

THE INFLUENCE OF BASIC INCOME ON POLITICAL AND SOCIAL- ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATIONS IN EASTERN EUROPE

Incomes level as one of main indicators of economic development makes great influence on political sphere, acting as impetus to political transformations. Decline in living standards and increase in poverty became impetus to social-economic changes and transformations. This tendency may be shown by example of East Central Europe (ECE). Drop in world oil prices in conditions of mono-oriented and noncompetitive economics provoked deep system crisis in USSR and other countries of socialist camp.

Main stages of social-political transformations of East Central Europe happened in the period of fall of population's incomes.

Considerable social-political transformations of ECE connected with aggravation of economic problems and are divided into 3 stages:

I. Economic crises in countries of socialist camp of the middle of 1970-s led to emergence of oppositional movements and aggravation of political crisis.

II. Slump in world oil prices and system economic crisis led to disintegration of USSR and socialist camp.

III. Aggravation of economic problems forms a basis of modern social-political changes.

The important role in solution of social-economic problems and overcoming of poverty plays political factor that means formation of effective and responsible political power. The struggle for political changes was the main substance of the activity of oppositional movements of East Central Europe during the second half of the XX century. To considerable extent political changes in East Central Europe were introduced under the pressure of the masses and political opposition.

Supplementing researches' conclusions of B.Geddes and G.O'Donnell one may resume that East European way of transformation processes had a number of differences from Latin-American one:

- The transformation of ECE was closely connected with (was allied to) dismantling of Pax Sovietica and had influences on global processes
- The formation of a new political system unlike remaining of old political actors
- The incompleteness of elites' consolidation unlike closedness of elites and their fast consolidation
- Wide mass participation
- The factor of Europeanization that is the influence of united Europe on social-political processes at its Eastern frontiers by way of formation of criterions of accession and membership
- The role of national factor
- The role of political emigration
- Inefficiency of state economics and decline in living standards.

The region of East Central Europe (ECE) plays an important role in the global rivalry of universal ideologies and political regimes. Situated between Europe and Russia and combining features of both of them ECE had a decisive influence upon results of the antagonism of Western democracies and soviet totalitarianism during Cold War.

Differences of East Europe from its western part have deep historical bases. Since the Middle Ages Central and East Europe has been developed in different civilization areas.

East Europe didn't live through processes of Reformation and Renaissance. Principles of Caesar-poperly have been kept inviolably.

During the XX century East Central Europe (ECE) was a region of the greatest geopolitical changes. During Cold War period ECE was the weakest region of Soviet Bloc. Relative poverty and technological being behind in comparison with inter-war period complicated this problem. The turning-stage in Cold War became Helsinki Conference. The fixation of inviolability of borders and human rights guaranteeing created preconditions for liberal evolution of Soviet totalitarianism. After Helsinki Conference appeared organized oppositional movements: Polskie Porozumienie Niepodległościowe (Polish Independency Mutual Understanding), Ukrainian Helsinki Group, Czech Charter'77, Konfederacja Polski Niepodległej (Confederation of Independent Poland), Association of Independent Trade-Unions "Solidarity" and others.

The task of disassembling of Pax Sovietica was also provided for solution of a complex of problems of national and social character in post-communist period. It included several problems: formation of a new geopolitical order, solution of the problem of borders, national minorities, the overcoming of international stereotypes and international reconciliation. Social-economic questions, rise of basic income, the overcoming of poverty, famine and the threat of civil conflict also required urgent solution.

The solution of these problems was found in course of permanent discussions. To a considerable extent opposition's views was based on conceptions of political emigration, especially Paris Periodical "Kultura". They considered transformation to be based on principles of evolutionism that meant gradual passing of power from communists and reformation of political, economical and social sphere.

