
CORONAVIRUS COVID-19 LIKE A TRIGGER OF SOVEREIGNIZATION

Tetiana Poiarkova

*Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University,
Faculty of social and humanitarian sciences,
Department of Political Science and Sociology,
Bulvarno-Kudriavska Str, 18/2,
Kyiv, Ukraine, 04053
t.poiarkova@kubg.edu.ua*

Abstract

Pandemic of COVID-19 has already become a historical event, aftermath of which revealed the disability of supranational institutions and international organizations to take flash decisions in order to save life of an average person. These circumstances determined the aim of the article to unite theoretical and applied researches of interdependence between emergency situations and sovereignization. It has been determined that the common trait of these practices is the decline of democratic freedoms and processes because of life values reappraisal. The article also considers the reasons of reconstruction of neopatrimonialism in post-soviet countries during the Pandemic.

Key words: *Sovereignization, Emergency Challenges, Decline of Democracy, Pandemic of COVID-19, Neopatrimonialism, Patron Clientelism*

INTRODUCTION

Pandemic of COVID-19 may with no doubt be regarded as the event that has caused swift transformation of usual social being. In this connection it is possible to agree with the leading historian P. Hennessy who says that contemporary history, which previously was divided into «before» and «after the World War II, now is being transformed into «before» and «after» corona [Kelly 2020].

In March 2020, in his interview to the Spectator S. Žižek presented a new book called «A Left That Dares to Speak Its Name», in which he indicated some features of “after corona” world and stated cardinal changes of belief systems, ideas and values of different social groups, classes and societies – in the demands of World Organization concerning counteraction to coronoviral infection [Nash 2020]. S. Žižek thinks that ideological upheaval becomes apparent in spreading of communist mobilization principles, the end of the era of worship of human freedom and renovation of class struggle.

We can state that these Žižek’s considerations are common with the considerations of general scientific community and state the decline of democracy (as a value) during the pandemic, when the necessity to save people’s lives and implementation of quarantines lead to a partial loss of civil freedoms and rights.

Let’s take note of a series of scholarly papers [Cukierman 2021; Bilgin et.al. 2021] that analyze the various dimensions of increasing authoritarianism in the politics of democracies through: 1) the ability to mobilize resources more efficiently; 2) greater obedience of citizens; 3) unified position of the media; 4) smaller global transportation; 5) the possibility of vaccination of citizens in a centralized manner.

But, to our mind, additional attention should be paid to the factors that conditioned the devaluation of democratic values and degradation of democratic institutions.

It is evident that pandemic of COVID-19 has actualized the consideration of problems connected with interdependence of emergency situations (including extraordinary situations when the whole nation is under the threat and is stipulated by law special legal regime for state institutions’ work) and «sovereignization» as the process of self-determination and subjectivization of political actors. These circumstances determined the article to analyze conceptual evolution of scientific theories and actual situation (pandemic of COVID-19) relative to the interdependence of emergency situations and sovereignization.

1. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE AND HYPOTHESIS

All mentioned above caused the aim of the article to explain theoretical groundwork concerning interconnections between emergency state, sovereignization and attendant degradation of democratic institutions and devaluations of democratic values.

Our hypothesis is in the assumption that pandemic of COVID, as an emergency state, stipulated for countries’ sovereignization and corresponding decay of democratic freedoms because of the necessity of the fastest decision making in order to

save people's lives. But, as we think, the degree of democracy decay depends on the type of political regime and corresponding political culture.

The aim and hypothesis made use such scientific methods as a systematic one, in which political life is seen as a system – integrated, complicated and self-registering mechanism that constantly interacts with the environment by means of entering and leaving the system and makes it impossible to completely understand the object of investigation and detailed analysis of connections between its elements; a culturological method, which is orientated to reveal dependence of political processes on the level of political culture (in particular the hermeneutic method for examining the innermost political and cultural context of events); a structural and functional method to study politics by means of investigation of behaviour differences of individuals and groups of people rather than political institutions; an anthropological method to study politics conditionality by human nature as a genetic being, that has an invariant set of needs rather than by social factors; a comparative method based on comparison of homotypic political phenomena (systems, parties, etc.) aimed to distinguish general tendencies in the development of political processes; a historical method which demands to investigate political phenomena in their historical consistency taking into consideration historical context.

The connection between emergency situations and sovereignization was specified by C. Shmitt in 1920 in his work «Political theology» [Shmitt 2000]. To his mind the definition of sovereignty by means of «principal restricted power – discontinuity of the existing order's action «stipulates the understanding of state as the institution that proves its superiority over the existing principles of law» [Shmitt 2000: 20, 24-25].

Thus, C. Shmitt compares the main points of sovereignty with the problem of emergency situations, which reveals the nature of state authority because such a decision doesn't correlate with the principles of law and proves that «for law making there is no need in law» [Shmitt 2000: 27]. In this context it would be logical to assert that «the correct definition of state sovereignty is not as the power monopoly or the monopoly of compulsion but as the monopoly of decision making» [Shmitt 2000: 26-27]. In 1921 in his work «Dictatorship. From the Origin of the Modern Concept of Sovereignty to the Proletarian Class Struggle» C. Smitt defines «emergency situation» as the launch of sovereignization in the shape of competence of power concentration and changes in constitutional definitions, which regulate competences, that (in its turn) ruins the whole system of powers sharing [Shmitt 2005: 232].

