

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Hnatiuk V. Introduction to subnational policy: from warnings to approval

Today a comprehensive analysis of political processes is impossible without the use of a subnational comparative method. Subnational issue in political science passes three stages of development and now appears to be as an independent subject of scientific analysis.

During a long period of time researchers analyze political processes in the state exclusively at the national level. There is the idea that any manifestation of political life in a diminished spatial scale is only a projection of a national political life. It symbolizes the phenomenon of "the main bias" in the theory of political science. The main array of works in the second half of the XX century, which relating to democratization, are from a national point of view. Subnational issues have obliquely arisen in studies, which characterized by fragmentary comprehension, remarks or mentioning. This conceptual content characterizes the development of subnational issue at the first stage in the 70's and 80's of the XX century, a representation stage, that symbolizes the first "meeting" of the paradigm of that time and the phenomenon that did not adapt, but existentially is always alongside with it.

This "whole-national bias" in comparative political science changes in the last decade of the XX century, when it begins to explore various aspects of subnational politics, namely: the territorial extension of the processes of democratization. The first decade of the XXI century is characterized by the presence of research that represents an increased scientific and theoretical interest in subnational politics, supported by its own methods for measuring and classifying cases within subnational units of analysis. In the 90's of the XX century by the middle of the second decade of the XXI century, which is chronologically the second interval, the stage of contact, is outlined in developing a subnational issue in comparative political science. It is a moment of "communication" between the political practice and the conceptual "embryo" (subnational comparative method), which is trying to understand it. In addition to the approval of methodological issues and a large number of studies on subnational politics, the transformation of paradigm "bias" from the "whole-national bias" to "federative monism" becomes an important change. The "federative monism" is embodied in the thesis that the only unit of subnational analysis is the subject of federative states that have a certain legally defined political independence, as opposed to the administrative-territorial parts of the unitary countries.

The research trend of the last four years (2014-2018) reflects new practical implications for using the comparative methodology in subnational politics. Studies show that "federative monism" overcomes today because work concerns unitary states in one or another way. The "assertion" of a subnational issue crystallizes in comparative science today and enters into a stage, the stage of collaboration, which, firstly, is based on the dynamism of the methodological principles of a problem, and, secondly, on the autonomy of studying one's own subject.

Key words: subnational issue, subnational unit, subnational comparative method, whole-national bias, federative monism.