUSIONS

The parliamentary elections of 2006, 2012 and 2014 were held according to different electoral formulas: by proportional in 2006 and by mixed in 2012, 2014. The dominant results of the 2006 elections were the parties of two Maidans – Kyiv and Donetsk: People’s Union “Our Ukraine”, “Fatherland” (BYuT), PORA, Party of Regions, CPU. The electoral choice of citizens was as follows: the West and the Center mainly voted for “Our Ukraine” and BYuT, while the South and East voted for the Party of Regions and the CPU.

The 2012 Ukrainian parliamentary elections demonstrated a new format of the party system, caused by authoritarian tendencies in public life following the 2010 presidential election and the dominance of the Party of Regions. Political forces that received almost equal support in all regions of Ukraine passed to the parliament. These were All-Ukrainian Union “Fatherland”, Party of Regions, PP UDAR, All-Ukrainian Union “Svoboda” and CPU.

According to the results of the parliamentary elections of 2014, which took place as a result of the Revolution of Dignity, the victory was won by new parties PP “People’s Front”, PP “Petro Poroshenko Bloc”, Radical Party of Oleh Lyashko and PP The “Union “Self-Reliance”.

Thus, the main types of parties that currently form the party system of Ukraine are as follows: the leading parliamentary parties formed as a result of the Revolution of Dignity; “old” party brands; populist parties; regional

⁶³ Остапеч Ю., Манайло-Приходько Р. Вплив місцевих виборів 2015 р. на еволюцію партійної системи та структурування регіонального простору (на прикладі Закарпатської області). *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філософсько-політологічні студії*. 2016. № 8. С. 63–75.

political parties; national minority parties; “new left” parties formed as a result of the termination of the CPU in accordance with the laws on decommunization; political parties formed on the basis of former structures of the Party of Regions; militarized parties; parties of civic initiatives and personal parties.

SUMMARY

The article is devoted to studying the Ukraine’s Party System and European Experience. The party system is defined as both the relationship between the parties and the relationship of the parties with the government and other political institutions of the country.

Internal structure, ideology, alliances, types of the party are investigated. The concept of party institutionalization is analyzed. The legal institutionalization of political parties and political institutionalization are described.

The development of the party system in Ukraine, the legal basis/framework for the activities and functioning of political parties in Ukraine, the electoral system of Ukraine are investigated.

The development of periods of party system in Ukraine is characterized.

The parliamentary elections of 2006, 2012 and 2014 are described.

The works of scientists who investigate this topic were analyzed. Such as M. Duverger, T. Bevez, G. Zelenko, S. Mainwaring and T. Scully, A. Kolodiy, R. Rose and T. Mackie, V. Randall and L. Svasand, A. Meleshevich, and other.

REFERENCES

1. Бевз Т. Інституціоналізація політичних партій як процес. *Наукові записки Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І.Ф. Кураса НАН України*. 2011. № 3(53). С. 31–45.
2. Гайворонский Ю. Консолидация партийных систем в контексте трансформации электорального пространства и политических режимов. На примере стран Балканского региона. *Полития*. 2014. № 2. С. 141–154.
3. Гельман В. «Учредительные выборы» в контексте российской трансформации. *Общественные науки и современность*. 1996. № 6. С. 46–64.
4. Джанда К. Сравнение политических партий: исследование и теория. Современная сравнительная политология. Хрестоматия. Москва : Московский общественный научный фонд, 1997. С. 84–143.
5. Дюверже М. Политические партии / Пер. с франц. Москва : Академический Проект, 2000. 538 с.

6. Зазнаев О.И. Вторая молодость «долгожителя»: концепт «политический институт» в современной. Проблемы политической науки. Казань : Центр инновац. технологий, 2005. 235 с.

7. Закон України «Про об'єднання громадян» (16 червня 1992 р.). *Голос України*. 1992. 18 липня.

8. Закон України «Про вибори народних депутатів України» (18 листопада 1993 р.). Ужгород, 1993. 42 с.

9. Закон України «Про вибори народних депутатів України» (24 вересня 1997 р.). Київ : Парламентське видавництво, 1997. 27 с.

10. Закон України «Про вибори народних депутатів України» (25 березня 2004 р.). *Все про вибори*. Київ : КНТ, АТІКА, 2004. 219 с.

11. Закон України «Про вибори народних депутатів України» (із змінами і доповненнями станом на вересень 2012 року). Київ : Алерта, 2012. 160 с.

12. Закон України «Про внесення змін до Конституції України». *Урядовий кур'єр*. 2004. 10 грудня.

