

Local Government Model as Basis of Federative Organization of Political and Territorial Landscape and as Resource of Federal Stability

Yulya Anatolyevna Matafonova* and Tatyana Nikolayevna Gordeeva

Transbaikal State University, Chita, Russia; mega-yulya@mail.ru

Abstract

Background/Objectives: The study considers the possibilities to identify the effects produced by the established local government model on the stability of a subject of the Russian Federation. **Methods:** Self-administration and subsidiarity have been defined as the most important institutions of federative political order. The study is founded on the principles of distribution of competence and jurisdiction between federal and regional level of state power on the one hand, and the local government on the other hand. **Findings:** Jurisdiction of local government is represented as an aggregate of two component elements: subjects of competence and the degree of power delegated to local government bodies. The study shows the matrix of potential optional combinations of these variables that represent the models of local self-administration: ideal types and transitional versions. **Applications/Improvements:** The study provides historical examples of the effects produced by the established local government models on the sustainability of sub-national entities to further improve federative organization and federal stability.

Keywords: Federal Stability, Federalism, Local Government, Local Government Jurisdiction, Powers, Model of Local Self-Administration

1. Introduction

Sustainable development of a subject of the Russian Federation is defined as a multidimensional notion that covers different factors. Undoubtedly, stability of a subject of the federation depends on social and economic variables: demographic development, conditions of production, infrastructure, cultural and educational sphere, etc. Special significance is attached to the achieved progress of civil society, legal and political institutions. One of such institutions is represented by local self-administration.

Stability of a subject of the federation in the context of federative system can be interpreted as “political stability” characterized by its focus on maintaining the foundations of federalism: territorial integrity, balance between centralization and decentralization, subsidiarity, etc. Consequently, federative system or its part (subject of

the federation as a regional system) is considered stable if it supports the foundations of federal statehood and the basic institutions of federalism¹. Research studies interpret basic institutions of federative political system in their narrow and wider senses.

Understood in their narrow sense, basic institutions of federative political system are represented solely by the establishments, organizations and structures that have been created to govern the federal state, i.e. the bodies of state power².

Widely understood, basic institutions of federative system represent the aggregate of political institutions that enable the implementation of the principles of federalism and that regulate political and territorial organization of power authorities. From this perspective basic institution of federative system is a certain social and political phenomenon founded on repetitive and sustainable collective behavior that leads to the formation

* Author for correspondence

of the universal norms of federative statehood. From the perspectives of this approach the basic institutions of federative system are as follows: institution of federation, institution of self-administration and subsidiarity, institution of elections, institution of pluralism (multi-party system) and democratic majority. The most important basic institution under the conditions of federative political order is the institution of local self-administration and subsidiarity whose principal functions are to regulate the system of federal relations and to delimitate authority and jurisdictions between federal and regional levels of state government³. The essence of the latter among the abovementioned functions makes the foundations of this research.

From ideological perspectives federalism is a doctrine, an aggregate of interrelated ideas that are employed to initiate and to manage political action. The authors of this study in principle share the views of American political scientist Vincent Ostrom who defined federalism as an ideology of truly self-governing society, as an alternative to centralized power vertical, as a homogeneous community. However, no truly self-governing society would possibly exist in the state where the traditions of local government have not been “interwoven” with everyday human practices and where they do not predetermine political behavior of the people aiming them at a civil union.

It should be noted that over a hundred years ago domestic scientists and statesmen have proved that the development of local government is largely predetermined by general regularities of state and social progress. Being a general notion and reflecting the process of the establishment and development of the rule of the people at the local level, in reality it can be built in line with different models and can be embodied in diverse organizational and legal forms⁴. Some of them are recognized by modern scientists; some others are still disputed in the course of the implementation of municipal reforms⁵.

Thus, scientific literature is still carrying on the discussion about the issues of local government; scientific attention is paid to local self-administration, to the processes of its organization, determination and characterization. Social-political, political-legal, formally legal definitions of the phenomenon of local government have been developed⁶.

The authors of this study suggest that the interpretation of the phenomenon of local government should be slightly different and that the processes of local self-

administration should be viewed from the perspectives of securing stability and sustainability of the state.