Democratic changes in East Central Europe were elaborated in political thought of emigration and oppositional movements. Especially it should be mentioned about the role of Parisian magazine "Kultura" under the editorship of Jerzy Giedroyc. Main problems of democratic and geopolitical changes in East Central Europe were discussed on columns of the magazine. Specifically one of "Kultura's" leading publicists – Juliusz Mieroszewski considered the evolutionism, revisionism and the support of democratization of socialism to be the way to social-political changes in East Central Europe. To his conviction Americans should make more exact their minimal aims concerning East Central Europe which might be achieved without war and realization of which would allow just a partial inclusion of regional countries into the all-European system. The transformation should begin with an initiative of communists themselves under the support of society with the reformist slogans because a frank coming out with a program of overthrow of communism was too riskful. J.Mieroszewski distinguished three stages of the transformation. The first stage had to be held under the leadership of reformist communists, besides social discontents and pressure on the policy of government were necessary. The second stage had to be held under the leadership of liberal communists. The liberalization of the economy, the social liberalization and consolidation of democratic powers had to realize during this period. The third stage had to be held under the leadership of democrats. 'Democracy will be achieved not due to communists but in spite of communists. But as communists cooperated [with other political powers] at certain stages so democrats should cooperate with communists during the certain period of time.'

Economic changes and rise of basic income took an important place in projects of ECE systems transformations. In 1990-s Z.K.Brzezinski was actively engaged in research of transformation processes of East Central Europe. Z.K.Brzezinski divided European continent into three groups of states:

- Europe № 1 – Western part of the continent drawn into Euro-integration;
- Europe № 2 – Central part that is considered to be the heir of common with West Europe cultural heritage and aspires as much as quicker integration with it;
- Europe № 3 – Balkan states and European part of the former USSR, some territories of which after long wait may rely on join in EU.

To Z.K.Brzezinski's mind Europe № 3 – especially Russia and Ukraine – would suffer deep home crises for several decades. He thought the lack of the conception of transformation of

etatist totalitarian system into pluralistic democracy was the serious problem in East Central Europe. Z.K.Brzezinski classified ways of transit to democracy of countries in this region into three types. The first most dynamic type represented by East Germany was characterized by the inclusion to the system of bigger national state. The second type represented by states of Central Europe that always had traditional connections with West and had been experiencing communist regime comparatively not for a long time, their economy wasn't completely communistic and because of the strong positions of Catholic Church full ideological unification didn't happen. The third most complicated and problematic type is represented by Russia considering that communism was a local product there and took roots strongly.

Z.K.Brzezinski stated the lack of based on practice transition theory. Research of transitology problems allowed him to distinguish three stages of post-communist transition to democracy that depending on circumstances in the concrete country would continue from 9 till 30 years.

- The first phase (1-5 years) is provided for changes as political aim and stabilization as economic one. In political sphere principles of democracy are being introduced, free press is being formed, mono-partyism and police control are liquidated and the first democratic associations and movements appear. In law sphere unjustified state control is being overcome. In economic sphere liberalization of prices, stopping of subsidies and unsystematic privatization can be observed. Foreign aid of West consists in strengthening of money units and giving of fixed-term credits.
- The second phase (3-10 years) consists in a transit from changes to stabilization in political sphere and a transit from stabilization to changes – in economic one. Its political features are: new constitution and election-law open and fair elections, real decentralized local (autonomous) governing, rotation of a new political elite and permanent democratic coalition. Law sphere is characterized by the creation of legislative normative basis of ownership-and-enterprise relations. Economic features will shown themselves in strengthening of bank system, small and medium privatization, demonopolization. These processes should be accompanied by the formation of a new class of proprietors and enterprisers. At this stage the foreign aid of West gets forms of infrastructure credits and investments, technical (management) aid, access to markets and trade preferences.
- The substance of the third phase (5-15 and more years) is fixation of changes in political sphere, stable development and increase – in economic one. Changes consist in creation of stable political parties and formation of democratic political culture. In law sphere independent judicature would come into being and formation of law-abiding culture. In economic sphere great privatization, formation of capitalistic lobby and development of enterprising culture could be observed. The aid of West should consist in considerable investments and inclusion of East Central European states into international organizations (EU, NATO).

It could be affirmed that post totalitarian transformations in East Central Europe had gone off according to three models (ways):

1. Organic transformation that was characteristic for Central Europe where were: strong opposition, wide mass participation, influences of Catholic Church, existed democratic tradition.