13. Закон України «Про місцеві вибори» (2015). URL: <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/595-19>

14. Закон України «Про політичні партії в Україні». *Все про вибори*. Київ : КНТ, АТІКА, 2004. С. 41–51.

15. Зеленько Г. Співвідношення процесів правової та політичної інституціоналізації політичних партій: українська практика. *Партійна система сучасної України: еволюція, тенденції та перспективи розвитку*: Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 24–25 листопада 2011 р. Київ : ПІЕНД, 2012. С. 205–221.

16. Исаев Б.А. Теория партий и партийных систем : учебное пособие. Москва : Аспект Пресс, 2008. 367 с.

17. Касьянов Г. Політичний досвід самостійної України. Державо-творчий процес в Україні (1991–2006). Київ : Наукова думка, 2007. С. 160–237.

18. Кармазіна М. Українська багатопартійність: становлення і розвиток. *Наукові записки Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І.Ф. Кураса НАН України*. 2012. № 3 (59). С. 4–87.

19. Кармазіна М. Політичні партії в Україні 2014–2017 рр. Київ, 2018. 168 с.

20. Колодій А. Багатопартійність і демократизація: висхідні та низхідні тренди в роки незалежності. *Партійна система сучасної України: еволюція, тенденції та перспективи розвитку*: Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 24–25 листопада 2011 р. Київ : ПІЕНД, 2012. С. 133–149.

21. Конончук С. Динаміка партійного представництва в Україні після Революції Гідності. Київ : ТОВ «Агенство Україна», 2016. 44 с.
22. Манайло-Приходько Р. Регіональний вимір розвитку та функціонування партійної системи України : дис. ... канд. політ. наук : 23.00.02 «Політичні інститути і процеси». Львів, 2018. 292 с.
23. Меркель В., Круассан А. Формальные и неформальные институты в дефектных демократиях. *Политические исследования*. 2002. № 2. С. 18–35.
24. Мелешевич А. Проблеми інституціоналізації та перспективи розвитку партійної системи України. *Партійна система сучасної України: еволюція, тенденції та перспективи розвитку*: Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 24–25 листопада 2011 р. Київ : ІПіЕНД, 2012. С. 46–64.
25. Остапець Ю. Електоральні процеси на Закарпатті у контексті загальнонаціональних виборів. Ужгород : «Ліра», 2016. 412 с.
26. Остапець Ю., Манайло-Приходько Р. Вплив місцевих виборів 2015 р. на еволюцію партійної системи та структурування регіонального партійного простору (на прикладі Закарпатської області). *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філософсько-політологічні студії*. 2016. № 8. С. 63–75.
27. Офіційний сайт Центральної Виборчої Комісії. URL: <http://www.cvk.gov.ua>
28. Пляйс Я. Партии и партийные системы в современной России. *Власть*. 2003. № 12. С. 19–24.
29. Трансформація партійної системи: український досвід у європейському контексті / За ред. Ю. Якименка. Київ : Центр Разумкова, 2017. 428 с.
30. Хантингтон С. Политический порядок в меняющихся обществах. Москва : Прогресс-Традиция, 2004. 436 с.
31. Шведа Ю. Партії та вибори: енциклопедичний словник. Львів : Видавничий центр ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2010. 750 с.
32. Шестак Н. Еволюція партійної системи України в умовах трансформації соціальних і політичних структур : дис. ... канд. політ. наук : 23.00.02 «Політичні інститути і процеси». Львів, 2015. 252 с.
33. Янішевський С. Локальні політичні проекти: чинники виникнення та перспективи політичної діяльності (за підсумками місцевих виборів 2015). URL: <http://www.niss.gov.ua/catalogue/8>
34. Janda K. *Political Parties: A Cross-National Survey*. New York : The Free Press, 1980. 178 p.
35. Mainwaring S., Scully T. R. *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*. Stanford University Press, 1995. 578 p.

36. Meleshevich A. Party Systems in Post-Soviet Countries: a Comparative Study of Political Institutionalization in the Baltic States, Russia and Ukraine. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

37. Randall V., Svasand L. Party institutionalization in new democracies. Party Politics. 2002. Vol. 8. № 1. P. 12–24.

38. Rose R., Mackie T.M. Do Parties Persist or Fail? The Big Trade-Off Facing Organizations. When Parties Fail: Emerging Alternative Organizations / Ed. by K. Lawson and P.H. Merkl. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Information about the authors:

Palinchak M. M.,

Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor
Dean of the Faculty of International Economic Relations
Uzhhorod National University
14, Universytetska str., Uzhhorod, 88000, Ukraine

Leshanych M. M.,

Lecturer at the Department of International Politics
Uzhhorod National University
14, Universytetska str., Uzhhorod, 88000, Ukraine