

**S.J.D. Andrzej Pogłódek**, Assistant Professor

Department of Comparative Constitutional

Law and Modern Political Systems

Faculty of Law and Administration

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw

## **SUMMARY**

### **of professional accomplishments**

**1. First name and surname:**

Andrzej Pogłódek

**2. Diplomas and academic degrees awarded:**

Doctor of Juridical Science, obtained at the Faculty of Law and Administration at the University of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński in Warsaw from 4 June 2013.

Thesis title: *Polski model zmiany konstytucji na tle porównawczym* [The Polish model of the change of the constitution on a comparative background].

Supervisor: Dr hab. Bogumił Szmulik, prof. UKSW.

Reviewers: Prof. zw. dr hab. Bogusław Banaszak, Prof. zw. dr hab. Mirosław Granat.

Master of International Relations, obtained at the Faculty of Law and Administration at the University of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński (October 22, 2013); Thesis title: *Organy wewnętrzne Senatu Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej* [Internal Organs of The Senate of the Republic of Poland].

Supervisor: Dr hab. Bogumił Szmulik, prof. UKSW.

Master of Law, obtained at the Faculty of Law and Administration at the University of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński (June 9, 2011); Thesis title: *Ludowa inicjatywa ustawodawcza*

w Konstytucji RP z dnia 2 kwietnia 1997 roku [The People's Legislative Initiative in the Constitution of Poland of 2 April 1997]

Supervisor: Prof. zw. dr hab. Mirosław Granat.

### **3. Information on hitherto employment in scientific institutions:**

October 1, 2011-September 30, 2015	An Assistant in the Department of Comparative Constitutional Law and Contemporary Political Systems at the Faculty of Law and Administration of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
1 October 2015 until now	Assistant Professor in the Department of Comparative Constitutional Law and Contemporary Political Systems at the Faculty of Law and Administration of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
1 June 2018 until now	Assistant Professor in the Section of Fundamental Rights at the Institute of Justice

### **4. Description of the academic achievement, referred to in Article 16(2)**

#### **a) the title of scientific achievements**

Authoring a monograph titled: *Instytucja referendum we współczesnym Kirgistanie. Studium prawno-polityczne* [Institute of Referendum in Modern Kyrgyzstan. Legal-Political Research].

#### **b) (author, title/titles of publication, year of publication, the name of the publishing house, editorial reviewers)**

Andrzej Pogłódek, *Instytucja referendum we współczesnym Kirgistanie. Studium prawno-polityczne*, Instytut Prawa Ustrojowego, Warszawa 2018, ISBN 978-83-64744-76-1, e-ISBN 978-83-64744-68-6, pp. 336, reviewers: Prof. zw. dr hab. Jerzy Jaskiernia; Dr hab. Jadwiga Potrzeszcz, prof. KUL.

#### **c) provides an overview of scientific work and mentioned to the results achieved, together with a discussion of their possible usage**

#### **The scope of research monographs**

The subject of the work is to provide the institutions of the national referendum in modern Kyrgyzstan. In accordance with the (sub) title of the work contains not only a representation of the normative solutions, but also the practice of the use of this institution in Kyrgyzstan.

The selection of it was legitimate meaning of the institution of the referendum on the political-legal of modern States. In fact, it seems reasonable to claim that the evolution of democracy is moving in the direction in which it will be necessary to combine representative democracy with the various institutions of direct democracy or semi-direct. It is difficult to imagine a contemporary democratic State without such institutions. There is no doubt that a significant place among them must be the institution of the referendum. The necessity of a referendum of the regime of the State is that it allows citizens to directly participate in deciding on the Government of the State. You can also conclude that the referendum fully today features a consolidated company and a corrective to the activities of the organs of political power. Reliance upon the institution of the referendum is particularly intense in these countries, which, like Kyrgyzstan pass transitioning.

Secondly, the choice of subject has been influenced by the increased interest in the post-Soviet area in Polish science of constitutional law and political sciences. In recent years began to appear a number of works addressing various issues-body States of the former USSR. However, there appeared so far work undertaking the issue of referendum institutions, which is an institution in the political practice of Central Asian countries is an important policy tool and is regularly used to carry out the body changes or the ruling political elite legitimacy.

Thirdly, Kyrgyzstan is only in former Soviet Central Asia, about which you can say that his political transformation proceeds in the direction of building a modern democracy. It is also from 2010 onwards, the only in the region of Central Asia of parliamentary and Cabinet system-what is a presidential exception in a region where both constitutions, as well as in practice, the political system is a kind of „hyper-presidentialism”, as indicated by the domination of the the head of State over other political authorities. Constitutional changes adopted in the last referendum of the 2016 confirm the selection of the parliamentary model of Government by the Kyrgyz.

And fourthly, the choice there have not been any works on the issue of the referendum in Kyrgyzstan perceived and carried out this way of the topic has also been influenced by the fact the neither law firm, nor political scientist. The monograph written by me in an attempt to fill this gap. Reach about belonging to the constitutional law of foreign countries also appeared with the intention of enriching the existing State of the art, show, as is recognized and which role in the system of the legal system fully the institution of the referendum in the former Soviet state of Asia Central, in which the process of democratization is maximized. Perhaps these solutions and experiences will turn out to be interesting for the Polish legislature.