One more thing has to be noted. The authors would like to identify the existence and the effects produced by the institution of local government or, more precisely, by the established model of local self-administration on the stability of a subject of the federation. Within the Russian legislative framework the institution of local government is regulated by the Constitution and by federal laws. In this regard, federal legislation is of a “framework” nature. Regional legislation determines the specifics in the regions, in the subjects of the federation. Inasmuch as the principal objective of the authors of this study is to identify the models of local government as the principles of distribution of powers and jurisdictions, as the authorities’ “level of confidence” in the people, as some certain amount of “state affairs” delegated to local level, the authors will interpret “state affairs” as the notion that includes the tasks of federal and regional levels. Thus, it will be assumed that local self-administration is a factor that predetermines stability of a subject of the federation and of the whole state which this subject represents.

2. Method

Despite the long-standing investigative tradition, there is still no commonly adopted term for “local self-administration”. This can be explained by different reasons. First, different theoretical areas understand local government as different “facts of administrative life”. Second, “problems” of translation from different languages often result in confusion. It has to be remembered that under the conditions of democratic state the documents about the organization of public authorities are used not only by the experts who specialize in the relevant spheres of law but also by wide circles of people who do not possess any special education. This fact stipulates more severe requirements to the precision of the definitions in the translated international agreements⁷. Third, the authors would agree to the opinion⁶ that this notion is of “supranational”, “cosmopolite” nature.

The review of the theories and major issues of local government makes it possible to dwell upon and to build this study on the fundamental assumption as follows: local self-administration is to be understood as free participation of the people in the activities of local bodies

of power, local authorities and local government. Similar to the case with the issues that predetermine the essence of theoretical economics, the authors will ask the questions that would help develop the theory of local government:

- what do the bodies of local government do?
- who is included in local government bodies?
- how do local government bodies act?

These three elementary questions: who does it, what does it do and in what manner, will become the foundation for identifying the principal characteristics of a particular system of local self-administration. The question "What do the bodies of local government do?" will develop into a comprehensive teaching on the jurisdiction of local government. The question "Who does it?" will lead to the consideration of different systems of local government organization. Finally, the question "How does local government act?" in the context of its correlations with such surrounding subjects as establishments, individuals, society and state will lead to the creation of the theory of control over local government⁸.

Thus, jurisdiction, organization and control are the groups of principal issues of local government. Different combinations of the fundamental concepts of jurisdiction, organization and control will represent that or another system of local government.

Jurisdiction, which is one of the abovementioned elements that predetermine the nature of local government, was selected as the most significant. Therefore, the study will be focused on the issue of local government jurisdiction, because the authors believe that all remaining tasks of local government will depend on whether the local citizens govern their own affairs or participate in the activities of local administration. This dualism correlates with the political aspect of such phenomenon as local self-administration. In the former case local government will be defined as social notion; consequently, the bodies of local government have to be public institutions that are not directly related to state power. In the latter case, if local government is authorized to deal with the affairs of the local state administration it will be a political notion. Therefore, the institutions of local government should be regarded as state authorities.

As a consequence, here there is a shift into the problem area of trust/mistrust of the state in the society, into the area of identifying the type and scope of the

affairs delegated to the local population to be solved at their discretion in such a manner that there would not be a threat to the integrity of the state union, to its stability and security. An important characteristic of local self-administration becomes to be represented by its stability as a low-level foundation, as the basis of statehood. From this perspective local government as a type of public power organization is called upon to ensure some certain level of manageability of the social system at the relevant level (local community that inhabits this territory, municipal entity under modern conditions in Russia).⁴

In general, Yu.A. Tikhomirov defines competence as the scope of public affairs lawfully delegated to the authorized subject. Today competence of local government is interpreted as an aggregate of two components: jurisdictions and the degree of power delegated to local government bodies⁹.

Here again depending on the approach applied to define the notion of local government bodies, namely, whether they are state power authorities or public authorities, all consequent definitions, all interpretations of the jurisdictions and of the degree of delegated powers will differ.

Delegated jurisdictions as well as the level of the delegated power can vary depending on the form of political order, on political and territorial organization, on social, political and economic situation in the country. Delegation of the jurisdictions from the state level down to the local level is regarded by some experts as decentralization of power. Notwithstanding the disputable nature of this assumption, the authors of this study will accept it to justify the methodology of qualitative assessment of the level of the delegated jurisdictions. Measuring the degree of decentralization on qualitative scale it becomes possible to judge in which case decentralization is stronger or weaker; i.e. it enables the alignment of the compared objects. Thereat, the objects of comparison can be represented by different countries or by one and the same country at different stages of its development.

