



Resume

Political passport of Zakarpattia (Ukraine): a brief history of survival of the region in Central Europe

Preamble

Problems of political development of regional society recently received considerable attention. The particular importance they acquire in the process of studying of political history which brings the necessity to avoid stereotypical errors caused by forced totalitarian-administrative pressure on the scientific field, levelling of political-party bias, rising to high level the issue of struggle of Ukrainians for the status of political nation and so on. Considerable attention in this respect is paid in recent years, especially to regional political history, regarded as one of the constituent elements of the political regional studies.

Political history of Zakarpattia in the XX century is peculiar and to some extent symbolic for Ukrainians of this region. This consists in that the effective political development of the region, when in this process began to participate directly local inhabitants started almost at the beginning of the XX century. Logical understanding of said must be find in the possibilities and prospects of Zakarpattia Ukrainians influence on the course of political events and decide important political objectives to their own opinion and their own strength. By the XX century such opportunities were not available for local population of Zakarpattia. At the time of collapse of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy is appeared the hope and is formed favourable

preconditions to develop social and political life by their own strength. And after the end of World War II such hopes were received the opportunities for realization.

Since the beginning of the twentieth century we can safely talk about the evolution of political institutions in Zakarpattia, as well as the formation of new political realities that are implemented in accordance with the folded situation. The most peculiar in this respect were complex transformational changes, which affected the political systems whereas during the last century the region had experienced a series of political cataclysms. They just were the driving force of the diverse elements of state-formation, formation and decline of the political systems, functioning of the various political regimes and their institutional manifestations etc.

Thus, just at the beginning of the XX century started the real and effective development of political history of Zakarpattia when activated the attempts of politicization of Zakerpattia society, bringing to mass mind the notion of own policy nation. During this period the region had experienced a number of political changes which emerged in the process of diverse elements of state-formation, formation and decay of political systems etc.

In XX century Zakarpattia had different official names of its own geographical territory, to some extent reflecting the specificity of the political development of the region: Ruska Kraina Country, Podkarpatska Rus, Karpatska Ukraine, Pidkarpatska territory, Zakarpatska Ukraine, Zakarpatska oblast. Different was also territorial filling of the region, and therefore researchers conventionally used generalized name to identify the region – “historic Zakarpattia”.

To our mind, the fundamental principle of understanding the specificity of social-political evolution of Zakarpattia society is the fact that only during the twentieth century it was part of at least eight inherently different state and half state formations (Austro-Hungarian monarchy, Hungarian Republic, Czechoslovak Republic, Karpatska Ukraine, Hungary, Zakarpatska Ukraine, Ukrainian SSR\ USSR, Ukraine). This to some extent reflects the specificity of the political development of the region, indicting his membership or becoming a part of some state formation and, consequently, require adaptation of the political institutes of the region to the requirements of that or another political system which increasingly absorbed rather poorly developed and relatively stable political subsystems. Based on the last we should understand the influence of transformational processes on party and electoral systems. So far as mentioned above state formations had different from one another political systems, within which were different political regimes, respectively, were different methods of formation of state and local organs of authority.

It should be noted the historical peculiarity of the region, which influenced on various political changes during the last century. Therefore, it should be preceded from a specific analysis of individual components that make it possible to describe objectively the complex picture of social and political development of Zakarpattia as a political region. The symbolism of the political history of Zakarpattia in the twentieth century in this case is also in sharp evolution, starting with the lack

of political traditions, political culture and political leadership, completing the modern institutions of political life.

Thus, the political portrait of Transcarpathia (Zakarpattia) should be viewed in chronological order and in the gradual implementation of the evolution of political institutions and relations of the region with the center.

Attempts of politicization of Zakarpattia Ukrainians at the beginning of XX century

The first important period in the political history of Zakarpattia in the twentieth century is based on the political-legal and state-representative basis. Its analysis should begin with a review of the political situation in the region at the turn of the XIX – XX centuries before the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the end of World War I, the problems of finding state and national identity. This period was also typical for national-cultural awakening of Ukrainians of Zakarpattia.

Felvideyk / Prycarpattia (Upper Hungary).

Being a part of dualist Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (1867 – 1918) the region had conventional name Pidkarpattia (by geographic location from the center). In the official chronicle the region was often called Felvideyk (Upper Hungary). Social and political situation of the population of Zakarpattia at that time was quite difficult because the general social changes hardly touched the province, but in 1900, the territory of four Zakarpattia comitats was about 18 thousand square kilometers with the population of 848 thousand 160 citizens. Because of the political and legal powerlessness and social inequality the inhabitants of the province were unable to effectively fight for their political rights. The political system characterized by the restriction of voting rights (high property and educational qualification), freedom of publishing, freedom of assemblies and so on. In addition, the electoral processes held under strict political terror (harassments, arrests). Appropriate was the policy of Hungarian political parties in regard to Zakarpattia. Participation of Zakarpattia Ukrainians in the activities of national political protests, strikes was limited.

To the similar state of things affected poor structuring of regional society and the lack of political and legal traditions of governance. The most obvious political problem was the lack of the political elite. Its leadership functions were assumed by the national cultural intelligentsia (activity of enlighteners) who performed an important role in the process of the political socialization of citizens.

More or less organized were the public addresses of by workers of large enterprises led by the newly formed social democratic organizations – the first political centres in the region. The increase of social and political movement in Zakarpattia was in 1905 – 1907 years. With the new force started struggle for the introduction of general suffrage.