### **Objective, methodology and systematics of work**

The monograph is focused on the issues of the institution of the referendum, which is one of the most important contemporary institutions of direct democracy. The aim of the book is to show the model of institutions of a nationwide referendum in Kyrgyzstan through a

combination of legal and political practice connected with this insight into the institution.

Extract also five specific objectives. The first is the plant a, in other words – presentation of the legal framework of the institution of the referendum nationwide in the Kyrgyz Republic both contemporary as well as historical dimension. This analysis I conducted pursuant to the provisions of the legislation which apply or apply on the territory of Kyrgyzstan. The second objective is to track and compare the changes in the shape of a standard the institution of direct democracy. As the target of the third explication should be indicated. explanation and justification introduced regulation, so both the reasons for adoption of such a model institution of the referendum, as well as the detailed solutions within its composition. The fourth goal is to attempt to assess the adopted model of institutions from the point of view of the referendum because of the fluids. The last, fifth objective is to present the practice of using a nationwide referendum in Kyrgyzstan and its impact on the transformation of the body in the country.

The presented aims led me to formulate the following assumptions:

1) even though the institution of referendum first appeared in the Basic Law of the Kyrgyz Soviet Socialist Republic from 1937 onwards, it was only after the dissolution of the Soviet Union in Kyrgyzstan have created the necessary framework legal to use.

2) in Kyrgyzstan, as in other countries of Central Asia, which after the dissolution of Soviet Union faced the challenge of transformation of the entire legal system, including regulations governing the institution of the referendum, it was difficult to refer to native before the soviet experience. This is the reason why the reception legal solutions from other countries (including the Russian Federation).

3) legal arrangements relating to the Organization of the referendum in Kyrgyzstan were over the period considerably, which in particular focused on the subject of the management of the referendum and its management mode. Changes in this regard were related to tilt to the regime-and this page was the President, and this Parliament.

4) the referendum in Kyrgyzstan before 2010, had a dimension of antiparliamentary. The referendum was often used during the reign of President Askar Akayev. Carried out at the referenda were controlled by the head of State and were prohegemonic. In addition to the first all focused on changes in the Constitution of Kyrgyzstan from 1993, antiparliamentary nature of this institution was also preserved under the rule of the Kurmanbek Bakiyev (constitutional referendum of 2007);

5) Constitutional Referendum conducted in June 2010, has played a significant role in legitimizing the post-revolutionary their order in Kyrgyzstan and has opened this Central Asia Republic path to democracy.

6) Currently model institutions countrywide referendum in Kyrgyzstan seems to be optimal for the country.

In the work of dogmatic legal method was used. It relies on the analysis of the legal norms and the study of their mutual relationship. It was enriched with an analysis of the institutional position which allowed the institution of constitutional referendum of Kyrgyzstan. The theme of the book required also use historical method, which is a combination of historical methods with appropriate legal teachings dogmatic method. Reach at the same time after the method legal-dogmatic and historical and legal has made it possible to complete presentation of the institution of referendum in Kyrgyzstan, also taking into account the dynamics of the political process. Finally mobilize the system method to show the circumstances changes their

system of Kyrgyzstan, to show the relationships and systems: political and legal, the dynamics change fluids in Kyrgyzstan after the dissolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Due to the taken the theme work is based primarily on the Kirghiz legal acts, as well as studies and monographic articles, primarily in Russian. After reaching the basic positions of the Polish literature, mainly related to the theoretical aspects of the institution of the referendum. Referring to the literature, it should be noted that the lack of studies theoretical or comparative information relating to the referendum, otherwise the thing is with the work relating to the same normative analysis of the institution of the referendum-these definitely missing. Hence the result need to for work related to the theme, for example. for Parliament, the head of State. As regards the practice of the institution of the referendum in Kyrgyzstan, it should be noted that in addition to official materials or press releases, there is no comprehensive scientific studies in this regard.

To maintain transparency considerations, work was divided into four chapters.

In the first one entitled „The Referendum as a Direct Democracy”, has an introductory character. I explain it as the concept of a referendum, as well as the evolution of the legal institutions throughout history. Referendum I present in relation to other forms of direct democracy (people's Assembly, the initiative of China, veto, recall, plebiscite, consultation, appeal ruling, participatory budget). An important part of the deal with topics related to the typology and classification of referendums and arguments filed in science „for” and „against”.

In the second chapter, titled „Legal regulation the Kyrgyz SSR, constitutional referendum and in independent Kyrgyzstan up to 2010”, discussed issues related to the normative regulation of the institution of the referendum in the indicated in the title of the time. For the period of the Kyrgyz Soviet Socialist Republic also presents solutions for the institution of the referendum at the level of the entire Soviet Union, as well as discusses the issue of his practice in the Soviet Union. The section on independent Kyrgyzstan contains a reproduction of the regulations of the law „On referendum of the Kyrgyz Republic” of 1991 and the Constitution of Kyrgyzstan from 1993 onwards along with the significant changes made to them in 1996, Then is presented the constitutional law „About the referendum of the Kyrgyz Republic” of 2007.