L. von. Mises in his work «Omnipotent Government: The Rise of Total State and Total War» (1944) broadened the conception of sovereignization as the phased process. The first phase included making of territorial sovereignty to implementate the control over economy on the basis of new peoples hegemony, groups and armies [Mizes 2013: 318, 331]. The second phase was seen as the gaining of subjectivization by suprastate organizations that is the condition for the surviving of democracy [Mizes 2013: 372]. The following phase was connected with the fall of liberal democracy – the concom-

itant of national states sovereignization by means of war, which, according to the definition, is «incompatible with international labour distribution» [Mizes 2013: 319]. The important milestone in the generalization of theoretical groundworks and historical practices of emergency situations implementation is the book (2003) «Homo Sacer. State of Exception» by G. Agamben's [Agamben 2011a]. In this work the transformation of an essence, as a temporary and exclusive measure, into governing technology is seen as the main threat of the present time that changes radically the structure and content of different traditional constitutional forms by means of «confusion of executive and legislative powers' acts».

In Agamben's judgment, the essence of emergency situation notion is in the fact they are legal form of something that can't have it. The specific factor of such a state is confusion of «power of law» and law as the result of isolation. This defines such «a state of law», in which, on one hand, norms are on-stream but aren't used (are out of «force»), on the other hand – the deeds which don't have the significance of law find their «force» during such a state. It is just «the perspective when emergency situation is the threshold beyond which the bounds between democracy and absolutism are obliterated».

On these grounds it is necessary to take into consideration Agamben's comment of 1995 («Homo Sacer. Sovereign Power and Bare Life») explaining the transformation of system's functioning in emergency situation into the norm for the following life [Agamben 2011b: 19]. To his mind, the nature of connection between emergency situation and dominion becomes apparent in the ability of governing stratum to be inside the governing system and out of it at the same time, that means to stop the law and place itself out of rules [Agamben 2011b: 22].

R. Higgs («Crisis and Leviathan: Critical Episodes in the Growth of American Government» (1987)) connected the phenomenon of emergency situation formation with «the effect of flywheel» – mechanism that prevents a wheel move backwards. The effect mentioned above is the case when state sector widens actively in the period of wars and crisis, but when they come to end it narrows but not to its initial level. So, emergency situations create the atmosphere in which government becomes a singular autonomy and grows in discrete steps with appropriate extension of powers. Thus, when test work has been finished, emergence functions in government's powers remain [Higgs 2010: 11].

Sovereignization as the process of gaining subjectivization by a state capable to be responsible for a number of simultaneous but different challenges was studied by P. Mason in his work «Post Capitalism: A Guide to Our Future» [Meison 2019]. To Mason's mind, notional characteristics of modern sovereign state should be the transition from democratic to new decentralized (often secret and alternative) institutions of decision making appearing due to necessity and leading to the change of world elite as the top of hierarchies like in nervous system [Meison 2019: 322-324, 314-318].

N. Moises characterizes sovereignization through the prism of politics fragmentation («The End of Power from Boardrooms to Battlefields and Churches to States, Why Being in Charge isn't What It Used to Be») [Moises 2017]. Basic reasons of changes in political self-determination for political actors the author sees in transformation of governing power as the result of possible revolutions: 1) increasing – as the overcoming of population control means by increasing its quantity, age composition, geographic division, life span, health status; 2) mobility as the end of fidelity to social hierarchies; 3) mentality as creation of new middle class – driving force of actions and behaviour [Moises 2017: 107, 110, 138].

Together all mentioned revolutions caused the phenomenon of «politics dispersion». These motive events lead to the situations when some signs of sovereignty such as armies, control over borders, currency, economics, taxation are left in national states [Moises 2017: 269]. But against a background of «hierarchies levelling» there is a gradual process to form the basis for sovereignization of small groups made of countries which come to an agreement about cooperative activity. Such associations become more effective than the group of dominating states, because the last ones can't determine directions of international cooperation and means for overcoming present and future crisis with the help of public organizations which act on the basis of international agreements [Moises 2017: 257, 258].

Moreover, central power is paralyzed when decentralization conditions the creation of new legal and executive bodies on lower levels, and the power is redistributed from capital and executive institutions to regional and local governments [Moises 2017: 139, 167].

As a result all these tendencies cause not only the «strengthening of hyper-competition» among different political actors with simultaneous recruiting of amateurs to fulfil political activity, but also lead to «gaining of new opportunities by insignificant countries and non-state formations» on the background of decline of «the great players» and multilateral institutions' united attempts [Moises 2017: 180-185, 145].

In our opinion, the idea of the interdependence of emergency situations and sovereignization makes us, first of all, recall the works of one of the followers of G. Agamben – S.D. Krasner. In particular, the works in which he stated the presence of several dimensions of sovereignty (such as inland independence, control over borders and migration, recognition under international law, absence on the territory of churches, political parties and agents of other countries) and its coexistence with acceptance of historical examples intrinsic to the states which under the influence of emergency situations were sovereign in one aspect while at the same time being sovereign in another of these aspects [Krasner 2001: 6-12].

2. THE REALITIES OF CONFRONTING THE COVID-19 IN THE POST-SOVIET SPACE

It should be admitted that transformation of political being under the influence of struggle with COVID-19 happened to be more multidimensional than theoretical works. For instance, because of restrictive measures, directed to fight COVID-19, states-members of Council of Europe in March 2020 began to inform the General Secretary of CU about derogation (partial deviation from laws) of some items of European Convention on Human Rights, as it is stipulated by article 15 of the Convention [ZN,UA 2020a].

It was rather demonstrative to give the government of Hungarian prime-minister V.Orban extraordinary powers with no fixed term to fight with the pandemic [News.liga.net. 2020]. As the result the government became able to rule the country with the help of decrees without parliament's appreciation. At the same time, the adopted law stipulates five-year imprisonment for violation of measures against corona and spreading of false information about the crises.