And in spite of the increasing activity of workers of large enterprises, which together with the newly formed social-democratic organizations (the first political centres in the region) organized political speeches, political lack of rights of

the local population, socio-economic backwardness of the region, policy of magyarization (magyarization) and denationalization actually influenced the political feebleness of regional political institutions within a strong state system. In consequence of this, institutional manifestations of the political system of dualistic monarchy of Austria-Hungary were extremely weak because centralized power by all means tried to control all political and economic key factors of social progress. All above mentioned also have relation to the party system of Austria-Hungary, whose manifestations in Zakarpattia in the early twentieth century were barely noticeable. Policy of pro-government and opposition parties concerning Zakarpattia was the same, and therefore Hungarian political parties were unpopular in the region and directly structural and organizational development in the region did not commit. If we classify political system within which was Zakarpattia in the early twentieth century, taking into account the formational approach of typology of societies, it was a bourgeois political system of the Western model. Its political regime characterized by authoritarian methods of governance.

Ruska Kraina

Only at the end of World War II, due to the enthusiasm of the national liberation movement, strengthening of the struggle against the war also began to change the political situation in the region. There was the first gradual increase of national consciousness of Ukrainians which promoted to the finding of ways to national-state determination. Therefore, attempts were made by the Hungarian government of M. Karoi to keep Zakarpattia as the part of Hungary (Law of Ruska Kraina). Participation in political self-determination of Zakarpattia community directly took on Zakarpattya emigration too.

Law of Ruska Kraina anticipated the formation of four comitats (Ung, Uhocha, Bereg, Maramorosh) of autonomous region within Hungary. The document also provided the right to self-determination in internal political affairs, and more specifically – the administrative self-governance, justice, education, religion, language. The legislative body of the autonomous region law declared Ruska National Assembly. In contrast to general state duties of the region the document attributed to: external political (foreign) and economic relations, military, financial, transport and social issues and more. Political power of the region was represented by the governor (regent). However, his power was not absolute, whereas inspection and control of his actions was accomplished by the Minister of Affairs of Ruska Kraina, who was subordinated to Hungarian State Assembly (Parliament).

However, the post-war transformation of the political system occurred in the conditions of dominance of reintegration processes. Those were the main regional peculiarities of transformation of political systems in Zakarpattia in the first half of the twentieth century and were characterized by several factors. Firstly among them we can name social dissociation, which was based on national and religious differentiation of population. The second factor can be considered political and civil uncertainty. At that time when all Slavic nationalities had clearly determined the course to the independence of the nation, Ukrainian Rusyns in Zakarpattia hesitated, and that was the great advantage for of other peoples.

Significant negative in this process imposed their own lack of strong political elite who will direct people in the right direction. Moreover, among the local elite predominated liberal moods of servility, particularly in relations with the Hungarian political beau-monde. The third factor was economic and business weakness of Zakarpattia region, which was traditionally considered as the agricultural sector. Therefore, attempts to keep the historic Zakarpattia within the boundaries of weak of that time conditions of Hungarian political system looked miserable. Alternatively the given situation influenced on the numerous attempts to establish their own locally-autonomous political regimes with specific models of imperious manner.

Hutsul Republic

Another attempt to stabilize the political situation, but rather to determine the orientation of the national government was the existence of Hutsul Republic in the north-east of Zakarpattia (1918-1919). Its existence Hutsul Republic ceased after the occupation of Romanian troops, which had received the consent of the European countries, started to put things in order in adjacent territories. It was semi-political formation that had emerged spontaneously. At that time when the Hungarian authority was losing control over the situation, detachments of people's self-defence, disarmed gendarmerie by peaceful uprising, transferred power in the hands of local residents. And on November 8th, 1918 at general assembly in Yasinya they adopted the unanimous decision about the union with Ukraine.

The leadership of twenty thousandth population and legislative functions was entrusted with peculiar parliament – the newly formed Ukrainian National Council, which consists of 42 members. Moreover, it was also clearly divided authorities of branches of power. Executive power belonged commissions (sections), whose leaders had to report to the Main Board (Holovna uprava). Therefore were formed the administrative, domestic, commercial, school, forestry, trade, food, diplomatic, military and other sections. These elements of state formation were complemented by the armed forces (police and border guards) that had awards of Ukrainian army. It should be noted that at the first meeting of the Ukrainian People's Council deputies took an appeal to the government of the West Ukrainian People's Republic on desire to be reunited with it. On January 8th, 1919, as a result of an armed uprising against the Hungarian, Ukrainian People's Council in Yasinya officially declared separate and independent Hutsul Republic.

Prime Minister, military commandant and chairman of Council was actually taken upon the functions of the President of Hutsul Republic with emergency power. Although this semi-state formation was not recognized by the international community, its internal political life was unfolded by the classic state-forming scenario. If we talk about the realities and prospects of independent existence of such a state, then on the basis of contemporary policy of neighbour states and big countries which had won in the World War I, the duration of its existence also looked ghostly.

On the increase of politicization of Zakarpattia Ukrainians also influenced the decision of General Public Congress general public. Hust Forum (January, 21

1919) and its decision once again confirmed the orientation of local residents for reunification with Ukraine. Hutsul Republic (1918 – 1919) and the activity of its leaders were reinforcing the idea of Conciliarism of Ukraine. And only complex foreign circumstances prevented the unification processes of the Ukrainian nation, which eventually made Zakarpattia Ukrainians start the movement for inclusion of the region in the framework of newly formed state – the Czechoslovak Republic.

Ruska Kraina (under Soviet rule in Hungary)

In 1919 was made another attempt for the formation of a new political regime on the territory of Zakarpattia. It was associated with the establishment of soviet power in Hungary. Due to the crisis of M. Caroi's government, the socialists came to power, who on March 21, 1919 proclaimed Hungary as a soviet republic. Owing to the merger of socialists with communists were created United Socialist Party of Hungary and one-party government, which carried out peaceful socialist revolution in Hungary. It became a surprise for all subjects of contemporary political processes. During three days after this the soviet power was spread on the territory of Zakarpattia. The soviet power remained in force the territorial allegiance and the name of the region – Ruska Kraina.