Legal regulation of the referendum in modern Kyrgyzstan. It is the third chapter that refers to the institution of referendum in the Constitution of Kyrgyzstan from 2010 onwards are presented in the subsequent steps in the referendal process in the Kyrgyz Republic in the present state of law, from to present an initiative referendum, by its Decree by the Parliament (Jogorku Kenesh), the referendum campaign until after the same voting and announcement of the results of the referendum.

In the last, fourth chapter, entitled the institution of the referendum the constitutional practice in Kyrgyzstan, I discuss the practice of applying the institution of referendum in Kyrgyzstan. From 1991 to the present in Kyrgyzstan was held eight referendums, of which seven were constitutional changes or the enactment of a new Constitution. The subject of the chapter is to present the issues to be treated under the referendum and the role of this institution in the constitutional system the portion of the central State. Attention was also paid to the two recent referenda: from 2010 and 2016 in the referendum of 2010, not only adopted the current



Constitution of Kyrgyzstan, with the result that it has passed from the presidential to parliamentary and Cabinet-presidential form of Government, but also the effects of the State coup sanctioned afterwards that overthrew President Kurmanbek Bakiyev. In the referendum of the 2016 deep parliamentarisation process was strengthened, mechanisms, however, the Kyrgyz regime rationalization system of parliamentary government.

Monograph close final remarks, which attempt to summarize the previous considerations and attempt to assess adopted in Kyrgyzstan referendum institutions model and its significance in the system of political and constitutional.

### **The achieved results**

I came to a conclusion, that your roots, the institution of the referendum in Kyrgyzstan the Kyrgyz Constitution date back to the Soviet Socialist Republic from 1937, however, throughout the period of the Soviet Kyrgyz SSR in no legislative act regulating the carrying out the referendum. The provisions of both laws essential Soviet Kyrgyzstan were, therefore, in this regard, only the dead letter of the law. In practice, it was only after independence Kyrgyzstan created the necessary legal framework for the practical application of the institution of the referendum. Secondly, despite the fact that the Kyrgyz people have some tradition of direct democracy in the form of kurultay institutions, the possibility of recourse to this pattern, as well as to the Soviet period, was limited. From here you can notice the front desk solutions from other countries, including to a significant extent from the Russian Federation. It should be noted that the legal basis of the referendum in Kyrgyzstan has been undergoing significant changes over the past 25 years, in particular regarding the entity authorized to manage the referendum and the mode of its management. Changes in this respect were accompanied by the tipping of the system - towards the president or towards the parliament.

The institution of referendum in Kyrgyzstan's systemic practice was used primarily to carry out systemic changes. From 1991 to the present, eight referendums took place in this country, with as many as seven referring to constitutional changes or the adoption of a new constitution. It should also be noted that the institution of the referendum in Kyrgyzstan before 2010 had an anti-parliamentary stance. The referendum was often used during the reign of President Askar Akayev. The referendums carried out at that time were controlled by the head of the state and had a prohegemonic character. The anti-parliamentary nature of this institution was also preserved under Kurmanbek Bakiyev's referendum (2007 constitutional referendum). The constitutional referendum held in June 2010 played a significant role in the legitimisation of the post-revolutionitarian system order in Kyrgyzstan and opened the door of the Central Asian republic to democracy. As a result, the state changed governments from presidential to parliamentary-presidential.

Under the new Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic, after 2010 the referendum was held so far only once, at the end of 2016. Until then, citizens tried only once in 2015, but it was blocked already at the level of the Central Commission Elections and Referendums. According to the Central Commission, the initiators, proposing amendments to the ordinary law, proposed de facto introduction of solutions contrary to the constitution. In addition, by 2016, there had been no attempts by qualified entities to initiate a referendum. It can be concluded that the reason was that in the Kyrgyz tradition the referendum was used to carry out systemic changes, and the

state constitution provides for restrictions in changing its provisions until 2020. The last referendum, which took place at the end of 2016, deepened the process of parliamentarization of the Kyrgyz regime., however, the mechanisms for rationalizing the system of parliamentary rule have been strengthened. In this case, however, the prohibition of constitutional changes described above was clearly violated. Assuming, however, that this prohibition was connected with the fear of returning to the presidential model of government, it can be concluded that the systemic changes approved in the last referendum do not contradict the spirit of the constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic of 2010 and that in a certain sense it was not against this direction of change. prohibition.

Therefore, the practice of applying the institution of a nationwide referendum in Kyrgyzstan is difficult to assess unequivocally, because the practice itself is relatively rich, but from the formal side most of the referenda took place in violation of the applicable law.