13 countries of EU were concerned about the influence of corona virus restrictions on the supremacy of law and basic human rights [Korrespondent 2020]. The joint statement said that emergency measures ought to be restricted, be propositional and temporary, be under control and esteem principles and duties of international law (especially concerning restrictions on freedom of speech and media).

The struggle with corona virus in Ukraine may be attributed to that trend. Thus, Cabinet of Ministers Resolution N211 (in the version of CMU Resolution from 02.04.2020 N255) implements severe restrictions on stay in public places without respirators or masks; no more than two people are allowed to be in the street (with exception); children under 14 aren't allowed to be in public places without parents, guardians or adult relatives; restrictions on visiting of parks, recreation zone, forests and beaches (with exception); all people older than 60 shouldn't leave places of isolation without permission [Government portal 2020]. The obligatory observation for the term 14 days after returning from abroad is also stipulated. Mentioned above measures were supplemented with the decision forbidding regular and irregular motor-car (except personal cars), railway and air transportation.

As we can see, the scope of restrictions cast doubt on article 29 of the Law of Ukraine «About the defence of population against infectious diseases», according to it quarantine is instituted and annulled by the Cabinet of Ministers, because this applies to guaranteed by the Constitution fundamental rights: right to freedom and personal immunity (article 29); right to movement (article 33); right to freedom of religion (article 35); right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association (article 39); right to business activity (article 42); right to work (article 43); right to strike (article 44) [LAW OF UKRAINE 2020].

This tendency has been confirmed during the third wave of CORONA viral pandemic (autumn, 2021). Thus, in October 2021 the European Court of Human Rights con-

firmed that obligatory vaccination was legit and could be necessary, that doesn't contradict to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. Based on this, the Ministry of Health of Ukraine made a decision about the obligatory vaccination for employees of educational establishments and State institutions. It means that unvaccinated employees will be kept out of work for the period of quarantine and they won't be paid for this period, but their place of work will be saved for them. As we can see, these quarantine measures conflict with some Laws of Ukraine. In particular, article 2-1 of the Labour Code of Ukraine forbids discrimination on any criteria in the sphere of work, and article 43 of the Constitution of Ukraine guarantees that citizens are protected from illegal dismissing. Pandemic period in Ukraine certifies the reduction of democratization and infringement of power distribution principles with corresponding enforcement of executive branch. For instance, in 2021 National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine, in fact, became an analogue of «soviet politburo» – an additional structure of executive branch, where they have collective discussions of the most resonance events and this is the basis for the President to make decree concerning the solving of these problems. It should be mentioned that such a practice is completely inconsistent with article 107 of the Constitution, according to which National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine is the coordinating body in national security and defence matters under the President of Ukraine and coordinates and control the activity executive power organs in the sphere of national security and defence, and the Head of National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine is the President of Ukraine.

According to P. Wawrzynski such a «revival of soviet manner» in overcoming of aftermath of emergency situation takes place because «function of memory is deep-rooted in political traditions» with the appropriate disdainful attitude to human needs on the background of spreading in media the statements that authoritarian-totalitarian regimes are more effective in crisis overcoming [Wawrzynski 2013: 126].

We think that representation of coronavirus influence on the processes of sovereignty as self-determination and subjectivization of political subjects in an emergency isn't complete without taking into consideration de-globalization processes which are accompanied not only by the returning of influence of local economy but renovation of neo-feudal economic practices of monopolistic space exploitation (physical and virtual) [Scheidel 2020].

And this, in its turn, influences the decline of political means to explore the politic space. This is connected with the fact that «net society is not a horizontal one, it is diametrically opposed» because discussions in the network of political problems doesn't mean the transfer of political activity on the new level. Thus, M. Paskvinelli in his work «Digital neo-feudalism: crisis of network policy and new typology of rent» emphasized that «under the circumstances of communicatory infrastructure (hardware level, protocolary level, level of metadata and social networks) redistribution

of resources under the control of one or another elite group becomes the essence of political process [Paskvinelli 2010].

All mentioned above actualize the thought of S.N. Eisenstadt and L. Roniger as to the ability of clientelism to transform and gain new kinds and forms and continue playing the significant role in political and administrative life, intertwining with efficient institutions and reproducing patrimonial practices in utterly efficient environment [Eisenstadt, Roniger 1984].

It should be mentioned that many scientists think that Ukrainian neopatrimonialism has been inherited from the USSR, and such a conception is based on the recognition of patron-client relations deep-rooted into the basic culture [Eisenstadt 2016: 372]. Among the authors who diagnose the existence of patron-client relations in the Soviet Union are [Eisenstadt&Roniger 1984; Lemarchand 1981; Gellner&Waterbury 1977; Graziano 1983]. The same feature of their works is the recognition of soviet clientelism as a substitute for trust and intercession that appears at the time of modernisation, ruining sacral sanctions of being and informal basis of social affiliation. Such circumstances led to the situation when patron-client relations resembled buying-selling services, and presents and appreciation turned into bribes. But patron-client relations played an important role in the societies that followed the way of modernisation because they combined solidarity and striving to establish pseudo-family relations in resources exchange on the basis of differences in social status. In the conception of the patronclientelism in the USSR they accentuated on the fact that the project of modernization (in historical form of Industrialization) had borrowed and forced character that turned social mechanism into institutional hybrids. Thus, having no «middle class», the ruling stratum became interested in reproduction of status quo rather than in the development, and for that they used administrative apparatus and bureaucratic obstacles to collect the tribute. Political activity gained features of pseudo-ideological personified relations, aspiration for hereditary leadership and reelection of one and the same politician. The reason of this was seen in the lack of equal access to political activity that caused the demand for the help of higher rank officials. All these together led to the transformation of the essence of policy, when politicians got motivation to mainly solve social problems and officials – to make decisions without orienteering on concrete electorate [Bussell 2019]. Patron-client relations in the USSR were described not only as taking posts without professional competence but also as the form of dependent relations, in which socioeconomic factor, together with ideological, cultural, religious and military factors of world outlook formation, was the condition of system survival [Shoemaker&Spanier 1984]. An important milestone in the political science is the work by Sheila Fitzpatrick «Patronage and the Intelligentsia in Stalin's Russia», in which patron-client relations in the USSR were defined as running deep into soviet elite [Fitzpatrick 2014]. Here the role of soviet patron-clientelism was reduced to the compensating for the absence of proper legal system. Soviet clientelism was positioned as relations between senior officials