The priority task of new power was to change the political system of the state.

It considered to great extent of social-political and social-economic contents of state livelihoods. Among the major plans for the realizing of tasks Revolutionary government council of Hungary marked the nationalization of banks, the submission of financial, economical and industrial institutions, the creation of the Red Army and other military units. The vast majority of these bold plans Soviet power did not have time to implement. Its policy as in Hungary and as in Zakarpattia was characteristic duplication internal political development of Soviet power in contemporary Russia and Ukraine. The process of formation of Soviet organs of power was took place on the importance of the role of Councils, their executive committees, directories with involving broader circles of population. It is confirmed by the results of the elections, according to which we can speak about heterogeneous social membership of councils.

If the formation of the People's Councils had a positive response among the local population, the other forms of government became unpopular. Administrative innovations had negative consequences, because power is increasingly gaining dictatorial traits. The most vicious in contemporary situation was the way of duplicating of the Soviet Bolshevik policy with its main negative manifestations (repressions against opposition and dissidents etc.). Furthermore, internal political situation deepened the problem of adaptation of the new political system, which far from it did not contribute to the implementation of new forms of functioning institutions of a weak political regime. It should be mentioned that the nurturing of plans to Carpathian areola of major world states or the usage of tactics of influence and the control of neighboring with Zakarpattia states. And those institutional manifestations which tried to initiate the representatives of Soviet power in Zakarpattia for the lack of time could not find the adequate support from the citizens.

But the fulfillment of fundamental changes in social-political and economic directions was failed by the Soviet power and owing to external political rejection of “Soviet Island” in Central-Eastern Europe.

The Soviet power lasted 133 days in Hungary and only 40 days in Zakarpattia. It is impossible to speak about the formation of a new political system and also about its stabilization and adaptation of local people to the new requirements of state livelihoods. And those institutional manifestations which were tried to initiate the representatives of the Soviet power in Zakarpattia by the lack of time could not find the appropriate support from citizens. Furthermore, politicians have failed to realize considerable range of social and political changes.

And it was not only time reasons, but also complex internal and external political reasons. Therefore, as the previous attempts that we have examined above, the latter has also failed.

The reasons are also common in mentioned cases. External political situation did not contribute to the implementation of new forms of functioning institutions of weak political regimes. It should be mentioned that the nurturing of plans to Carpathian areola of major world states or the usage of tactics of influence and the control of neighboring with Zakarpattia states. Directly or indirectly we consider that in contemporary conditions key factors could predominate only of external nature.

Checking by democracy and authoritarianism /1919 – 1944 years/

Podkarpatska Rus /1919 – 1938 years/.

The next stage of national belonging of the region – is the formation of the Czechoslovak Republic, which called on the inhabitants of Zakarpattia actively involved in political life and to become a real political entity of the postwar world order. In particular, a new to the population was the factor that political history of 1920 – 1930 years was based on the foundations of a democratic society. And the establishment of a multiparty system gave a push to comprehensive development of political thought, ideological struggle and political culture in general.

Indeed dramatic changes took place when owing to the voluntary decision of the local political elite, elite immigrant groups and the support of the European countries who were winners of the First World War and also the USA Zakarpattia lands were included to the newly formed Slavic state – the Czechoslovak Republic. During 1919 – 1939 years the region under the name was Podkarpatska Rus Ruthenia was able to fulfill itself in a democratic political system. It was carried gradual evolution of a new state structure in Zakarpattia and its integration into the political system in Czechoslovakia. In practice began the establishing a new political elite, whose representatives had nominated the priority issue about defending of acting autonomy. Czechoslovak political system had all the characteristics of a democratic society, primarily expressed in the effectiveness of pluralism, the implementation of legislative framework, the practice of political equality.

According to adopted by the Czechoslovak authority General Statute about organization and administration of Podkarpatska Rus was formed the Directory as an advisory body in the autonomous affairs. Administrator together with the military commander concentrated in their hands the executive branch of power. During 1919 – 1920 years the Czechoslovak government reorganized the administrative-territorial structure in Podkarpatska Rus. However, the relationships between local and central authorities were in almost constant conflict stage, as provided in the General Statute broad authorities to autonomous power were not implemented. In all administrative bodies was the dominance of Czech officials because the government believed that local residents are not ready to carry out the administrative functions professionally in the local authorities.

In September 1919, in the region were formed political and school departments (referats) and also health care department. Subsequently, there were legal department, police department, department of public works, department of post-offices and telegraphs, economic and financial departments, department of social care. Thus began an intense political integration of Zakarpattia into political and state system the Czechoslovak Republic.

With the adoption of the Constitution the Czechoslovak power was to make some concessions in determining the status of Podkarpatska Rus, as the continuation of the conflict between central and local authorities did not promote to the stability of the political situation in the state. According to the changes to the General Statute, adopted April 26, 1920, the civilian administrator was denied the right to exercise the local executive branch of power. Instead of administrator was introduced the post of Governor of Podkarpatska Rus, whose competence included the exercise of executive power in matters within the jurisdiction of autonomy. The Constitution of the Czechoslovak Republic gave fairly extensive rights for the future Soim of Podkarpatska Rus (regional parliament). In accordance with norms of the Constitution the Soim could adopt laws that dealt with the issues of language, religion, education and also the functioning of local administration. In addition to the Soim was granted the right to make special laws relating Podkarpatska Rus which were in force on this territory, in the case of granting it such right of Czechoslovak Parliament and if the adopted laws do not conflict with existing legislation of the Czechoslovak Republic. The Constitution defined the Governor of Podkarpatska Rus as the highest representative of the autonomy, appointed by the president of Czechoslovakia. It was also noted that the governor is responsible not only to the Soim of Podkarpatska Rus, but also to the Czechoslovak authority. The representation of Podkarpatska Rus in the legislative organ of state was to be determined by the legislation of Czechoslovakia about elections. The subjects of the election process were political parties which have appeared since 1919.