This study made an effort to illustrate the effects produced by the models of local self-administration that emerged either in the course of the development of the state or as a result of the delegated powers on the established and supported state and territorial stability and on administrative traditions.

3. Results

Considering the competence of local government as an aggregate of two component parts, namely, as an aggregate of jurisdictions and the degree of power delegated to local government bodies, the authors will assign three relative values to each of these variables: minimal value, middle, and maximal value. Thus, it is possible to build the simplest matrix that reflects optional combinations of these variables. Such an approach creates several models of competences: ideal types and transitional versions

Table 1. “Jurisdictions” and “power” variables combination matrix

Jurisdictions/ Level of power	Minimum	Middle	Maximum
Minimum	min*min(ideal type)	min*mid	min*max
Middle	mid*min	mid*mid	mid*max
Maximum	max*min	max- *mid	max*- max(ideal type)

The authors will try to interpret the obtained types of the models of local government competences and to find examples in history.

The extreme, the ideal types of the models combine the extreme values: minimums or maximums of the delegated jurisdictions and minimums or maximums of the powers to enforce them. The first type can be regarded as surrogate of local self-administration, while the second corresponds to the full autonomy of the administrative unit; and thus it would seem unreasonable to talk about the existence of local government at all.

To illustrate the option *max*max* consider the proto-federal traditions in the history of the Russian state (since the 8th - 9th centuries up to the middle of the 12th century). This example would vividly demonstrate the seemingly impossible combination: unification and sustainability of the system under the conditions of “absolute” independence of its parts. The elements of polycentric proto-federal social order can be found in the earliest periods of the Russian history. The relevant evidence is provided by Byzantine authors and by eastern chroniclers (Abu Zayd al-Balkhi, Ibn Hawqal, Estakhri, Muhammad al-Idrisi, Yaqut al-Hamawi) and also by domestic sources (“The Tale of Past Years”, “The Radziwill Chronicle”, “The Hypatian Codex”, etc.). Thus, in the 4th century the Byzantine author Procopius of Caesarea wrote as follows:

“these tribes of Sclaveni and Antes are not governed by one man but live in popular sovereignty from time immemorial”¹⁰.

According to the federalist theory of people’s sovereignty suggested by J. Althusius who revealed the essence of federalism through two principal notions of “union” and “treaty”, among the East Slavs, before they established their state, the proto-federal origins of social order were manifested through the facts as follows:

- unification of the tribe unions into even larger congregations “the unions of the unions”. The sources name three large political centers that could be regarded as proto-state unions: Kuyaba (southern group of Slavic tribes with Kiev in the centered), Slawiya (northern group, Novgorod), Arthaniya (south-eastern group, Ryazan). In the 9th century the major part of Slavic tribes joins the territorial union that became to be called “Rus Land”. In 882 Kiev and Novgorod, two largest political centers of ancient Slavs, have united under the power of Kiev thus having formed the Old Russian state. Since the end of the 9th and up to the beginning of the 11th century this state included the territories of other Slavic tribes: Drevlians, Severiane, Radimichi, Ulich, Tiverts, Viaticchi. The Old Russian state became a federation of Slavic tribes in its own way;
- contract nature of government that manifested itself through the practices of inviting the most powerful and authoritative Prince for principdom and concluding a treaty or “ryad” between him and the community that actually meant the union nature of statehood. However, later, according to the Arab historian Ibn Rustah, Russian Princes used to unite Slavic lands by way of “coercing” the tribes, by laying them under tribute and tithe;
- the popular assembly or “Veche” that used to exercise the power and authority of the Prince (affairs of war and external politics) in the absence of Prince or his authorized representative.

These conclusions are also confirmed by the data provided by other researchers. A.S. Morozova notes that there were some certain origins of federalist traditions in Russia ruled by popular assembly, and she regards federalism as a mechanism of interaction between the power of the Prince and the community. Political and legal system of Russia finds its origins in the depth of

national culture and statehood. The customs of Slavic tribes united in the 4th - 7th centuries in special territorial state communities or lands were the most ancient sources of Russian law¹¹.

The inclination toward living within a union-type state formation was highlighted by both pre-revolutionary and modern historians. Thus, N.I. Kostomarov followed by V.O. Klyuchevskiy noted the originality of Russian lands and their striving for federation which was inherited from ancient tribal life¹².