and principles, where being an influential person gave an average one freedom in political sense and access to shortages – «pull» – in economic sphere.

At the beginning of XXI century western political science started to cover soviet kind of patron-client relations in the context of democratization of post-soviet space and as the reason of democratic institutions and processes simulation. Among the most solid scientific papers is the work «Comparing political corruption and clientelism» [Kawata 2006], that led to the appearance of corresponding scientific course [e.g. Kitschelt&Wilkinson 2007].

On the basis on this recognition, in Ukrainian scientific works of 1990s, soviet political elite was treated as a specific administrative hierarchy (or «nomenklatura») with such characteristic features as total accountability, absence of competition in ruling elite and social feedback [Fesenko 1995].

To our mind, in independent Ukraine neopatrimonialism was recreated in the features of «belonging» based on acquaintance, common membership of senior official's retinue, when promotion the senior official by ruling strata meant career movement of his supporters and secondary role of ideological slogans amid being concentrated on personal interests [Poiarkova 2019]. Under such circumstances patron-client relations were defined as a form of new reality mastering by old means. In the course of time this was supplemented with the tendency to inherit available privileges. Access to privileged education, acquaintances, taking up posts with perspectives of promotion became the channels giving an opportunity to inherit influential positions. With time all these conditioned further ability of post-soviet ruling class to survive during system changes in independent Ukraine.

In other words, one of the essential characteristics of Ukrainian state at the time of COVID pandemic is the disclosure of dependence on influential people, which is supported by different social strata which change their loyalty for certain preferences from budget money sharing. Personification reveals itself in the appearance of institutions, hierarchies and constructions which are based on personalities and gradually deviate from the rules of political competence. This leads to: 1) reduction of moral and intellectual levels in education, science, culture and public communication; 2) imitation of reforms; 3) degradation of deputy body and parties as well as total discredit of judges and law-enforcement bodies. As a result, party patronage became the typical model of relations between authorities (central and local) and business groups, and conversion of political capital into economic one, corruption of political elite, clientelism turned into the most effective means of state government.

The explanation of this fact can be found in Th. Carothers's works (in particular in «The End of the Transition Paradigm») where he gave the definition of hybrid regimes of «grey zone» as those that have features of democratization of political life, including the existence of restricted political space to be and opposition parties and independent civil society, as well as regular elections and democratic institutions [Carothers 2002]. Such regimes are characterized by weak representation of citizens' interests,

low level of political participation, breaking the law by officials, dubious legitimacy of elections, public distrust of state institutions and low institutional effectiveness of the state [Carothers 2002: 49].

Th. Carothers distinguished two phases (two syndromes) in the development of hybrid regimes. The first one is the syndrome of feckless pluralism with its inherent political transparency that makes leaders declare their intentions concerning reforms which are only declarations. Feckless pluralism has some elements of democracy such as elections and rotation of power. But citizens are kept out of the participation and distrust the political elite (as corrupt officials). This phase is characterised by political competition between ingrained parties the essence of which is patronage nets. The following phase is the syndrome of dominant-power politics [Carothers 2002: 52]. It is characterised by domination of one political group – party, family, a single leader – and makes it impossible to change the power in the nearest future. In such a situation the main state funds supply the ruling party. The monopoly of power is supplemented by elections which are like a show. The state is ineffective because of single-party rule, unstable state governing, large-scale corruption and «crony capitalism». Regime of dominant power is presented by constitutionally adopted elements of democracy (democratic constitution, elections of the President, parliament], there is a certain space for opposition, possibility to compete at elections, but one-party political groups (party, family, a single leader) dominate in political system.

To understand such regimes it is necessary to take into account the cyclicity of their functioning occurs as a result of street protest. In such regimes the reason of social disturbances is variation of public mood which changes strategies in elites' behaviour and, consequently, dynamics of the political regime. Loss of support for the ruling regime is possible thanks to: 1) disagreement between the state of economy and political support; 2) discrepancy between social expectations and the level of authoritarianism. For instance, social expectations contradict the increase of repressive measures, tax pressure, payments for housing and communal services and, in general, dismantle of social state. This contradiction makes new risks to aggravate antagonism between: 1) interests of population and elite connected with industrial sector of economy having made during the soviet period; 2) democratization as the elite see it and social expectations.

In other words, under such regimes supporting of authoritarianism or democracy vectors is connected with social expectation concerning one of these models. This process is characterised by two phases, where the first one takes in the period of erosion of values belonged to the previous regime. When the regime is yet a stable, but its support becomes to reduce and political institutions start to be ineffective, opposition looks like a marginal body; all the initiatives belong to the «power» elites keep the loyalty of the regime. The next phase is the split of elites and consolidations around an alternative political project.