2. Inorganic transformation that was characteristic for East Europe (a version close to Latin-American way): weak opposition, lack of wide mass participation.

3. Chinese way of transformations that is caring out of limited reforms and retention of power by previous authorities at the same time.

Questions of international relations made a considerable threat during transformation period. The new geopolitical order was imagined as a system of independent national ECE states under the circumstances of disintegration of USSR, reunion of Germany and Romania with Moldova and preservation of the integrity of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia.

The sharpest problem was a question of borders that were changed many times in ECE. In general after Helsinki Conference a preference got the conception of inviolability of borders. In

1986 several Polish oppositional organizations appealed with the initiative of getting agreements concerning the inviolability of bilateral post-war borders to the same surroundings in Ukraine, Lithuania and Byelorussia. Those agreements between representatives of Polish and Ukrainian opposition were signed in 1987 in Paris.

The liberalization of the policy concerning national minorities, the overcoming of international stereotypes and international reconciliation were considered to be a necessary precondition for the elimination of outside inspirations of international conflicts at the stage of liberation from Soviet domination and success of democratic transformations.

Disintegration of Soviet Bloc coincided with economic crisis. Questions of social maintenance, technological renovation, privatization of state sector and so on required urgent solution. Economic changes in countries of the region were held by two models: by the way of gradual reforms and by the way of "shock therapy". The most successful scenario of reforms fulfilled countries of "shock therapy".

The elaboration of complete reforming system of different branches in ECE gave the opportunity to avoid Yugoslavian way in post-communist period. It furthered the liberation of ECE states from Soviet domination, disintegration of OWT, the overcoming of totalitarianism and democratization of social relations. The majority of ECE countries had demonstrated a successful way of transit to the market economy and liberal.

In the end of the 20th century global democratization was beyond doubt in fact. There were several factors influenced upon such a conviction. The most important of them were USSR's defeat in Cold War and formation of mono-polar world under the aegis of the idea of liberty and democracy. The most vividly these notions about the final victory of democracy and global movement were reflected in F. Fukuyama's famous bestseller. But in two decades after the downfall of communist regimes in East Central Europe such an affirmation isn't non-alternative.

We may talk about democratic changes under the pressure of oppositional powers only in Central Europe. In East Europe, specifically in Ukraine, post-communist transformations were realized by former communist leaders and champions of democracy were tortured in prisons and camps. Latin-American way of transformation prevails in East Europe.

There are no democratic traditions in political life of peoples of the region. Phenomena of political processes that are often used for substantiating of democratic principles' existence in historic past (aristocratic democracy in Poland during the period of the First Republic, Zaporizhian Sich) in reality were kinds of anarchy, self-will and weakening of centralized authority.

An important issue is the problem of succession of such aims as state building, economic prosperity, law-abiding state and democracy. Political experience of countries of successful transformation (Chili, South Korea, Taiwan and Singapore) affirmed that they moved to democracy through the achievement of economic prosperity and "liberal authoritarianism".

To the end of the 20th century peoples of East Central Europe have no their statehood, their nations are much elder than states. So statehood is more significant value for them than democracy. Peoples of the region squeezed between three civilizations and several empires attached priority to problems of independency and statehood over issues of democracy. The problem of democracy is elaborated in history of political thought of peoples of East Central Europe rather weakly.

The way to democracy which West European nations had been going by for centuries East Europe should have gone during several decades. In this case only an introduction of superficial, "elitist" democracy is possible.

In the 20th century East Central Europe became the region of the most dynamic changes. But there is also some threat for irrevocability of democratization processes in haste and frequency of changes. It should be mentioned that A. de Tocqueville affirmed the necessity of stability as an important condition for the development of democracy. Instability in East Central Europe showed itself in political system, partyism, power system, law system and so on. Inserting of changes and frequent amendments into constitutions generates law collisions. The system of

appointment and dismissal of government members in Ukraine proved to be one of those law collisions. A great amount of constitutional changes projects affirms about the wish of every political power to rewrite the constitutional law in accordance with their interests. By the way it should be mentioned that American constitution has not been rewritten for 200 years and there were inserted only 26 amendments into it.