Moreover, N.I. Kostomarov considers the domain period of Russian state as an attempt to preserve federative origins and to struggle against autocracy and centralization. Following the theses of the pre-revolutionary political thought a number of modern researchers admit the natural character of some type of federalization of social and state life in Rus (Russia).

An important factor of law in the Old Rus, according to V.V. Gayduk, was represented by the circumstance that, along with customs and traditions, contracts in the Rus were commonly recognized as a source of law and regulations of social relationships. The nascent forms of the traditions of Russian federalism can be found in Novgorod: the institution of direct democracy called "Veche"; contractual relations established between the Prince and the people. Widely practiced self-administration illustrates not only the existence of the Old Russian polis democracy and popular sovereignty, but it also demonstrates their most vivid manifestations¹³.

M.V. Gligich-Zolotareva¹⁴ clearly defines the features that characterize the Rus as proto-federation and that confirm that this historic model should be regarded as belonging to type *max*max* identified in this investigation earlier:

- considerable degree of independence of the territories; provisions in the treaties that imply their exclusive competence;
- conventional equality of the territories; common principles of establishing local governments are determined by the Prince;
- financial and tax proto-federalism; regulations of the security issues;
- existence of the authoritative body that represents the territories and participates in adopting the countrywide legal norms;
- international legal capacity of the state in combination

with the guaranteed participation of its component parts in external economic relations;

- mandatory consideration of war and peace issues by the authoritative body that represents the territories;
- union nature of statehood recorded in the supreme contractual document (ryad).

The authors of this study believe that this confederation (federation, polycentricism, autonomy) played a twofold role in the process of further development of federative origins. On the one hand, it was polycentrism that saved the Rus from the Golden Horde and that helped its preservation as cultural community. The model of self-administration, where the jurisdictions and powers were at the maximal levels, made it possible to maintain political and territorial stability and the Russian statehood even under the period of factionalism.

On the other hand, the multiplicity of the established forms of local governments later on led to competitive struggle, to competition in the process of establishing a centralized state and to abandoning this model of local self-administration.

The combination *min*min* can be considered using the examples of the Soviet system of local self-administration and political-territorial landscaping of the state.

Upon the events of October, 1917 the principal forms of local power organizations were recognized as Soviets (Council-Boards). Despite the declared democracy, the jurisdictions and powers of Soviets could well be described by the combination *min*min*.

The Constitution of 1918 established the unified system of the Soviets built based on territorial and linear principles. Soviets (or the Congress of Soviets) were established in the territories of settlements (village councils), towns (city councils), districts (district congress of Soviets), regions (regional congresses), provinces and territories. Thereat, there was strict subordination between Soviets depending on the significance of the territorial unit where they were established.

As the role of the Communist Party of Russia (RKP) increased, the Party Committees took over some part of the authority of the local governments and placed them under their control. Then followed the process of centralization, and the Soviets were deprived of their independence. On December, 8, 1918, People's Commissariats were authorized to cancel any decrees of the Soviets as bodies of local government.

Upon adopting the Constitution of 1924 and later on, Soviets remained the bodies of local government only *de jure*; in reality they were subordinated to Executive Committees and to the upper Party structures. During this period local government ceased to exist as such.

In fact, Soviet legislation did not explain such notions as “issues of local competence”: within the framework of the Constitution of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic of 1918 the issue of the authority of local bodies of power was never raised; in the Constitutions of 1924, 1936 and 1977 the local Soviets were recognized independent within their terms of reference. The text of the Constitution of 1977 implied that the local Soviets of People’s Deputies were the local bodies of state power in each particular administrative-territorial unit (Clause 145 of the Constitution of the USSR of 1977). This legislative norm gives foundations for the researches to maintain that the system of the local Soviets was not the system of local self-administration in the real sense of the word^{15,16}.

Independence of local powers was rejected as bourgeois principle unacceptable for the Soviet State. The very notion of “local self-administration” could be found in normative literature only when it described the level of power within the general system of social self-administration.