Thus, the demand for changes opens for some elites opportunities which are inaccessible under the existing regime. In fact, it is the transition from «outer arbitration» (with attracting of public at large in the frames of public competition) to «inner arbitration» among the elite levels. That supplies consolidation of elites and gradual reduction of public participation in politics. The stampede of some elites to «new demands» strengthens opposition's structures while mobilisation opportunities of the former regime reduce. This provokes instability and crises. After this the new system of political values starts to implement as a system of political reforms.

The pandemic of coronavirus disavow the fact that in Ukraine there is as an authoritarian model of governing, where the President is the main «patron» of political clans, being at the head of the pyramid and uniting around him patronage-clientele systems with the privilege to appoint on responsible posts loyally, without taking into consideration professional skills, that is followed by ineffectiveness of state institutions. The symptom of the present time in Ukraine is the spreading of «vertical blackmail in the form of discrediting evidence» [Radiosvoboda 2021]. As A. Ledeneva sees it, such blackmail is an integral practice of hybrid neo-patrimonial regime [Ledeneva 2006]. This explains why in Ukraine they used state money from the Fund to Fight COVID-19 in other spheres of state governing. For example, in 2020 the amount of money allocated from the Fund to Fight COVID-19 was 78.4 billion hryvnias from 80.9 bln, including the use of 63.7 bln hryvnias of 72 bln from general fund and 2.8 bln hryvnias of 6.4 bln from special fund.

Structure of the biggest money recipients attract attention [gov.ua 2021]. First of all, it is the State Agency of Motor roads which used 25.7 billion hryvnias of 26.2 bn (or 98.3%) to develop and maintain common use and State-Aid roads. Secondly, it's the Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Agriculture, which used 8.8 billion hryvnias of 10.7 bn or 82.1%. That money was used as unemployment reliefs, as one-time compensations for the united payment of national insurance paid to subjects of economic activity and one-time material aid to subjects of economic activity.

Thirdly, it's the Ministry of Social Policy which used 4 billion hryvnias of 6.8 bn or 59.8% from general fund and 2.8 billion hryvnias of 5.0 bn or 55.5% from special fund. Money mentioned above was paid as insurance payments for temporary disability, payments to families of medical staff died from COVID-19, parental benefit to individual entrepreneurs, one-time material aid to assured people owing to the loss of income because of absolute prohibition of their activity during the quarantine. Fourthly, it's the Ministry of Public Health which used 17.8 billion hryvnias of 20.4 bn from general fund to buy reviving apparatuses, means of self-defense, equipment for admitting areas in hospital regions, to increase salaries of medical staff that treat people suffering from COVID-19, to deliver oxygen to hospitals, etc. But 86.8 % of 1.4 billion hryvnias from special fund weren't used.

Mentioned above tendency is seen in the realization of the program called «Great Motor road Building». In 2020 120 billion hryvnias were spent on road construction.

In 2018 only 40 bn were spent on roads. Thus, in 2018 3,800 km of motor roads were repaired, but in 2020, thanks to the «Great Motor road Building» program they repaired 4,000 km and the general cost of such a maintenance doubled [5.UA 2021]. It is important to mention that this program is positioned as the program of the President of Ukraine, but the mentioned objects were built before and weren't connected with the President, and money appeared thanks to the changes in tax code and budget code, which were adopted several years ago and provided for fiscal revenues from excise-duties on fuels and lubricants into a special fund called «Motor road Fund». Among the reasons of such an increase in the cost of work they call cartel agreement of the largest six companies, which share 67% of motor road budget. Wide spreading was given to the information concerning the fact that European Bank for Reconstruction and Development had included a special issue into the contract for credit extension in the amount of 450 million Euros which demanded the discharge of four clerks, who had financed tender offers, from European projects.

Diagnostically, all these are repeated on a regional level to the advantage of local elites and their partners in regional authorities. This undermines the authority of central bodies, the example of such actions is the refusal to implement quarantine measures in some cities during the crisis moment of the pandemic. Illegal and unconstitutional is the implementation of particular covenants and regime of residence without introduction of defence or emergency situation that can be introduced by a decree of the President and approved by Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine [Druzenko 2020].

The Russian Federation also uses the pandemic and is the subject of the sovereignty of the so-called LPR-DPR. Thus, from 18.03.2020 to 01.05.2020 Russia forbade entry to Ukraine for both self-proclaimed republics [Chervonenko 2020]. From 2020 to 2021 self-declared «republics» have blocked the work of checkpoint on the line of demarcation to deeply separate these arrears from Ukraine under the pretext of COVID-19 spreading [Dw.com 2021]. So, before the pandemic five checkpoints worked in Donbas. Now along the 400 kilometer demarcation line only two checkpoints work – one Lugansk region and one in Donetsk region.

But they allowed entering Russia to those people from LPR-DPR who have Russian passport or who in Ukrainian passport or in the passport of LPR-DPR have the record about residence on the territories beyond Kyiv's control. It is important that with the implementation of «the regime of high readiness to emergency situation» they continue to give the Ukrainians Russian passports [Romanova 2020].

The situation of coronavirus pandemic was used by the RF as a cause for propaganda in LPR-DPR. Internet media under the control of the Russian Federation and with the help of information spam made necessary «information fuss» and frankly propagandistic disinformation about: 1) institutional disability of Ukraine and western countries to take preventive measures, treat and oppose to the pandemic; 2) the situation on the territory under Ukrainian control concerning the number of infections with COVID-19 and the speed of infection spreading; 3) infection state in Military Forces

of Ukraine; 4) information concerning enrichment of officials thanks to the selling of protective masks, etc.

They also tendentiously presented the decision of Ukrainian government to temporarily stop crossing the demarcation line by people registered in the territory under control and want to enter the territory under control though the checkpoints [Donetsk Institute Information 2021].