After the legal registration of Zakarpattia lands being a part of a new state was appreciable the dynamics of democratization of social-political life in the region. The gradual evolution of a new state structure was carried out in Zakarpattia and its integration into the political system of Czechoslovakia. In practice began establishing of new political elite (G. Zhatkovych, A. Beskyd, A. Voloshyn and

others), whose representatives raised a priority question about giving the region the effective autonomy. The Czechoslovak political system had all the characteristic features of a democratic society, primarily expressed in the effectiveness of pluralism, the implementation of legislative framework, the practice of political equality. Podkarpatska Rus, as part of Czechoslovakia, was in the epicenter of political changes, received due to the transformation of the political system possibilities in participation of state formation and so on. The process of involving citizens to state development passed through the prism of representative democracy, which intermediaries were political parties. The multiparty system that had both positive and negative characteristics contributed to faster attraction of public masses into the state policy.

During the 1920 – 1930's the manifestation of political pluralism took effect of direct participation in the political evolution of the state by its citizens. The newly formed Czechoslovak Republic, which immediately began large-scale development of democratic principles, among which was the establishment of a multiparty system, gave opportunity to lead freely their political ideas of different orientations into life. The main burden concerning the implementation of reunification processes undertook some political parties.

The important factor in their activity was the accumulation among local residents the priority issue – bringing to the awareness of population the objective communion of Ukrainians on both sides of the Carpathians. Ukrainian politicians and party leaders of the interwar period we can consider the forerunners of reunification of those political processes that had happened in the second half of the 1940s, the best representatives of Ukrainian political nation of Zakarpattia.

However, the achievements of many Ukrainian political parties and their representatives in this way actually were privatized by one communist political organization that, objectively speaking, did not pretend to have leader role of general Ukrainian reunification and did not bear the idea of unity of a nation in its modern sense.

Just at this time political parties led the struggle for policy of the Ukrainian nation in Zakarpattia and the idea of reunification of Ukrainian lands on both sides of the Carpathians. However, it was not a new idea in the interwar period. Therefore at the end of World War I really considered the idea of forming a unified national state in ethnographic boundaries. However, external political factors prevented to do this.

The newly formed Czechoslovak Republic, which immediately began large-scale development of democratic principles, among which was the establishment of a multiparty system, gave opportunity to lead freely their political ideas of different orientations into life. The main burden concerning the implementation of reunification processes undertook some political parties.

They represented so-called pro-Ukrainian political trend in contemporary Podkarpatska Rus. Among them were the Rus grain-growing (zemledilska) Party (1920 – 1924), the Christian People's Party (1924 – 1938) (both had the status of autonomous political organizations) and affiliated organizations of national parties

– Zakarpattia Regional Committee of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia (Regional Committee of CPCz) (1921 – 1938) and the Social Democratic Party of Podkarpatska Rus (1920 – 1938). In the programs of the named political parties did not sound open requests for connection of Zakarpattia to Ukraine as the ultimate goal, but gradually passed evolution of radicalization in the political sense. By the mid-1930s it was time of appearance on the political scene another two pro-Ukrainian parties – the Ukrainian Peasant Party and the Ukrainian fraction of Agrarian Party. The main task of Ukrainian Peasant Party its leaders had seen in the formation on the basis of the party a unifying core of all Ukrainian public and political forces: “Therefore, all Ukrainians, under blue and yellow flag, under which we stood in 1918! We must fight for the idea of autonomous Ukrainian Pidkarpattia!”

It is interesting that both left and right political parties, in spite of the ideological difference, wanted to unite Zakarpattia Ukrainians with Ukrainian people on the other side of the Carpathians. The only difference consisted in that, that some (Regional Committee of CPCz) saw this union being a part of the Soviet Ukraine, and others (the Christian People’s Party, the Ukrainian Peasant Party, the Social Democratic Party, the Ukrainian agrarians) – saw it in a non-communist United Ukrainian State. Ukrainian leaders played progressive role in the party representative body – the first Rus (Ukrainian) Central People’s Council. Their cultural and national support was fellowship “Prosvita”, which in 1937 united all progressive national forces, regardless of their party affiliation.

It should be noted that the transformation of the political system, and especially its stabilization and gradual adaptation of Zakarpattia regional political institutions of the Czechoslovak political system was a significant step forward in comparison with previous attempts of similar nature. The progress was obvious in all social and political spheres for local citizens even in spite of the halfness of the process.

The Carpathian Ukraine /1938 – 1939 years/.

Features of the national state formation of the Carpathian Ukraine at the end of 1930’s forced to make a focus on political and legal basis. This stage was the top state forming competitions of Transcarpathian Ukrainians, who in full force declared themselves as a political nation.

The Prague government during the interwar period constantly delayed the implementation of its promises to the autonomy of the region, arguing that the Transcarpathians, they say, is not yet ready for the independent life. However, the political maturity of local inhabitants hasn’t already raised doubts of conscious representatives of regional politic. 1938 was a year of dramatic political changes in the historic Zakarpattia. The party development of 20 – 30 years of XX century, during which crystallized two party blocks, which were following Ukrainophilic and Russophilic orientations, also was on the doorstep of transformation. At that time the greatest influence on political life had national councils, in particular Persha Ruska (Ukrainian) the Central People’s Council and the People’s Ruska Central Council (Russophile), amidst which actions were coordinated by the representatives of regional political elite.