This model was scientifically considered within the framework of the Soviet state paradigm and within the principle of democratic centralism. V.A. Perttsyk in 1963 has defined the essence of local government in the USSR as follows:

“1) it reflects the will of the local population; 2) it has not any special interests of its own that would deflect from the interests of central authorities; 3) it is interrelated with the central authorities based on the principle of democratic centralism (according to this principle, the competence of the upper Soviets covered policy-making, planning and regulatory activities); 4) the upper Soviets administer the activities of the lower-level bodies of state power, their decrees are subject to compulsory implementation by lower Soviet authorities; 5) one of the organizational and legal manifestations of democratic centralism is represented by dual subordination of the executive bodies of the local Soviets (they report to the local Soviets that have formed them and they simultaneously report to the relevant bodies of the upper Soviets); 6) self-administration implies the fullness of authority of the local Soviets in resolving all the issues that are covered by

their terms of reference”¹⁷.

By contrast to the first of the abovementioned models, this model was initially formed “top down” and was completely accountable to All-Russia Congress of Soviets and to the Government, to the Council of People’s Commissars.

The foundations for determining the jurisdiction of the local government were laid by the Constitutions of the Soviet period.

Similar policy was pursued by the Soviet Government with regard to the construction of the federative state.

Following Marxist tradition V.I. Lenin’s attitude toward federation was negative. As early as in 1913, wary of separatism, he declared against “federative principle”; and the Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited People which was written by him and adopted in January of 1918 said that “The Soviet Russian Republic is established... as federation of Soviet national republics”. Federative principle of state building was confirmed in 1922 when the USSR was created. Creation of the Union represented a stage of transition toward the highest stage of development; and the USSR itself, being a congregation of the republics conquered by Soviet power, represented something transitional on the way to the future world-wide republic of Soviets. V.I. Lenin has formulated his own principles of building the federal state:

- socialist federation founded on Soviets;
- federation based on ethnic attributes;
- principles of voluntary congregation;
- principle of equality of all republics;
- democratic centralism.

Each principle, according to V.I. Lenin, should be interpreted dialectically and in its dynamics which finally made it possible for the Soviet power to substitute federalism for unitarianism. In this regard N. Alekseyev was perfectly right to observe as early as in 1927 that “Today Russia is the most unitarian and, what is more, the most centralized state...And everything that the Soviet Government says about federalism... is a mere fraud invented by cunning people for the ones who are fools”¹⁸.

Therefore, “Soviet federalism” was doomed to crawl toward unitarianism and to over-centralization. Thereat, the established new order of state territorial organization was associated with loud and continuous critique of both autonomy and unitarianism. For more than once the Party Congresses repeatedly declared that the Union of

the Republics should be regarded as the union of equal state units and not as a step to the elimination of these republics or as the beginning of the establishment of the so-called “whole and undivided”.

The illusiveness of “Soviet federalism” became clear even as on December, 30, 1922, the 1st Congress of Soviets of the USSR adopted the Agreement and the Declaration on the establishment of the union state, according to which the major part of republics’ power passed to the central authorities. This provision was also documented in the Constitution of the USSR adopted on January, 31, 1924.

Gradually, the initially declared scope of competence of the republics was reduced; and the Russian Communist Party of the Bolsheviks took over the monopoly in interpreting the provisions of the Principal Law and the state building principles.

Thus, the established model of local powers, as well as the federative political order proved to be no more than “decorative façade of the centralist unitarian state”: the concepts of federalism and local government became nil and void. Based on this type of characteristics it is possible to discuss the established interrelation between the model of local government organization and the form of political and territorial landscaping. When the rights of the local communities for resolving the issues of self-administration are either absent or ignored, then, expectedly, emerges the type of political and territorial government that denies federative ideas. Correspondingly, stability of the state is maintained due to administrative and commanding pattern of government. Given the fact that in this case the subject of federation is not established as the center of regional level decision-making, it would make no sense to talk about federal sustainability of a separate political and territorial subject.

Based on the described models the authors of this study came to the conclusions as follows.

The first model proves that the formation of the local self-administration model “from bottom to top” makes the foundations of federalism that is of contractual origins and possesses the basis of federative sustainability. Interrelations between local communal self-government and the central power used to be built on the principle of administrative subordination of suburbs and towns to larger cities that represented political centers. The decision made by Veche of the senior city was mandatory for the bodies of local government in the suburbs and towns;

and this ensured the unity of the whole system of self-administration. The power of the Prince had little effects on the local governments as there was no necessity for it.