It is important that on the territory of occupied Donbas the RF breaks not only quarantine restrictions but also article 51 of Geneva Convention, which underlines that «Country-invader must not make people from occupied territories to serve in their armies or subsidiary units. Any pressure or propaganda to the benefit of voluntary draft is forbidden».

For example, in so-called «LPR» such an «order» was published by the leader of «LPR» Leonid Pasichnyk on November 16, 2020. In one of the paragraphs of the «order» it is said that in these «military units» they don't forbid public meetings which were forbidden because of COVID spreading. At the same time «people's militsiya» were charged to control 1.5 meter social distance, wearing protecting masks and gloves among the participants of such meetings.

In so-called «DNR» the same «order» was published by the leader of «DNR» Denis Pushilin on November 21, 2020. In the preamble to the order it is said that «the measures are taken in order to control the presence of servicemen who are in reserve and are assigned to a military unit (assigned to special formations), to staff reserves and mobilization units» [Vostok-SOS 2020].

It is extremely significant that Germany and France show their concern about the restrictions imposed by separatists on the observation mission of OSCE since the 21st of March [Inshe.tv 2020]. Heads of Ministries of Foreign Affairs of both countries accused Russian-orientated separatists in Donbass of prevention to work of OSCE observers under the lee of corona.

The successful attempts of the RF as to the sovereignization of LPR-DPR are proved by the leader of CREON group Fares Kilsie who thinks that this region might become the area for expansion of economic cooperation between the RF and the EU by means of mutual investment into industry [Interfax 2021].

As to the occupied Crimea, the RF used a different practice. Russian FSB Border Administration in the Republic of Crimea limited crossing the border by residents of the annexed Crimea who have local registration and also by residents of Russia because of COVID-19. At the same time residents of the Crimea can enter the peninsula from Ukraine without any limits [RadioSvoboda 2020].

In addition the RF's government has extended the list of territories and land plots that can be in property of «foreigners» and «foreign legal persons» and in fact deprived the Crimean Tartars who in most have the Ukrainian citizenship, of their land [ZN,UA 2020].

CONCLUSION

There is no doubt that pandemic of COVID-19 is the factor which was transformed from medical one into a trigger for the processes of self-determination for political subjects of different levels. First of all, this is connected with the conflict between universal values and emergence actions directed to save lives, which was revealed by the pandemic. Some countries' governments realized that by means of adoption of anti-coronavirus programs, implementation of quarantine, regime of entry, etc., and in such a way they set the superiority of national interests over the decisions and propositions of supranational structures and organizations (e.g. European Union and World Health Organization).

To our mind, it can be established that pandemic of COVID-19 stipulated sovereignization as the renovation of national states' political subjectivization. Implementation of quarantine in European countries not only revealed the restricted ability of EU's institutions to make the fastest decisions for their citizens' sake during the pandemic but also certified borderlines within the EU with the transmission in decision-making to national or even regional level.

So, we can distinguish two dimensions of contemporary sovereignization. For the EU countries it is the decline of European solidarity's basis. For post-soviet countries it is a certain degradation with the trend to the well-established institutional hierarchies, returning of actors, structures and relations of previous time. The analysis of interconnection between the pandemic and sovereignization of Ukraine is not complete without considering the fact that the world pandemic of COVID-19 became not only a medical problem for the Russian Federation and made by it LPR and DPR on the part of Donetsk and Lugansk regions but also a propaganda opportunity and an instrument of information influence on slowing-down of reintegration of Donbas into the united Ukrainian and European space.

The merge point of these practices is the decline of democratic freedoms and procedures as the result of life values reappraisal. Thus, freedoms and rights of average person become crimes, because moving without mask is danger to life. Under the pressure of necessity to save life, civil freedoms are being limited (for example, restriction in movements). So the pandemic plays the role of mutagenic factor because it not only changes the essence of sovereignty as a state and a suprastate formation but also causes degradation of democratic values and institutions amid actualization of neopatrimonial practices of survival.