The referendum institution is an introduction to an essentially representative model of government, an element of direct democracy. It allows to alleviate the shortcomings of parliamentarism. Semi-direct democracy is characterized by the existence of three institutions: elections, a referendum and a civic legislative initiative. It seems that the evolution of modern democracy is proceeding in a direction in which a representative democracy will be necessary together with various institutions of direct or semi-direct democracy. It is difficult to imagine a democratic state without these institutions today. There is no doubt that a significant place among them must be given to a referendum institution. Without it, the sovereignty of the people would be „The cleansing of the eyes“. The referendum institution always allows the sovereign to be ready and gives the opportunity to correct the decisions of his representatives. It allows limiting the influence of political parties on the electoral corps. The voter who is put before making a decision in a referendum can opt for „for“ or „against“. It does not have to be guided by the party label, decisive at the election, when the program platform can combine elements rated by the voter positively with elements perceived negatively. The legal regulation of the referendum must ensure that it cannot be used as an institution for overthrowing the democratic system, for the legitimacy and primacy of parliaments as legislators, and for the rule of law.

The legitimacy of the referendum institution also results from the fact that after each election a difference arises between the representatives and the voters, which is inscribed in the nature of democracy as a system involving the replacement of power. The political position of the parliament, also uncorrected by the institutions of direct democracy, may lead to its arbitrariness. The referendum allows to confirm the majority of parliamentary support of the majority of voters. As such, the referendum is therefore an instrument of political control in the hands of citizens. In addition, in modern democracies there is no conflict between the legislative and executive powers, because the latter must have the confidence of the parliamentary majority, so the role of the election is to select a winning party that will be able to form a government and to allow it to pursue a political program. Therefore, the legislative power is not only a counterweight to the government, but also its most important support. The value of a referendum as an independent way of realizing citizens' right to participate in deciding about governing the state and resolving cases of local importance and the legitimacy of its use in specific situations are confirmed by historical facts, the evolution of the referendum over the long period of its existence. The use of this political and legal institution in the state system is a

general tendency, which is justified by the fact that in a modern, post-industrial and informative state the referendum institution performs a consolidation and corrective function in relation to the activities of public authorities.

Currently, the model of a nationwide referendum institution in Kyrgyzstan seems optimal for this country. There is also no longer a problem of incompatibility of the current statutory regulation with the 2010 constitution. The newly issued law „On the referendum of the Kyrgyz Republic” is fully adapted to the constitution. The current basic law, in connection with the „parliamentarization” of Kyrgyzstan in 2010, restored the model in force until 1996, in which the parliament was the governing body of the referendum. At present, this is the exclusive competence of Jogorku Kenesh, who manages them with the act. This is the most important system change in this respect, because so far from 1996 the President had the exclusive right to manage the referendum. The subject of the referendum is the draft law on bringing amendments to the constitution and the most important matters of national significance, the term of which the legislator has left to the ordinary legislator. Such a solution should be critically assessed, because the scope of the possibility of using the institution of a nationwide referendum should be defined, in practice in negative terms, in the basic act itself. Currently, however, according to the constitutional delegation, the legislator has done so. The catalog of issues recognized by the ordinary legislature as unquestionably a subject of a referendum is basically typical. Certain problems can only arise from the referendum issue of changing the secular nature of the state, unitariness and territorial integrity of Kyrgyzstan. However, it should be recognized that this applies only to an ordinary referendum, not a referendum whose subject matter would be the change of the constitution. The constitutional boundaries of the referendum on temporal restrictions should also be considered typical.

The legitimate solution - taking into account the negative experience of the Kyrgyz Republic in this regard - is to exclude the President from participating in the referendum process. This prevents a referendum from being directed against the parliament. At the same time, a group of entities that have the right to apply to Jogorku Kenesh with a request to order a referendum is relatively extensive. Such law has a group of 10,000 voters, deputy Jogorku Kenesh and the Government in the case of an ordinary referendum, and in the case of a constitutional referendum two-thirds of the total number of deputies of Jogorku Kenesh, Government and a group of 300,000 citizens. At the same time, in the case of citizens, the above number of signatures is required in the case of draft changes to the provisions of the chapters of the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth chapters of the Constitution, 300,000 voters. In this case, the problem arises whether citizens have the right to submit proposals for amendments only to those chapters of the Basic Law, or in the case of others, only 10,000 voters need to initiate the procedure to amend the constitution of Kyrgyzstan. This, however, must be resolved by the systemic practice.

It is also legitimate to diversify the parliamentary majority required to order a referendum. In the case of amendments to the constitution, the Act on the management of the referendum is adopted by a majority of no less than two-thirds of the total number of deputies no earlier than one month and no later than three months from the day of submitting the bill from Jogorku Kenesh. In other cases, the law on the ordering of a referendum requires the votes of the majority of the current deputies of Jogorku Kenesh, however, no fewer than 50 deputies of this body. As I said earlier, in my opinion, currently the President of Kyrgyzstan can not apply



the constitutional veto granted by the constitution in the case of the law on the ordering of a nationwide referendum. This is due to the clear purpose of the legislator, which was to exclude the President from the referendum process in Kyrgyzstan.