Frequent fundamental changes of political power, even democratic one, are not of democratic sense yet. Yushchenko, Saakashvili, Lukashenko gained power by the way of democratic elections. But political regimes in their countries are far from democratic standards. It was found that coming of democratic leaders by democratic way is not a guarantee of democracy. Democratic slogans and pro-West rhetoric may conceal tactical aims.

A disproportionate distribution of national wealth during privatization period caused great social differentiation. There were arose small group of new bourgeois that concentrating financial-economic resources aimed to put political sphere under their control. Dissatisfaction of people finds expression in rise of strong anti-system movements. In a great number of states of the region communist parties have their factions in parliaments and mainly former party functionaries form political elite.

Change of political elite hasn't happened almost in whole East Central Europe. Democratic elections haven't led to changing of political elite and persons in power.

In early 1990-s S.Huntington distinguished several factors furthered global democratization:

- Complicated situation of authoritarian regimes;
- The influence of processes in USA, EU and former USSR;
- Phenomenon of "snow ball" when changes in one country stimulate changes in the other;
- Change of Catholic Church's position.

At the beginning of 21st century these factors experienced considerable changes.

An important problem is also the position of West itself. Don't changes in countries of West, in particular USA affirm restriction of democracy under the pretext of struggle against terrorism? Is it democratic conduct if a state or group of states impose advantageous for them political regime on the other state? Wouldn't new challenges compel political elites of West to refuse an idea of global democratic transformation in favour of their own security?

American projects of global spreading of democracy met obstacles. It is strengthening positions of realism supporters that considered international security, stability, the access to energy recourses to be main aims of priority beside ambitious projects of democratization. Uncritical approach to liberal values causes that as the result the influence achieved political powers which are not supporters but enemies of democracy.

- Opponents to democracy spreading policy advanced several main arguments:
- Roots of democracy are in culture that's why it's not the universal value;
- Principles of respect of national sovereignty;
- Idealism and ideology shouldn't determine national interests of a state;
- Democratization is a complicated and complex process that's why management of it from outside is an adventurism.

Democracy couldn't be introduced from outside despite society's wish. Democracy should be introduced by society itself. Democracy would be effective if it grounds on social consensus and if it is perceived by the majority as useful form for solution of society's problems. On the contrary, attempts of West to impose democracy by force may cause destabilization and create conditions for the formation of any kind of authoritarianism or totalitarianism.

States of East Europe are out the frameworks of euro integration that in its term decreases an ability of influence of EU on the situation. There is also a lack of consolidated position of EU and blurred character of relationship with Eastern neighbours. The Program of East partnership includes states-potential pretenders to membership ad those that are uninterested in

participation in euro integration. Europeization – that is giving perspectives of membership in case of democratic transformations may become an important stimulus for democratization of East Europe.

Disintegration of USSR became a regress for democratic processes on post-soviet area. These processes which began in the whole USSR were divided according to national criterion that as it was found didn't strengthen positions of democracy.

So, we may state the breaking away of societies from those democratic achievements of the period of M.S. Gorbachov's perestroika. During last years of USSR's existence national borderlands often represented an oppositional to Moscow authoritarian-totalitarian surrounding. Disintegration of USSR caused their strengthening. Practically in all post-soviet states the former party clique retained its positions, renaming only political institutions. Some of post-soviet states returned to totalitarianism (Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan). Political regime, in particular totalitarianism has certain inertia of motion. Creating of democratic institutions, constitution, elimination of some totalitarianism features aren't sufficient changes for consolidation of democracy.