Due to the compromise on October 11, 1938 formed the first autonomous government of Podkarpatska Rus, headed by A. Brodiy – the leader of Russophile policy orientation in the region. But autonomous government lasted a very short period of time and managed to hold only three ministerial sittings (15, 18, 22 – 23 October, 1938), on which were viewed and approved the main governing bodies, a number of important economic and business issues, problems of border demarcation with Slovakia, creating a center of social security, internal political situation in Podkarpatska Rus and so on. Soon it became known that Adam Brody had been working for a long time to Hungary under the nickname “Bertalon”. He was accused of state treason and arrested.

Especially the situation has changed dramatically in political life with the arrival of the second autonomous government headed by the leader of pro-Ukrainian orientation A. Voloshyn (October, 1938). After the prohibition of activity of all political organizations Persha Ruska (Ukrainian) the Central People’s Council monopolized political life of the region, which had to stabilize the socio-political situation.

Simultaneously began the organizational work of creation a new (ruling paradigm) Ukrainian National Party, the apparatus of which was forming by the ruling elite of the region. Established in January 1939, the party Ukrainian National Federation (UNF) acted as a single electoral subject. These facts point to the one-party system and there is no alternative to elections to Soim (regional parliament), that was indicated the authoritarian character of the political system. Although the authority justified it by the need to stop political chaos, by its actions violated had already acquired in recent years democratic victories.

We assume that authoritarianism was temporary because the convocation of Soim and the importance of its decisions, in particular the proclamation of the independence of the Carpathian Ukraine on 15 March, 1939, the election of the president and ministers, approval of state symbols, had pointed to the political and legal framework of a democratic state status of the Carpathian Ukraine. However, unfavorable conditions for the deployment of state life and also the beginning of the Hungarian occupation negated attempts of political construction.

Government was working in extreme conditions. The political crisis in the region was deepened by the contradictions between Czech officials and local population, as well as numerous conflicts in the Ukrainian sphere (camp). In 1938 – 1939 years faced each other the representatives of two generations: young radical nationalists, who demanded from the government to act decisively and older moderate politicians, who with the help of maneuverings tried to keep the autonomous status of the region. The autonomous government of the Carpathian Ukraine after decisions of the first Vienna Arbitrage moved to Khust.

The political regime of the Carpathian Ukraine started based on the one-party system, which represented Ukrainian National Federation (UNF). Its policy symbolized authoritarian type of government. The formation of a single pro-state party UNF and the presence of its members in government determined the state

position of government that was based on authoritarianism and nationalism, despite of the proclaimed democratic contents of documents.

Party leaders chose a radical way owing to internal and external crisis circumstances and thus tried to stop the political chaos in the region. So, this way had been chosen as acceptable in contemporary conditions and had to solve two major problems. Firstly, gather and unite all national Ukrainian political and cultural forces and to stand out as a single front in a favour of their conquests. Secondly, give the possibility to organize a strong opposition that will bring to nought all attempts of Ukrainian association to form prerequisites for building a full autonomy of Carpathian Ukraine.

In November 1938 was the formation of the Organization of People's Defense of the Carpathian Sich (OPDCS), although the first Sich troops in the early 1930s were started to form by Dmitry Klympush from Yasinya. On November 9, 1938 in Hust took place Constituent Assembly of the Carpathian Sich. The commander of the Carpathian Sich was elected Dmytro Klympush.

On November 22, 1938 the Czechoslovak Parliament changed the constitution, adding resolutions of the federal system. At the same time was adopted a separate Constitutional charter of Podkarpatska Rus, according to which the region considered as a federal part of the renewed Czechoslovak Republic (so-called "second" republic). Thanks to the adoption of this law, the legal status of Podkarpatska Rus / the Carpathian Ukraine went far beyond autonomy defined in Saint-Germain contract and the Czechoslovak constitution of 1920. In accordance with these decisions foresaw to form their own regional government and the convening of Soim (Parliament).

In January 1939 the Prague authority proposed a new government of the Carpathian Ukraine (the third autonomous government), under the leadership of A. Voloshyn.

On February 12, 1939 was appointed the elections to Soim of the Carpathian Ukraine, 92.4 per cent of voters voted for the party list of Ukrainian National Federation (UNF). It gave the right to the government of Carpathian Ukraine to summon Soim – the first parliament the history of the region.

On March 14, 1939 the Prime Minister A. Voloshyn declared independence and sovereignty of the Carpathian Ukraine and appointed the convocation of Soim on March 15, 1939, which had to adopt this decision that had occurred. In general was held six sittings of Soim who adopted the decisions that had a great historical importance for the establishment of the young Carpatho-Ukrainian state.

The sitting of Soim officially proclaimed the independence of the Carpathian Ukraine - republic headed by the President. 22 members of parliament adopted the Constitutional Law. Part 1: «§1. Carpathian Ukraine is an independent State. §2. The name of the state is: the Carpathian Ukraine. §3. The Carpathian Ukraine is a republic with a president elected by Soim of the Carpathian Ukraine headed. §4. The official language of the Carpathian-Ukraine is Ukrainian. §5. The colour of national flag of the Carpathian Ukraine is blue and yellow, whereby blue colour is

upper stripe and yellow is lower stripe §6. State emblem of the Carpathian Ukraine is previous regional emblem: bear in the left red semicircle, and the trident of St. Volodymyr the Great with the cross on the middle dent. §7. State anthem of the Carpathian Ukraine is: "Ukraine's glory has not perished...". §8. This law obliges right now from its adoption".

After this the Soim of Carpathian Ukraine elected A. Voloshyn the president of the Carpathian Ukraine, who after taking the oath, appointed a new (the fourth autonomous) government headed by Julian Revai.