As in many other countries in Kyrgyzstan, the legislator decided to set the turnout threshold required to recognize the nationwide referendum as legally binding. It was set at 30%, which seems reasonable, because it prevents a situation where, as a result of passivity in society or a boycott conducted by opponents of a matter being the subject of a referendum, the decision could not be effectively taken. On the other hand, achieving such a turnout gives some legitimization of the decision taken in the political dimension or its social perception. It should be noted that 30% of those eligible can be made up of the majority who actively participate in the democratic procedures of citizens. Typically, the rules for the recognition of the decision as adopted in the referendum were defined. More than half the participants in the referendum who took part in the vote are required to do so. If the subject of the referendum were alternative variants of the response, the one who received the most votes is accepted. Only in the event that more than half of the people who took part in the referendum voted against all alternative options, the referendum would not bring any solution other than the rejection of all proposals.

As for temporal limitations, they should be considered typical. The referendum can not be carried out during the period of martial law or extraordinary law on the whole territory of the Kyrgyz Republic or its part. In addition, in the period between the referendum order and the official announcement of its results, it is not possible to propose a new referendum.

Protecting the permanence of the referendum resolution is the ban on re-introducing a referendum with the same content or the same idea within a year after the official announcement of the results of the previous referendum. Another important solution is a ban on changing a decision made in a referendum in a non-referendum mode. Only one exception is established - a case where the decision itself provides for the possibility of its repeal or change in another mode.

In the end, the following classification of the „types” of the national referendum in Kyrgyzstan can be proposed - based on the typology referred to earlier:

- 1) Legislative referendum - used to approve or reject the new constitution prepared by Jogorku Kenesh;
- 2) constitutional referendum - carried out in order to approve changes to the current constitution;
- 3) legislative referendum - used to approve or reject a law adopted by the legislative authority;
- 4) referendum on other matters - its essence is to take another important state decision.

In principle, the referendum institution in the Kyrgyz Republic was planned as a binding referendum. Only the lack of required attendance can turn them into an optional referendum.

Ultimately, the institution of the referendum in Kyrgyzstan was in my opinion shaped correctly in a way that suited the needs of that state.

## **5. Discussion of other scientific and research achievements**

In addition to the monograph presented above as a scientific achievement within the meaning of art. 16 sec. 2 of the Act of March 14, 2003 on academic degrees and the academic title in the field of art (Journal of Laws No. 65, item 595, as amended) I am the author or co-author of five monographs; author or co-author of 64 articles in Polish, 2 in Russian; 2 in English, 6 glosses, 5 reviews, 1 reports, 11 passwords; the author of the translation of SK FR's verdict from Russian into Polish. In addition, I am the co-author of eight didactic publications (textbooks, tests) and a co-editor of 4 collective works (3 didactic publications and 1 multi-author monograph). Of which 5 monographs (including three meeting the volumetric criterion); 51 articles; 6 votes; 3 reviews; 1 translation and 11 passwords were issued after obtaining the degree of Doctor of Juridical Science. A detailed list of my publications is included in Appendix No. 4 to the application for conducting habilitation proceedings.

The total value of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education award for post-doctoral theses is 368.5 points. The evaluation of scientific achievements in the case of legal sciences based on other bibliometric indicators using databases indicated by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education is significantly impeded in the case of legal sciences, due to the fragmentary nature of sources that would have to be used. There is also no relevant Polish scientific citation database referring to this field of science.

My scientific and research work after the defense of the doctoral dissertation focused primarily on the systemic issues of foreign states and the issues of comparative constitutional law. However, it is impossible to indicate the typical timeframes and chronological consequences of these investigations, because they have permeated each other over the years of scientific work. The fruit of these interests were numerous publications in the form of independent articles, chapters in books and editorials of books. The basic research fields are:

### **States unrecognized and partially recognized**

As regards the first group of interests, it includes regions in the post-Soviet area, which unilaterally proclaimed their sovereignty. Areas controlled by these countries are recognized by others as separatist regions. First of all, these studies included post-soviet countries not recognized and partially recognized<sup>3</sup>. Currently existing post-Soviet „unrecognized countries” can be divided into two groups. First of all, they have partial international recognition and control over the whole of their area (Republic of South Ossetia - 1991, Abkhazia was established - 1991). The second group are countries without recognition from any of the recognized countries (Transnistrian Republic of Moldova - proclaimed - 1990, Republic of Nagorno-

---

<sup>3</sup> During the Cold War, countries were not recognized as rare. Examples include Azad Jammu and Kashmir (1948) proclaimed in part of Pakistan and controlled by Pakistan. Later it was created as a result of the invasion of Turkish troops Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (1983). After the fall of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, entities such as Nagorno-Karabakh, Transnistrian Moldovan Republic, Republic of Gagauzia, Republic of South Ossetia and Chechen Republic of Ichkeria were established. Of these, Chechnya was eventually reintegrated into the Russian Federation, while Gagauzia was granted Moldova's autonomy with the right of secession in the event of the loss of its sovereign status. Unrecognized countries also appeared in Africa, but with Somaliland, Somaliland demonstrates the sustainability. The case of Western Sahara should be treated separately. In 2014, the Republic of Crimea appeared in Ukraine, which was de facto recognized by the Russian Federation and became a non-recognized state-owned entity - the Donetsk and Lugansk People's Republics. The appearance of these entities in Ukraine may be treated as a delayed part of the process of decomposing the area of the former USSR, which in most cases took place in the nineties.