For past years Russia has been playing a destructive role in democratization process. During M.S.Gorbachov's perestroika (in 1980-s) Moscow became the initiator of democratic changes, glasnost and openness. But now we can observe policy of ruled democracy, supporting of centrifugal movements (Abkhazia, Ossetia, Transnistria, Crimea and so on) in many states that declare wish of democratic changes and pressure on states of pro-West orientations. Mono-orientation of energy-supplying furthered the strengthening of Russia's positions in East Central Europe. Using issues of prices on oil and gas and transit way and refusing ratification of European Energetic Charter, Russia insists on advantageous for it political concessions. As in Russia there was formed authoritarian regime with dominant political party, controlled mass media and with the lack of mass participation democratic processes in former USSR make potential threat for Kremlin. That's why lately political pressure of Russia has been aimed first of all to states of so called colorful revolutions where democratic changes have happened or have been declared – Ukraine, Georgia, and Kirgizia.

During post communist period in ECE quasi-democratic regimes were formed. They often used pro-European or pro-American rhetoric for their legitimating. Defense of human rights, freedom of speech, independence of judicial system and a number of democratic freedoms weren't guaranteed by state. The effectiveness of autocratic regimes also caused weakness of democratization. Facts reason that position of democracy in a number of East Europe's states weakened much in comparison with the situation in M.Gorbachov's epoch.

There are permanent challenges for democracy in countries of East Europe:

- Low level of political culture of population
- Political instability, strong anti-system movements
- Economic problems and poverty, high level of corruption
- Active renewal of spheres of influence by Russia, that is demonstrating the effectiveness of so called ruled democracy that is authoritarianism
- Threat of regional ethnic separatism in a number of states, existence of unrecognized states (Transnistria, Abkhazia, South Ossetia and others) in the region or close to it
- Terrorism

World financial crisis endangers weak bank systems of East Central Europe (Poland, Hungary, Ukraine) and problems of liberal model of economy. A number of states that had been demonstrating fast paces of economic development suffered the considerable decrease of production that intensified social. Authoritarianism, state interference, protectionism and other instruments that don't correspond to classic model of liberal economy are more effective for overcoming of the crisis. The West stops being the only attractive model. Financial crisis of 2008-2009 years could change balance of superpowers cardinally. New pretenders for global

leadership appear and democracy's lot will depend on correlations of superpowers' influences, first of all of EU, USA, RF, and China and on values propagated by them.

International conflicts, ethnic stereotypes and hatred, lack of international reconciliation and separatism make the considerable threat for democratization processes. It should be mentioned that processes of international French-German and German-Polish reconciliation formed the basis of post-war democratization and European integration. Later reconciliation of the two largest peoples of the region – Ukrainian and Polish made a great influence on changes in East Central Europe. The lack of international reconciliation gives opportunities to inspire contradictions and to use them for legitimizations of restriction of democratic freedoms. There are several hotbeds of international tension and confrontation. So international reconciliation is a precondition for democratic changes and its lack – is an obstacle.

International contradictions and external influences caused a rise of unrecognized states in the region that also lays obstacles to democratization processes.

The proclamation and acknowledge of the independence of Kosovo, Abkhazia and South Ossetia created a dangerous precedent in the international law. This tendency has threatening consequences for East Central Europe, on the territory of which or near of which several unrecognized states or potential seats of conflicts are situated (Transnistria, Crimea, Nagorno-Karabakh, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, North Cyprus, Chechnya and so on). A spreading of the problem could destabilize the situation in whole macro region, because several states (Ukraine, Macedonia, Moldova, Romania and Bulgaria) have numerous compact national minorities and ethno regions that may potentially put forward claims to giving them sovereignty. Besides an appearance of unrecognized states with badly controlled government bodies and borders could create buffer zones that may be used for international terrorism, illegal trade of weapon, drugs and so on.

The region is situated in a very short distance to seats of many ethnic conflicts, particularly on Balkans and Caucasian, the spreading of which may destabilize situation in neighbor countries.