The second model of the Soviet local self-administration confirms the established dependency: if the model of local self-administration is purely nominal and is characterized by the minimal jurisdictions and minimal jurisdiction, then the contractual nature and federative principles are also reduced to minimum.

There are several opinions on local self-administration in the Soviet period of Russia. N.V. Postovoy believes that the Soviets were actually not the bodies of local government; they represented the system of state authorities at the local level and did not possess any real power¹⁹. N.V. Morushkin notes that local self-administration after the Revolution of 1917 in Russia was built within the system of state government preserving its own basic competence represented by the category of “local needs” and its jurisdiction “to resolve the issues of purely local consequence”²⁰. However, the total control over this jurisdiction “to resolve the issues of purely local consequence” and the hierarchical system of subordination to the upper Soviets compromised the very concept of “local self-administration”.

Obviously, there is a connection between the model of local self-administration and the type of political and territorial landscape, its stability and security. There is not an unambiguous answer to the question whether the model of local self-administration affects federalism or whether the initially laid foundations of state territorial policy form the convenient model of local government. Or whether there are mutual correlations between the model of local power and the type of political and territorial landscaping?

Of course, the abovementioned models emerged in different historical periods: the first model emerged when communal (self-governmental) origins were stronger than the state; the second model, the reverse one, was formed during the epoch of “strong power” when communal principles gave way to the state. Therefore, notwithstanding the specifics of development of federalism within political and territorial landscape of that or another state, it has to be regarded not as just political process that is predetermined by some certain historical, social and economic conditions, but, in the first place, as a link in the general evolution of state and interstate relations.

The model of local self-administration founded on the combination of the jurisdictions and powers represents a certain example that encompasses the characteristics due to which that or another subject pursues some definite model of state building.

4. Discussion

The issue of the correlations between the authority of local government and the federative foundations is disputable and multifaceted.

Federalism is more than just a form of political order. Federalist origins can be found in the models of power organization at any level. In science this phenomenon is called polycentrism. V. Ostrom, the author of the theory, notes that traditional models of government in the regions of large cities form polycentric political system with many centers of decision making that are formally independent. These centers reveal sustainable and predictable behavioral models and, correspondingly, they function as a system. Federalism is implemented within the constructions of territorially polycentric states²¹.

Given the opinion that the state power and local self-administration represent two types of public power, R.G. Abdulatipov notes that local government is the form, although a special form, of enforcement of power that accomplishes its functional foundations²². According to his views, local self-administration is one of the basic elements for building the integrated three-level structure of power within a single federal state. Consequently, it is the basis, the resource for the organization of the whole state system with its political and territorial landscape.

Considering the normative aspects of justifying the competence of local-self-administration The European Charter of Local Self-Government has to be mentioned as the document that defines this notion as “a form of sovereignty of the people that entitles territorial communities, using their own resources and through their selected bodies, to resolve a certain range of issues to the interests of the local community”^{23,24}.

Dualism of local self-administration is represented by the fact that on the one hand, it is a form of self-organization of the community, and it is of social nature; on the other hand, it possesses the attributes of power institution and, consequently, it implies the nature of the state.

To distinguish a certain range of competence of municipal authority, the world practices use the principle of subsidiarity. According to this principle, administrative competence to resolve some certain issues should be escalated to the upper levels in cases when they could be resolved there in more efficient manner than at the lower levels which, to a considerable extent, helps streamline the activities of federal and regional authorities. They could focus their efforts on the functions of overall leadership, coordination and control which are more appropriate to them. Besides, this solves the issue of the optimal combination of general interests of the state and the interests of some certain municipal entity. As a result, the population gains the opportunity to administer its own affairs and to implement in practice the right for local self-administration that is stipulated by the Constitution. In turn, the representatives of the state authorities should no longer be wary of losing manageability of the territories of the municipal entities. They are endowed with the functions of control over the activities of the bodies of local self-administration that possess two considerable peculiar features. First, the control is not of preceding but of succeeding nature. Second, the control is exercised from the perspectives of lawfulness and not from the perspectives of appropriateness²².

Scientific literature has established the connections between local self-administration and federative political and territorial landscaping; however, the correlations between the models of local authorities and federal stability have never been discussed.

The study investigated one of the elements that model the system of local self-administration, namely, the competence. The authors of this study have plans to investigate two other elements, namely, organization and control. The authors believe that the construction of the generalized model of self-administration that would include all three constituents and the assessment of its effects on federative stability are of great scientific interest from both theoretical and practical perspectives.