Decision of Soim had changed yet again the state-legal status of the Carpathian Ukraine. Since this time, although somewhat symbolic, the Carpathian Ukraine ceased to be part of a federal Czechoslovakia and became an independent state. Proclamation of full independence of the Carpathian Ukraine was an important state-political act, but had not enough international recognition, because there was not time on it. It was the highest manifestation of the will of the population, in accordance with to the right to self-determination, which belongs to the Ukrainian nation so as it belongs to dominant state-forming peoples. We must understand that in that time it was a general crisis of political systems in the conditions of exacerbation of international relations. The Carpathian Ukraine passed a short way from the regional political autonomy to the state independence with transitive authoritarianism.

Pidkarpatska territory /1939 – 1944/.

The period of Hungarian occupation period is also peculiar in the political history of Zakarpattia. Its characteristics indicate a sharp turning point of a newly formed system of democratic relations in society and the revenge of Hungarian political regime, re-establishment of old Hungarian orders at the beginning of the XX century.

During March – July, 1939 in the region established a military-administrative dictatorship of Hungarian occupation authority. Also was changed the official name of the region – Pidkarpatska territory. The regime was characterized by repressions and purges, firing of a large number of professionals, civil servants; it indicated a nontolerant personnel policy of the new power. As before the World War I increased magyarization (hungarization) of all social spheres. The political system experienced significant changes several times. In the summer of 1939 Hungary replaced the dictatorship by the civil power. The Ratified by the Hungarian Parliament laws concerning Zakarpattia entered into force a new political management institute – the Regency Commissariat of Pidkarpatska territory.

In addition, the Hungarian party system carried back orders of "Austro-Hungarian" period and the promised autonomous parties in Zakarpattia could be forgotten. Because of the replenishment of deputy corpus in the Hungarian Parliament was taken in the region by the way of co-opting the "the best" and "faithful" of representatives of the local elite, and to speak about the system of pluralistic choice at this time was impossible.

The loss of regional characteristics in the process Sovietization of Zakarpattia /1944 – 1991/

Zakarpatska Ukraine /1944 – 1946/.

After the liquidation of Hungarian occupation regime in the autumn 1944 in Zakarpattia began the establishment of people's power with the Soviets and political force structures. The movement for reunification with Soviet Ukraine was activated. This period obtained the political and legal status of semi-state (transitive) body and the name – Zakarpatska Ukraine (1944 – 1946). During this period was forming branchings of People's Committees, as bodies of local government. However, its formation was only partially from the national initiative. The main role was performed by the representatives of military headquarters of the Red Army, which were appointed by the leadership of localities. At the same time on pots were local civil servants. Therefore, at this stage, there was somewhat paradoxical situation of dual power. However, in course of time the Communists and Soviet workers forced out of administrative positions old civil servants and monopolized power in their hands. Everywhere exercised the control of Soviet force structures over political organs of the Transcarpathian Ukraine.

The new power made clear that a return to the “Czech pluralism” with extensive multi-party system would not be. Instead of that, started to form a one-party system with monopolizing role in society. Formed Communist Party of the Transcarpathian Ukraine (CPTU), which operated in Zakarpattia from 19 October 1944 to 15 December 1945, was the successor of the Transcarpathian Regional Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (operated in 1921 – 1938). At the Organizational conference in Mukachevo was decided to unite all centers in a single communist organization.

Party's main task was the reunification of the Transcarpathian Ukraine with the Soviet Ukraine, and therefore obligated its members to lead the movement of national masses for the unity of the Ukrainian people and soon solve the socio-economic and national-cultural problem through the prism of sovietization of the region. In practice, this meant the establishment of various committees which dealt in the confiscation of private land ownership and creation on its basis the collective farms, the elimination of educational and scout centers and the organization of communist youth organizations.

In general, the priority task of members of the Communist Party of the Transcarpathian Ukraine (CPTU) was total bilshovization of society with the help of force structures. Moreover, also was carried out intensified purge of the newly accepted communists taking into consideration the peculiarities of “recent tenure as a part of foreign state”. The activity of the Communist Party of the Transcarpathian Ukraine (CPTU) had deeply revolutionary character, idealized merits of the Red Army and communists in liberation of the region.

In its work the Communist Party of the Transcarpathian Ukraine (CPTU) based on the formation of mass trade union, youth arts and cultural and sports organizations. On the initiative of the CPTU during 1944 – 1945 years was carried

out mass assemblies, meetings, conferences, congresses of workers, peasants, teachers, cultural workers and others. Much work was done during the preparation and conduction of the First Congress of People's Committees, which adopted Manifest on the reunification of the Transcarpathian Ukraine with the Soviet Ukraine on November 26, 1944. The broad strata of local population took part in these events that would contribute to the enthusiasm of the level of political culture in the conditions of adaptation to new political system.

As a result of implementation of its main task and unpredictability of outlined further program principles, the existence of the Communist Party of Transcarpathian Ukraine (CPTU) as a separate party structural and organizational unit became impractical. On December 15, 1945 the Central Committee of the All-Russian Communist Party of Bilshovyks decided to consider possible adoption of the CPTU to the All-Russian Communist Party of Bilshovyks and automatic transfer of its members to the All-Russian Communist Party of Bilshovyks. However, this decision had caused another wave of party-political purge of the staff, whereof witnessed the eloquent facts (only 38 percent of the CPTU became members of the All-Russian Communist Party of Bilshovyks). Instead of the Central Committee of the CPTU was appointed Regional (Oblast) Committee of the Communist Party of Bilshovyks of Ukraine, and on January 5, 1946 was approved its new membership.