The preventive solution and counteraction to ethnic conflicts is provided for the applying of a complex of measures of political-legal character:

- Democratization of social-political relations that gives an opportunity to find out and solve conflicts at the first stages and to exclude power methods of solution;
- Implementation of principles of international conventions in the field of defense of rights of national minorities by states;
- Intensification of an influence of international organizations that are engaged in a preventive regulation of conflicts;
- Applying of a flexible system of administrative order (different types of many-leveled federations and autonomies);
- Applying of principles of people's diplomacy for the reconciliation of hostile peoples;

The solution of the problem may be realized only by the way of wide arrangements of the parties concerned. The items of priority of such an arrangement should be the confirmation of following principles:

- Renewal of respect to principles of international law;
- Calling of a new conference on security problems;
- Creation of a new international organization on questions of European security or giving OSCE powers for more effective activity;
- Activating of role of EU in Eastern policy and in a support of international security on the continent.

The solution of problems of the counteraction to separatism and ethnic conflicts requires international consensus, respect to principles of international law and democratization of social-

political life of ECE's countries. Methods of a preventive solution of conflicts and the initiating of public initiatives in the direction of international reconciliation and cooperation are perspective for the region.

Complex measures of international community, separate countries and social institutions could counteract to threats or minimize their influence on international security.

Some separate factors don't mean the main tendency yet that's why it's hard to foresee the evolution of political regimes in EU. For that it's important to answer several questions. Should democratic transit end in democracy? What are reasons for supposing that countries not living in democracy for centuries will become democratic in the 21st century? We may think that are diseases of growth and expect that after some transition period in these countries democratic order will come into being. May be West has illusions concerning democracy in other parts of the Earth and try to impose forms of government that are not immanent and effective to them. Only future could answer these questions. Impose enforce force

At this moment we may affirm that EU gravitates towards political regime which would have democratic features declaratively but a big dose of authoritarianism in fact. Democracy in XXI century will meet with serious challenges and threats. East Central Europe will be the one of regions where the answer to those challenges will be formed.

Rise of basic income, struggle against poverty and building of competitive economics are closely mutually interwoven with issues of transformation of political sphere. Lumpen proletariat is social basis of totalitarian regimes and the lack of democracy doesn't further economic development and prosperity in modern globalized world. Transformation processes in East Central Europe realized by two different ways brought diverse results. In Eastern part of the region transformations were incomplete that's why East Central Europe retains a considerable conflict potential that may influence on social processes on a larger scale.

- Aron R. Pokój i wojna między narodami.- Warszawa: Centrum im. Adama Smitha, 1995.- 227 s.
- Balcer A., Kaczmarek M., Stanisławski W. Kosovo before the final decision // CES Studies.- Warsaw: Centre for Eastern Studies, 2008.- № 27.- P. 47-81.
- Boutros-Ghali B. The 50th Anniversary Annual Report on the Work of the Organization.- New York: United Nations, 1996.- P.317-326.
- Brzezinski Z. The Grand Chessboard. American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives.- New York: Basic Books, 1997.- 223 p.
- Common vision for common neighborhood. Conference Proceeding 3-4 May 2006.-Vilnius, 2006.- 223 p.
- Dančák B., Fiala P. (Eds.) Národnostní politika v postkomunistických zemích.- Brno: Masarykova Univerzita, 2000.- 316 s.
- Dellenbrandt J. Parties and Party Systems in Eastern Europe // Developments in East European Politics.- London: Macmillan, 1993.- P. 158-162
- Doyle M.W. Ways of War and Peace. Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism.- New York; London: W.W.Norton & Company, 1997.- 557 p.
- Eberhardt P. Między Rosją a Niemcami. Przemiany narodowościowe w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej w XX w.- Warszawa: PWN, 1996.- 427 s.
- Freedman L. Order and Disorder in the New World // Foreign Affairs.-1992.-№ 1.-P. 20-37.
- Geddes B. A Comparative Perspective on the Leninist Legacy in Eastern Europe // Comparative Political Studies.- 1995.- Vol. 28.- P. 242-269.
- Higley J., Gunther R., eds. Elites and Democratic Consolidation in Latin America and Southern Europe.- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Howard M. The Springtime of Nations // Foreign Affairs.-1990.-№ 1.-P. 17-32.
- Huntington S.P. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.- London: The Free Press, 2002.- 367 p.