Karabakh - proclaimed 1991, Lugansk People's Republic and Donetsk People's Republic - proclaimed 2014). The fruit of this research was the following publications on post-Soviet unrecognized countries:

Pogłódek A., *Konstytucja Republiki Osetii Południowej*, Warszawa 2016; Pogłódek A., *Instytucja prezydenta Naddniestrzańskiej Republiki Mołdawskiej*, "Białostockie Studia Prawnicze" 2016, nr 20B, pp. 335 - 348; Pogłódek A., *Konstytucja Republiki Abchazji*, Warszawa 2015; Pogłódek A., Starzec B. *Procedura zmiany Konstytucji Republiki Abchazji (na tle porównawczym)*, [in:] *Z najnowszej problematyki prawa publicznego i prawa prywatnego*, eds. T. Stanisławski, B. Przywora, Ł. Jurek, P. Świata, Lublin 2014, pp. 11-23; Pogłódek A., *Instytucja prezydenta w Republice Abchazji*, [in:] *Ewolucja władzy wykonawczej w krajach Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej w okresie transformacji ustrojowej 1989 - 2014 r.*, eds. B. Szmulik, M. Paździor, Lublin 2015, pp. 131 - 144; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Status prawno-konstytucyjny Gabinetu Ministrów w Republice Abchazji*, [in:] *Ewolucja władzy wykonawczej w krajach Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej w okresie transformacji ustrojowej 1989 - 2014 r.*, eds. B. Szmulik, M. Paździor, Lublin 2015, pp. 145 - 155.

### **Constitutional systems of Central Asian countries**

The second area of research was the political development of the countries of Central Asia. Central Asian countries understand Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. The countries of this region, modernizing their political institutions, have their specificity. In the case of the Kyrgyzstan system for Central Asia, it is a body laboratory which is connected with the constitutional changes that have been carried out, which eventually led to the establishment of a democratic political regime there. Nonetheless, in Kyrgyzstan there are problems associated with the consolidation of the democratic regime, which is connected both with the traditional division of the country to the north and south, as well as the presence of a large Uzbek minority. However, most countries in the region chose a model for authoritarian modernization. In this model, the rulers try to maintain social and political stability, which is however related to the implementation of limited democratic reforms. In this respect, the basic role is played by the role of the head of state entitled to designate (and correct) the direction of systemic modernization in accordance with the needs of the country's development. This model is typical for Kazakhstan. At the same time, it should be noted that the transformation of the presidential-parliamentary model into a parliamentary-presidential one (Kazakhstan) does not really change much in the mechanism of the actual exercise of state power.

The third model is expressed in the rejection by the ruling elite of the need for democratic modernization of the state and as a result of this lack of systemic changes aimed at democratizing the political regime, or in the case of being only „imitated” in such a direction. It should be noted here that this group including Turkmenistan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan is internally diverse. In the case of Uzbekistan, there are indications that it is heading towards the model chosen by Kazakhstan. In the case of this group of countries, the choice of the ruling elite was conditioned by the survival of a strong clan - social organization of society. In addition, in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, this was associated with the threat of representatives of political Islam striving to create Islamic states modeled on Afghanistan and problems related to the presence of national minorities. Thus, the states of this group were faced with the dilemma of the choice between Afghanistan and the disintegration of their countries, and the stability



associated, however, with the preservation of the authoritarian model of government. In the case of Turkmenistan, the most representative of this group of political regime began to take on the characteristics of eastern despotism. Hence it was called the „sultan's regime”. After the death of Turkmenbashi (2008), limited system changes were started in Turkmenistan. However, the systemic modernization of Turkmenistan has only the task of rationalizing the authoritarian system. In this respect, the basic direction of changes may allow in the future to carry out an authoritarian modernization of Turkmenistan on the model of Kazakhstan. Also in the case of Tajikistan, the extent of systemic changes is insignificant. It is different in the case of Uzbekistan, which in recent years has been carrying out more decisive political changes. However, so far in this country, as in Kazakhstan, there is a significant difference between the political model and political practice. The following works were the result of research devoted to Central Asian countries:

*Konwencja o standardach demokratycznych wyborów, praw i wolności wyborczych w państwach członkowskich Wspólnoty Niepodległych Państw* (tłum. A. Pogłódek), „Roczniki Administracji i Prawa” 2018, t. XVIII, z. 1, pp. 417 – 436; Pogłódek A., *The institution of the nationwide referendum in Turkmenistan*, „Annals of the Administration and Law” 2017, no. 17 (1), pp. 13-31, Pogłódek A., *Referendum ogólnokrajowe w Republice Kazachstanu*, „Środkowoeuropejskie Studia Polityczne” 2017, nr 3, pp. 163-176; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Pełnomocnik Praw Człowieka w Kazachstanie – próba oceny*, [in:] *Kazachstan. Polska. Wybrane zagadnienia ustrojowe, społeczne i edukacyjne*, eds. A. Bisztyga, P. Zientarski, Toruń 2017, pp. 116-128; Pogłódek A., *Postępowanie ustawodawcze w Madzłisi Oli Republiki Tadżykistanu*, [in:] *Aktualne problemy konstytucji. Księga Jubileuszowa z okazji 40-lecia pracy naukowej Profesora Bogusława Banaszaka*, eds. H. Babiuch, P. Kapusta, J. Michalska, Legnica 2017, pp. 701-719; Pogłódek A., *Instytucja referendum ogólnokrajowego w Tadżykistanie*, [in:] *Aktualne wyzwania demokracji partycypacyjnej w Polsce i na świecie*, eds. P. Kuczma, Polkowice 2017, pp. 219 – 236; Szmulik B., Pogłódek A., *Pozycja ustrojowa Medzłisa Turkmenistanu*, [in:] *Człowiek Prawo Państwo. Księga Jubileuszowa dedykowana Stanisławowi Leszkowi Stadniczenko*, eds. J. Jeżewski, A. Pawlak, Warszawa 2017, pp. 957 – 975; Pogłódek A., Nowak K., *Służby specjalne w systemie politycznym Kirgistanu*, „Studia Politologiczne” 2017, vol. 43, pp. 99 – 113; Pogłódek A., *Służby specjalne w systemie politycznym Uzbekistanu*, „Studia Politologiczne” 2017, vol. 43, pp. 127 – 147; Pogłódek A., *Dwuizbowy parlament Republiki Tadżykistanu*, „Roczniki Administracji i Prawa” 2016, t. XVI, z. 2, pp. 19 – 42; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Glosa do decyzji Izby Konstytucyjnej Sądu Najwyższego Republiki Kirgizji z dnia 11 lipca 2014 r.*, „Przegląd Sejmowy” 2016, nr 3, pp. 104 – 108; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Pełnomocnik Praw Człowieka w Tadżykistanie - próba oceny*, [in:] *Azjatyckie systemy ochrony praw człowieka. Inspiracja uniwersalna - uwarunkowania kulturowe - bariery realizacji*, eds. J. Jaskiernia, K. Spryszak, Toruń 2016, pp. 664 – 676; Szmulik B., Pogłódek A., *Sąd Konstytucyjny Republiki Uzbekistanu*, [in:] *Zagadnienia prawa konstytucyjnego. Polskie i zagraniczne rozwiązania ustrojowe. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesorowi Dariuszowi Góreckiemu w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, eds. K. Skotnicki, K. Składowski, A. Michalak, Łódź 2016, pp. 411 – 426; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Status prawny akyjkaczu (ombudsmana) w Republici Kirgizji*, „Przegląd Prawa Konstytucyjnego” 2016, nr 2, pp. 153 – 173; Szmulik B., Pogłódek A., *Ludowa inicjatywa ustawodawcza w Republice Kirgizji*, [in:] *Ustroje tradycje i porównania. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana prof. dr hab. Marianowi Grzybowskiemu w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, eds. P. Mikuli, A. Kulig, J. Karp, G. Kuca, Warszawa 2015, pp. 502-512; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Prawo do informacji publicznej w Polsce na tle rozwiązań przyjętych w krajach Wspólnoty Niepodległych Państw*, [in:] *Jawność w samorządzie*



terytorialnym, ed. B. Dolnicki, Warszawa 2015, pp. 597 – 610; Поглудек А., Пжывора Б., *Участье Конституционной палаты Верховного суда Кыргызской Республики в процессе изменения основного закона*, [in:] *Правове життя: сучасний стан та перспективи розвитку*, ред. И. Я. Коцан, О. В. Лаба, Луцк 2015, с. 122 – 127; Pogłódek A., *Postępowanie ustawodawcze w Izbie Ustawodawczej Olij Mażlisa Uzbekistanu*, "Roczniki Administracji i Prawa" 2015, t. XV, z. 2, pp. 75-88; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Samorząd terytorialny w Kirgistanie - zagadnienia ustrojowoprawne*, "Samorząd Terytorialny" 5/2015, pp. 79-87; Pogłódek A., *Finansowanie partii politycznych w Republice Uzbekistan*, [in:] *Instytucjonalne gwarancje zasady pluralizmu politycznego w Polsce na tle standardów europejskich*, eds. B. Szmulik, M. Paździor, Lublin 2014, pp. 285 – 297; Pogłódek A., *Wybrane elementy statusu prawnego członka Senatu w Uzbekistanie*, "Społeczeństwo-Kultura-Wartości: studium społeczne" 2014, nr 3, pp. 157 – 168; Pogłódek A., *Instytucja referendum w Uzbekistanie*, "Roczniki Administracji i Prawa" 2014, t. XIV, pp. 17-32; Pogłódek A., Szmulik B., *Senat Republiki Uzbekistan. Zagadnienia wybrane*, "Gdańskie Studia Prawnicze. Księga jubileuszowa profesora Andrzeja Pułto", t. XXXI, ed. A. Szmyt, Gdańsk 2014, pp. 361 - 371.