The First Congress of People's Committees, except Manifest on Reunification of the Transcarpathian Ukraine with the Soviet Ukraine, chose the highest organ of state power – the People's Council of the Transcarpathian Ukraine (PCTU) with 17 members. The head of the Council was chosen I. Turianytsia. Also was approved the staff of executive and administrative body – the government of the Transcarpathian Ukraine. According to the decree the People's Council of the Transcarpathian Ukraine (January 9, 1945), all absolute power belonged to the people in the region and carried through freely chosen representative bodies, that is, local people's committees and People's Council – In the center.

Whereas the People's Council of the Transcarpathian Ukraine was the single highest executive and legislative organ of power in the Transcarpathian Ukraine, its activity could be described as full consistency of the legislative and executive powers. Elected members of the People's Council of the Transcarpathian Ukraine except legislative activities carried implementation of the adopted laws by the Council and the dominated principle was "democratic centralism". But gradually became more tangible the duplication of the fundamental principles of the Soviet power in the context of the Soviet Union, and attempts to resist this immediately eliminated.

Zakarpats'ka oblast in the Soviet Ukraine /1946 – 1991/.

At the beginning of 1946 a transitional status of the Transcarpathian Ukraine was changed by the legal adoption of its territory as a part of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic SSR and the formation of Zakarpats'ka oblast with the center in town Uzhhorod. Legally, the status of the region was solved on June 29, 1945. Since that time had been the fully legitimate infusion of social and political institutions

into the national Soviet political system and aspects of the politicization of Transcarpathian Ukrainians lost its regional peculiarities in comparison with other regions of Ukraine. It was the third and the last period of sovietization of the region in the twentieth century. This process was completely implemented by primordial idea of unity of the Ukrainian people.

However, it should be noted that ideas of reunification of the Ukrainian lands on both sides of the Carpathians were not new. At the end of the World War I was really considered the idea of formation of a single national state in ethnographic framework (though in non-Soviet variant). However, the foreign policy factors made the obstacles. In the interwar period, the main burden of the implementation of reunification processes undertook separate political parties that were in Transcarpathia. Among them was communist political organization. Political parties of Transcarpathia could, and it would be rightfully, consider the forerunners of those reunification processes, that had occurred in the second half of 1940s. However, the achievements of many Ukrainian political forces and its representatives were actually privatized by a single communist political organization which, objectively speaking, did not claim to be the leader of national reunification in its modern sense.

In one way or another, on the stage of sovietization the core of political system remained communists, their party entirely controlled social and political processes. The party practically monopolized all the levers of regional livelihoods. The main objective of that time was the strengthening and activation of the Soviet organs of power, the establishment of soviet order, the maintenance of social justice etc. Also was strengthened the ideological work, especially among people who distrusted communists, was started the campaign of forming soviet and party senior staff using visitors. The widespread character gained dismissal from offices of qualified local workers.

Consequently, we can say that the staff police of the soviet power was directed to the approval of new political system and its adaptation to the corresponding institutions as soon as possible. For this was made the substitution of the status of transitional semi-state but properly autonomous formation to the equivalent administrative-territorial unit – oblast (region) as a part of the Ukrainian Soviet Social Republic (USSR). As a result, along with the political aspects were realized economic aspects (normalization five-year plans, collectivization), cultural and national (breaking with the notion of “Carpathian Ukrainians” and extension of meaning of the notion “Ukrainians”), social activities (introduction of the soviet passport regime with compulsory registration). But there were other disadvantages, which at the first years of the soviet power negatively influenced on its image. It was extreme militarization of the region due to supersaturation of servicemen, strict borderline regime, anti-religious policy (liquidation of the Greek-Catholic church), the introduction of administrative-command system, the management of all social spheres.

In the content of the sovietization process 1950 – 1980 years occurred the actual duplication of the main elements of the political system of the Soviet Ukraine /

the Soviet Union. General trends dominated over the regional peculiarities of this process and pointed out that the sovietization of Transcarpathia was carried out “from the top”, rapid, emergency mode. The leading role in this process played party centres with the full support and control of military units and security organs. Therefore, this period is called as a dynamic in terms of social development of the region, and a controversial, due to the exaggeration role in this process of “popular initiative”.

The electoral process in Transcarpathia during the soviet period passed a complex evolution, but the electorate – good practice of political training. During this time was everything: from a strict selection of deputies (cooptation) to alternative and transparency of subjects of the election process. In the postwar years was created the conditions for the deployment of civil and political activity of the working people, providing their widespread participation in social and political life. However, during Stalinism there were gross human rights violations. First of all, that was showed by the conditions of the election campaigns which with the previous pre-Soviet traditions of pluralism and democracy had nothing in common.

Therefore, the process of adaptation to the soviet political system in Transcarpathia took place in rather difficult circumstances of post-war reconstruction. If economic successes had objectively positive character, the political control of livelihoods of local residents left a negative trace on the sovietization of Transcarpathia as a special political region.

The post-soviet period /since 1991/

Zakarpats'ka oblast in independent Ukraine.

The development of political life in the period of formation of Ukraine's independence and its further livelihoods serves today as a new guideline of evolution of Zakarpattia as a political region.

The end of 1980 – the beginning of 1990 was a landmark factor in determining Ukrainians as a political nation. The wave of liberalization of social and political relations, democratic transformations of public life led to the transformation of national consciousness, the search for truth, freedom, human values, preservation of historical monuments, and the renaissance of cultural heritage. Under the conditions of single party system the grouping of citizens by common interests carried out by forming unofficial public organizations, associations and unions. As on the other Ukrainian lands, in Zakarpats'ka oblast region the process of activation of public associations, centres of political parties, representatives of the regional elite had accumulating role in making important social change.

The historical significance and the role of informal public organizations can hardly be overestimated. They actually created a mass social base and a broad framework for the rise of a powerful national-democratic movement with a vivid variety of its manifestations. Also cultural and educational orientation didn't take the last place.