REFERENCES

- Agamben, Dz., ([1998] 2011), *Homo sacer. Suverennaya vlast i golaya zhizn* [from Rus.: Homo Sacer. Sovereign Power and Bare Life], Moskva, Izdatelstvo «Evropa».
- Agamben, Dz., ([2003] 2011), *Homo sacer. Chrezvyichaynoe polozhenie* [from Italian: Homo Sacer. Stato di eccezione], available online at http://abuss.narod.ru/Biblio/polis/agamben_hs2-1.htm
- Bussell, J., (2019), *Clients and Constituents: Political Responsiveness in Patronage Democracies Modern South Asia*. Oxford: University Press.
- Carothers, Th., (2002), *The End of the Transition Paradigm*, in *Journal of Democracy*, National Endowment for Democracy and The Johns Hopkins University Press, 13:1, 5-21.
- Chervonenko, V., (2020), *Donbas na karantyni: «DNR» zakryvaie punkty propusku cherez koronavirus, Rosiia ne puskaie* [from Ukr.: Donbass in quarantine: «DNR» closes checkpoints because of a coronavirus, Russia doesn't let], BBC News, 20.3.20, available online at <https://www.bbc.com/ukrainian/features-51974270>
- Cukierman A., (2021), *Effectiveness of collective action against the pandemic: Is there a difference between democratic and authoritarian regimes?*, in CEPR Discussion Paper No. 15791, available online at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165176521001178>
- Donetsk Institute Information, (2021), *COVID-19 in the propaganda of «DNR» and «LNR»*, available online at <https://dii.dn.ua/analytics/157-covid-19-v-propagandi-dnr-ta-lnr>
- Druzenko, H., (2020), *Derzhavnyi perevorot, yakoho my ne pomityly* [from Ukr.: A coup d'état, which we did not notice], Hvylya.net, 5.4.2020, available online at <https://hvylya.net/analytics/204095-derzhavnyi-perevorot-yakogo-mi-ne-pomityly>
- Dw.com., (2021), *Izolovani v «DNR»: yak i navishcho separatysty blokuiut KPVV na Donbasi*, [from Ukr.: Isolated in «DNR»: how and why separatists block CPVV in Donbass], available online at <https://www.dw.com/uk/vizy-i-dozvoly-yak-i-navishcho-separatysty-blokuiut-kpvv-na-donbasi/a-57387177>
- Eisenstadt S. N., Roniger L., (1984), *Patrons, clients and friends, Interpersonal relations and the structure of trust in society*, Cambridge.
- Gellner, E., Waterbury, J., (1977), *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*, London: Duckworth.
- Glavcom.ua., (2021), *Ponad 30 osib, poviazanykh iz «Kvartalom», otrymaly derzhposady* [from Ukr.: More than 30 people associated with the Quarter have received government positions], available online at <https://glavcom.ua/country/politics/zelenskij-za-rik-pratsevlashtuvav-u-vladi-desjatki-kvartalivtsiv-spisok-680411.html>
- Graziano, L., (1983), *Political Clientelism and Comparative Perspectives*, in *International Political Science Review* 4(4): 495-518.
- Gov.ua., (2021), *Minfin predstavliaie detalnyi analiz vykorystannia koshtiv Fondu borotby z COVID u 2020 rotsi holovnymy rozporiadnykamy* [from Ukr.: The Ministry of Finance presents a detailed analysis of the use of the COVID Fund in 2020 by the main managers], available online at <https://www.kmu.gov.ua/news/minfin-predstavlyaye-detalnij-analiz-vikoristannya-koshtiv-fondu-borotbi-z-covid-u-2020-roci-golovnimi-rozporiadnykamy>
- Fesenko, V., (1995), *Politicheskaya elita Ukrainyi: protivorechiya formirovaniya i razvitiya* [from Rus.: Political Elite of Ukraine: Contradictions of Formation and Development], in *Polis* (6): 87-94.
- Fitzpatrick, Sh., (2014), *Patronage and the Intelligentsia in Stalin's Russia in Challenging Traditional Views of Russian History*, edited by Stephen G. Wheatcroft, Basingstoke, United Kingdom: Palgrave MacMillan, 92-111.
- Government portal, (2020), *Postanova Kabinetu Ministriv № 211 (u redaktsii Postanovy KMU vid 2 kvitnia 2020 r. № 255)* [from Ukr.: Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers № 211 (as amended by the Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of April 2, 2020 № 255)], available online at <https://www.kmu.gov.ua/npas/pro-vnesennya-zmin-do-postanovi-kabinetu-ministriv-ukrm020420ayini-vid-11-bereznya-2020-r-211>
- Higgs, R., ([1987] 2010), *Krizis i Leviatan. Povоротные моменты роста американского правительства* [from Rus.: Crisis and Leviathan: Critical Episodes in the Growth of American Government], Moskva-Chelyabinsk: IRISEN.

- Inshe.tv., (2020), *Germaniya i Franciya: Okkupanty ORDLO ispolzuyut koronavirus kak prikrytie* [from Rus.: Germany and France: CADLO invaders use coronavirus as a cover], Inshe.tv, 31.3.2020, available online at <https://inshe.tv/society/2020-03-31/519363/>
- Interfax, (2021), *Kak COVID-19 povliyyayet na vneshnyuyu politiku Evropeyskogo soyuza* [from Rus.: How COVID-19 will affect the foreign policy of the European Union], available online at <https://www.interfax.ru/world/709958>
- Karabulut G., Zimmermann K.F., Bilgin M.H. et al. (2021). *Democracy and COVID-19 outcomes in Economics Letters*. Volume 203, June 2021, 109840, available online at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165176521001178>
- Kawata, J., (2006), *Comparing political corruption and clientelism*, Hampshire, England ; Burlington, VT : Ashgate.
- Kelly, J., (2020), *BBC Stories. Coronavirus: The month everything changed, 28.3.2020*, available online at <https://www.bbc.com/news/stories-52066956>
- Kitschelt, H., Wilkinson, St. I., (2007), *Patrons, clients, and policies: Patterns of democratic accountability and political competition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Korrespondent, (2020), *Nova dyktatura Yevropy? Borotba Uhorshchyny z virusom. Korrespondent* [from Ukr.: The new dictatorship of Europe? Hungary's fight against the virus], 2.4.2020, available online at <https://ua.korrespondent.net/world/4212635-nova-dyktatura-yevropy-borotba-uhorschyny-z-virusom>
- Krasner, St. D., (ed.), (2001), *Problematic Sovereignty: Contested Rules and Political Possibilities*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Law of Ukraine, (2000), *Pro zakhyst naseleння vid infektsiynykh khvorob* (Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy (VVR), 2000, № 29, st. 228) [from Ukr.: About protection of the population against infectious diseases (Information of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (VVR), № 29, article of the law 228)], available online at <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1645-14#Text>
- Ledeneva, A. V., (2006), *How Russia Really Works: The Informal Practices That Shaped Post-Soviet Politics and Business*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lemarchand, R., (1981), *Comparative Political Clientelism: Structure, Process and Optic*, in *Political Clientelism, Patronage and Development*, eds. S.N.Eisenstadt and R.Lemarchand, Beverly Hills, CA: 7-32.
- Meison, Pol., ([2015] 2019), *Postkapitalizm. Putivnyk u maibutnie* [from Ukr.: PostCapitalism: A Guide to Our Future], KYIV: Nash format.
- Mizes, L. fon., ([1944] 2013), *Vsemogushee pravitelstvo: totalnoe gosudarstvo i totalnaya vojna* [from Rus.: Omnipotent Government: The Rise of Total State and Total War], Moskva, Sotium.
- Moises, N., ([2013] 2017), *Zanepad vlady: Vid vladnykh kabinetiv do poliv bytvyy y tserkov, a potim i do derzhavy, abo chomu sohodni buty pry vladi oznachaie zovsim inshe, nizh kolys* [from Ukr.: The End of Power From Boardrooms to Battlefields and Churches to States, Why Being In Charge Isn't What It Used to Be], Kyiv: Fors Ukraina.
- News.liga.net., (2020), *Parlament Vengrii prodlil chrezvyichaynyie polnomochiya pravitelstva Viktora Orbana, ne ogranichiv srok ih deystviya* [from Rus.: Hungarian Prime Minister Orban received indefinite emergency powers], 30.3.2020, available online at <https://news.liga.net/world/news/premer-vengrii-orban-poluchil-bessrochnye-chrezvyichaynye-polnomochiya>
- Paskvinelli, M., ([2010] 2012), *Tsifrovoi neofeodalizm: krizis setevoi politiki i novaya topologiya renty* [from Rus.: Paskvinelli Matteo. Digital neo-feudalism: crisis of network policy and new typology of rent], available online at <http://moscowartmagazine.com/issue/12/article/161>
- Poiarkova T., Plotnytska I., (2019), *Evolution of patron-client relations in the USSR in Ideology and politics*, 3(14), Pp.11-20.
- Radiosvoboda, (2021), *RNBO zaprovadyla sanktsii proty Medvedchuka i yoho druzhyny* [from Ukr.: The National Security and Defense Council has imposed sanctions against Medvedchuk and his wife], available online at <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/news-rnbo-sanktsii-medvedchuk/31111807.html>
- Romanova, El., (2020), *Rassadnik novyih grazhdan. Nesmotrya na rezhim samoizolyatsii, v Rostovskoy oblasti prodolzhaetsya massovaya vyidacha pasportov zhitelyam «DNR» i «LNR»* [from Rus.: Breeding ground for new citizens. Despite the self-isolation regime, in the Rostov region, the mass issuance of passports to residents of the «DPR» and «LPR» continues], Novayagazeta, 8.4.2020, available online at <https://novayagazeta.ru/articles/2020/04/08/84790-rassadnik-novyh-grazhdan>