5. Conclusion

Thus, it will be safe to say that the models of local self-administration, depending on the scope of delegated state affairs and on the level of powers for their resolution, are subject to differentiation and to some sort of classification.

Besides, it is possible to find historical examples of the effects produced by the established type of local self-administration model on the stability of territorial entity. Hence, the statement that local self-administration represents a basis of federative political and territorial landscaping and is a factor that predetermines the stability of the subject of the federation (given the reservations made in the beginning of the study) is quite justified.

6. Acknowledgements

Special thanks to our colleagues for their assistance in developing the study and to the leadership of the Transbaikal State University.

This study has been developed as part of the research project “Ensuring Secure Socio-Political Development of a Near-Border Constituent State of the Russian Federation Zabaikalsky Krai”. The study was supported by the grant of the President of the Russian Federation for governmental financial support of young Russian scientists; a unique identifier of the applied research project: MK-7134.2015.6.

7. References

1. Figueiredo RJ, Weingast BR. Self-enforcing federalism. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*. 2005; 21(1):103–35. DOI: 10.1093/jleo/ewi005.
2. Bednar J. Federalism as a public good. *Constitutional Political Economy*. 2005; 16(2):189–205. DOI: 10.1007/s10602-005-2235-5.
3. Matafonova YuA. Management of a federative state: basic institutions of a federative system *Vlast*. 2014; 11:133–6.
4. Balykhin AG. Approaches to the evaluation of the essence of local self-administration in Russian and European scientific and legal traditions. *Bulletin of RUDN, Series Legal Sciences*. 2011; 4:21–6.
5. Ribot JC. African decentralization: Local actors, powers and accountability. *International Development Research Centre*; 2002. DOI: 1020-8186.
6. Bondar NS. Local government and constitutional jurisdiction. *Constitutionalization of municipal democracy in Russia*. Moscow: Norma; 2008.
7. Zamotayev AA, Chekalkin V. On Russian edition of the European charter of local self-government: some issues to ensure the adequacy of applying the documents of the Council of Europe to the enforcement of public power. *Municipal Power*. 2007; 1:6–20.
8. Sveshnikov MI. Foundations and limitations of self-administration: Practice of critical analysis of major issues of local government in legislation of the most important European states, Saint-Petersburg; 1992.
9. Tikhomirov YuA. Theory of jurisdiction: monograph. Moscow: Yurinformtsentr; 2004.
10. Procopius of Caesarea, The gothic war. 1. Translated by Kondratyev SP. Moscow; 1996.
11. Morozova AS. Origins of federalism in Russia. Establishment of modern model of state government: historical and legal analysis; 2015.
12. Klyuchevskiy VO, Historic portraits. Historic thinkers. Compiled, prefaced and supplemented by Aleksandrov VA. Moscow: Pravda; 1990.
13. Gayduk VV. Institution of federalism: theoretical issues. Moscow: Nota Bene; 2008.
14. Gligich-Zolotareva MV. Legal foundations of federalism. Moscow: Yurist; 2006.
15. Barry D, Barner-Barry C. Contemporary Soviet politics: An introduction. 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall; 1991.
16. Matveyev MN. Power and society in the system of Soviets of people's deputies in 1977–1993. Samara: Samara University; 2005.
17. Koveshnikov EM. State and local government in Russia: theoretical and legal foundations of interaction. Moscow: Norma; 2002.
18. Alekseyev N. Soviet federalism. *Social Science and Modernity*. 1992; 1:110–18.
19. Postovoy NV. Local self-administration: History, theory, practices: monograph. Moscow; 1995.
20. Marushkin NV. On the issue of the specifics of local self-administration territorial organization in Soviet Russia. Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, culturology and art studies. *Issues of Theory and Practice*. 2012; 12(2):122–4.
21. Ostrom V. Essence of American federalism. What is self-governing society? Translated from English; Prefaced by Oblonskiy A. Moscow: Arena; 1993.
22. Abdulatipov RG. Federal studies. Saint-Petersburg: Piter; 2012.
23. The European Charter of Local Self-Government, Strasbourg; 1985 Oct.
24. Mukhoryanova OA, Novikova IV, Rudich SB, Bogushevich EV. E-Government in the Western European Countries, Asia and in the USA. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*. 2016 Apr; 9(16).