For the time of contemporary national cultural and political awakening on the Ukrainian lands 1990 – 2016 years had occurred dramatic social and political changes that led to the return of original national sources of Carpathian region, gave the possibility to touch memorable pages of the past. Ukrainian society of contemporary state experienced the period of formation and adaptation of many public institutions to the political system. Choosing the democratic way of development in all spheres of social life and taking a pattern by Western European variant of democracy, the Ukrainians tried to adjust to the realities and prospects of development of modern democratic society. Only under these conditions can be expected to the liberalization of relations and social and political activity of the Transcarpathians in the context of forming the principles of civil society.

In everyday vocabulary Zakarpats'ka oblast is called by the regional name Transcarpathia (Zakarpattia). It is geographical and historical territory, the geopolitical position of which is called unique because of its location on the crossroads of economic, trade, national and cultural routes in the centre of Europe. The region is located in the far west of Ukraine.

In the northeast, east and south-east Zakarpattia borders on Lvivska and Ivano-Frankivska oblasts and in the northwest, west and south boundaries of the oblast are the state border of Ukraine with total length of 467.3 km, which includes Poland – 33.4 km, Slovakia – 98.5 km, Hungary – 130.0 km and Romania – 205.4 km. In view of the last in Zakarpats'ka oblast are 19 border crossing points of neighboring states.

The area of Zakarpattia with center in Uzhhorod is 12.8 thousand km², or 2.1% of Ukraine's territory and is one of the smallest among the oblasts of the Western region, occupying 11.6% of its territory.

The number of de facto population in oblast on January 1, 2010 was numbered 1244.8 thousand people, 2.7% of the population of Ukraine. According to the population size, the oblast among other regions took 17 place, and according to the average population density (97.6 persons per km) – 8th place. 62.8% of the population lives in rural areas.

The geographical location of the region also determines the presence among its population a sufficiently large number of national minorities. In Zakarpats'ka oblast live citizens about a hundred nationalities and ethnic groups, including 80.5% – Ukrainians, 12.1% – Hungarian, 2.6% – Romanians, 2.5% – Russians.

The multinational composition of the population of the region led to its multi-religious character. In the region registered numerous religious organizations of different religious confessions and faiths. Ethno confessional organizations are the most typical for the Jewish population, Germans, Slovaks, Romanians, and Hungarians. For them, according to their own historical, ethno cultural and canonical and ritual traditions, was created the normal conditions and opportunities to satisfy their religious needs.

On the basis of this survey, it should be noted that in Zakarpats'ka oblast during the last century, were formed the preconditions for the formation of a new type of thinking of local population and special features of its regional political awareness

and political culture. The Transcarpathians regularly participated in state forming and other political processes, specifically influencing on their dynamics owing to peculiar regional and national traditions, historical, cultural, mental characteristics, the typical content of struggle and defending social and political values.

Summary

The motivation to write this material – is an argument for historical and political traditions of small regions that under any geopolitical circumstances focus attention of state power on the effectiveness of single-minded policy of “Center” to “Region”. Mistakes and negative effects between two subjects lead to the development of appropriate national regional policy that will promote the participation of population in political life. Especially important is the study of specificity regions with common characteristics. It gives opportunity to identify traditional trends of political culture, political behaviour of the population in the regions and their influence on power to the adoption of important social and political decisions.

The detailed overview of the past and circumstances of modern development spur on the formation of political portrait (passport) of Zakarpattia region – the most western region of modern Ukraine, which is filled with courses of regional political processes, polyethnicity and multireligion, geographic specificity of the territory and its border status, the number of population, socio-cultural aspects of the formation of electoral behaviour and complex and dynamic political history.

Social and political life of the region initiated the creation of new administrative and territorial systems according to the circumstances and requirements of that time and also led to bearing up the principles of authoritative relations of “Center” according to historical traditions. XX century gave opportunities to many modern Ukrainian regions to realize several different variants of political relations in the context of functioning of various political regimes. But this opportunity was given as a result of global and specifically European transformational processes, somewhere extremely tragic.

XX century in political history had brought a number of fundamental changes that made society flexibly respond to them, adapt or not to accept the contents of institutional manifestations in each particular case. The complexity of the transformation of political systems (or particular political regimes) in the geographical boundaries of the Transcarpathian region consisted in the fact that this area was at the turn of several state formations, on clash of political and international interests in Central Europe, the strategic axis “East – West”.

Historic insight witnesses about complicated socio-political relations with local inhabitants with political elite of different level. However, that concerned primarily the period when the citizens of these areas were forcibly removed from the adoption of socially important political decisions, and thus could not influence by their own efforts on the course current events. That also reflected on the effectiveness of political development of lands. Therefore, only from the early twentieth century, when in this process began directly participate local inhabitants,

on transformations of political relations affected conditions of the historical and geographical, mental and ideological, political and legal character.

So, small in area Zakarpattia during the twentieth century had different official names of geographical area, reflecting the specificity of development of political system of the state, to which the region belonged. These transient changes demanded adaptation of political institutions of territory to the requirements of this or other political system, which every time absorbed rather poorly developed and ad hoc stable / unstable regional political subsystems. Basing on the last, we must understand the influence of transformation processes on the party and electoral systems. As state formations, to which at various times included Zakarpattia, had different political systems within which functionated various political regimes, respectively, were different methods of formation of state and local power, the character of citizens' participation in social processes.

Consequently, in the context of analysis of current processes of social and political transformations of the Ukrainian society is priority consideration of territorial peculiarities of electoral space and electoral behaviour in the development of regional policy of the Ukrainian state and the consolidation of the Ukrainian nation. Indeed, these electoral moods of territorial sociums are sensitive indicator of political mutual understanding "Center" and "Region".