Scheidel, W., ([2017] 2020), *Velikiy uravnitel* [from Rus.: Scheidel, Walter. The Great Leveler: Violence and the History of Inequality from the Stone Age to the Twenty-First Century 2017], available online at <https://ru.bookmate.com/books/XhWaU7CV>.

Shmitt, K., ([1920] 2000), *Politicheskaya teologiya* [from Rus.: Political theology], Moskva: «KANON-press-C».

Shmitt, K., ([1921] 2005), *Diktatura. Ot istochnikov sovremennoj idei suvereniteta do proletarskoj klassovoj borby* [from Rus.: Dictatorship. From the Origin of the Modern Concept of Sovereignty to the Proletarian Class Struggle], SPb: «Nauka».

Shoemaker, Ch., Spanier, J., (1984), *Patron-Client State Relationships*. New York, N.Y. : Praeger.

Vostok-SOS, (2020), «Viiskovi zbory» v «L/DNR» ta sytuatsiia z COVID-19: porushennia prav liudyny, zafiksovani u lystopadi [from Ukr.: «Military meeting» in «L/DNR» and the situation with COVID-19: human rights violations against, recorded in November], available online at https://vostok-sos.org/vijskovi-zbori-v-l-dnr-ta-situacziya-z-covid-19-porushennya-prav-lyudini-na-tot-zafiksovani-u-listopadi/?utm_source=rss&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=vijskovi-zbori-v-l-dnr-ta-situacziya-z-covid-19-porushennya-prav-lyudini-na-tot-zafiksovani-u-listopadi

Wawrzynski, P., (2013), *Civil Society and Transition: The Role of Politics of Memory in the Establishment of a New Order, Questions of Civil Society: Category-Position-Functionality*, Edited by Ralph Schattkowsky & Adam Jarosz, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing: 125-142.

Zhegulev, Il., (2020), *Invoking Cossack Resistance, Ukrainian Mayor Defies Lockdown Measures*, Reuters, 5.4.2020, available online at <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-co-roanvirus-ukraine-mayor-idUSKBN22H1X7>

a) ZN,UA, (2020), *Krainy-chleny Rady Yevropy povidomliaiut pro vidstup vid deiakykh polozhen cherez pandemiu* [from Ukr.: Council of Europe member states report deviations from certain provisions due to a pandemic], ZN,UA, 31.3.2020, available online at <https://dt.ua/WORLD/krayini-chleni-radi-yevropi-povidomyayut-pro-vidstup-vid-deyakh-polozhen-yek-pl-cherez-pandemiyu-342717>

b) ZN,UA, (2020), *Putin peredav prava vlasnosti na zemliu v Krymu rosiianam* [from Ukr.: Putin handed over land ownership in Crimea to Russians], ZN,UA, 25.3.2020, available online at https://dt.ua/WORLD/putin-peredav-prava-vlasnosti-na-zemlyu-v-krimu-rosiyanam-342568_.html

5.UA, (2021), *Presidents program «great construction or «great stealing»*, available online at <https://www.5.ua/polityka/prohrama-prezydenta-velyke-budivnytstvo-chy-velyke-kradivnytstvo-rozsliduvannia-espreso-240480.html>