- Kennedy P. The rise and fall of the great powers. Economic change and military conflict from 1500 to 2000.- London: Fontana Press, 1989.- 898 p.
- Kondziela J. Badania nad pokojem: teoria i jej zastosowanie.- Warszawa: Ośrodek Dokumentacji i Studiów Społecznych, 1975.- 168 s.
- Lapidus G.W. Gorbachev's Nationalities Problem // Foreign Affairs.-1989.-№ 4.-P. 92-108.
- Lehmann I.A. Peacekeeping and Public Information. Caught in the Crossfire.- London; Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 1999.- 175 p.
- O'Donnell G. Introduction to the Latin American Cases // Transitions from Authoritarian Rule.- Baltimore; London: John Hopkins University Press, 1993.- P. 3-18.
- Peace, Security and Conflict Prevention. SIPRI – UNESCO Handbook / Introduction by Adam Daniel Rotfeld and Janusz Symonides.- Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press; SIPRI; UNESCO, 1998.- 230 p.
- Schmitter P., Karl T. The Conceptual Travels of Transitologists and Consolitolologists: How Far to the East Should They Attempt to Go? // Slavic Review.- 1994.- Vol. 53.- P. 173-185.
- Simon G. Nationalism and Policy toward the Nationalities in the Soviet Union.-Boulder CO: Westview, 1991.- 483 p.
- Wearth S.R. Bez wojny: dlaczego państwa demokratyczne nie walczą ze sobą? – Warszawa: Politeja; Świat Książki, 2001.- 383 s.
- Бжезинський З. Великі перетворення // Політична думка. – 1994. – №. – С.5-15.
- Бульбенюк С. Посткомуністична демократизація: структурний і процедурний виміри // Віче – 2007. – №16. – С. 40-52.
- Дарендорф Р. Дорога к свободе: демократизация и ее проблемы в Восточной Европе // Антология мировой политической мысли. В 5 т. Т. II Зарубежная политическая мысль XX в. / Нац. обществ.-науч. фонд Акад. полит. науки; Руководитель проекта Г.Ю. Семигин и др; Ред.-науч. совет: пред. совета Г.Ю.Семигин и др. – М.: Мысль, 1997. – С.791-796.
- Елизаров В. От тоталитаризма к демократии: две модели // Pro et Contra. – 1998. – №3. – С.98-110.
- Задирако П. Важкий шлях до демократії та свободи // Політологічні читання. – 1994. – №1. – С. 197-208.
- Зеленько Г. «Навздогінна модернізація»: досвід Польщі та України. – К.: Критика, 2003. – 216 с.
- Іскакова Г. Особливості посткомуністичної трансформації і проблема прав та свобод людини // Політичний менеджмент. – 2005. – №2 (11). – С. 138-144.
- Лактіонова В. Соціополітичні та психологічні наслідки розпаду СРСР і трансформація України // Віче – 2007. – №16. – С. 15-17.
- Лапкин В, Пантин В. Восприятие западных институтов и ценностей в постсоветском пространстве: опыт Украины и России // Полис. – 2004. – №1. – С. 74-87.
- Латигіна Н. Шляхи та структурні фази демократизації суспільства // Політичний менеджмент. – 2005. – №2 (11). – С. 68-77.
- Наумкіна С. «Третя хвиля» демократизації: підсумки і перспективи. Аналіз зарубіжних концепцій // Політичний менеджмент. – 2004. – №2 (5). – С.162-170.
- Хантингтон С. Будущее демократического процесса: от экспансии к консолидации // Политология: хрестоматия / Сост. проф. М.А. Василик, доц.М.С. Вершинин. – М.: Гардарики, 2000. – С. 692-704.
- Етнические и региональные конфликты в Евразии. – Книга 3: Международный опыт разрешения этнических конфликтов / Общая ред. Б.Коппитерс, Э.Ремакль, А.Зверев. – М.: Весь мир, 1997.- 304 с.
- Юрженко Л. Соціально-політичні конструктивні зміни як умова демократичного транзиту // Політичний менеджмент. – 2004. – №1 (14). – С. 119-128.