### **System of the Russian Federation and republics of the Russian Federation**

Undertaking research in this area was associated with interest in the issue of federalism in the modern world. In this area, the subject of the research was the system of the Russian Federation and the state system of republics of the Russian Federation. The Russian state became a federation for the first time in 1918 after the proclamation of the Russian FSRR. However, throughout the Soviet period, it was not federalism, the „full” status of federation entities had only autonomous republics, autonomous circuits and districts, and most of the area constituted ordinary administrative units. It was not until the collapse of the USSR that the Russian Federation was established as a full federation, in which all administrative units obtained the status of federation entities. Based on the Federal Constitution of 1993, federalism, although young, has already undergone several stages of development, it is currently in the middle of centralization. The selection as a subject of research investigations of the republics of the Russian Federation resulted from the dissimilarity which it manifests in contrast to other subjects of the Russian Federation. The Republic of Poland are the subjects of our neighbors, whose emergence resulted from densely inhabiting a given area separate from the Russians, a nation for which the republic is supposed to be a form of implementing the principle of self-determination.

This is due to the origin of these republics, which arose from the existing under the Russian FSRR: autonomous socialist Soviet republics and autonomous regions. In the process of the collapse of the USSR, they accepted their declarations of state sovereignty and are still called „sovereign republics” in the 1992 federal agreement. These entities of the Federation over the years have shown the greatest tendency to expand their independence (Bashkortostan, Tatarstan) or even to join the Russian state (Chechnya). In each federal state, the freedom of its entities to determine their own state system is limited. It results from the necessity for the entities to take into account the basic principles of the political system proclaimed by the federal constitution (eg the republican form of government, the division of power). In addition, federal legislation in the Russian Federation defines a certain framework for the organization of the system of entities. In the area of the political system, various issues were raised by the Russian Federation. The fruit of my scientific research in this area was the following publications:

Pogłódek A., *Procedura zmiany konstytucji republiki Federacji Rosyjskiej na przykładzie Republiki Sacha (Jakucja)*, [in:] *Dokoła Wojtek... Księga pamiątkowa poświęcona Doktorowi Arturowi Wojciechowi Preisnerowi*, eds. R. Balicki, M. Jabłoński, Wrocław 2018, pp. 621-631; *Postanowienie Sądu Konstytucyjnego Federacji Rosyjskiej № 21-P z dnia 14 lipca 2015 roku (Dotyczy prawa Sądu Konstytucyjnego do kontroli wyroków Europejskiego Trybunału Praw Człowieka)* (tłum. Andrzej Pogłódek), "Roczniki Administracji i Prawa" 2017, t. XVI, z. 2, pp. 449 – 470; Pogłódek A., *Zasada podziału władzy w Konstytucji Republiki Krymu z 2014 roku*, [in:] *Fundamentalne wartości i zasady ustrojowe. Model konstytucyjny a praktyka ustrojowa w Polsce*, eds. B. Szmulik, M. Paździor, Lublin 2016, pp. 301 – 319; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Służba cywilna w Federacji Rosyjskiej - próba oceny 25 lat doświadczeń*, [in:] *25 lat transformacji ustrojowej w Polsce i w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej*, eds. E. Gdulewicz, W. Orłowski, S. Patyra, Lublin 2015, pp. 497 – 509; Pogłódek A., *Glosa do wyroku Sądu Konstytucyjnego Federacji Rosyjskiej z dnia 23 września 2014 r. N 24-P*, "Przegląd Prawa Konstytucyjnego" 2015, nr 4 (26), pp. 215 – 227; Pogłódek A., *Prawno-polityczne podstawy przyłączenia Krymu do Federacji Rosyjskiej (w świetle doktryny rosyjskiej)*, "Studia Prawnicze KUL" 2015, nr 2, pp. 223 – 241; Szmulik B., Pogłódek A., *Pełnomocnicy ds. ochrony praw przedsiębiorców w Federacji Rosyjskiej*, [in:] *Iura et negotia. Księga jubileuszowa z okazji 15-lecia Wydziału Prawa i Administracji Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego*, red. A. Tarwacka, Warszawa 2015, pp. 288 – 304; Pogłódek A., Nowak K., *Konstytucja Republiki Sacha (Jakucja)*, Warszawa 2015.

## Moldova

As I have already mentioned, a separate trend of my research interests concerned the system of Moldova. Within its framework, I focused on issues related to the judicial system, guarantees of protection of human rights and political rights of citizens. The result of this research were publications devoted to the subject matter, the following works:

*Mołdawia: postanowienie Sądu Konstytucyjnego nr 5 z dnia 2 marca 2016 r. w sprawie wykładni art. 106/1 ust. 1 Konstytucji Republiki Mołdawii (przyjęcie przez rząd odpowiedzialności za ustawę)* (tłum. i oprac. A. Pogłódek), „Przegląd Sejmowy” 2018, nr 4, pp. 165-172; *Postanowienie Sądu Konstytucyjnego z dnia 24 listopada 2015 r. dotyczące wykładni ust. 1 i ust. 4 art. 85 Konstytucji Republiki Mołdawii w sprawie nieutworzenie rządu i rozwiązania parlamentu w trakcie ostatnich sześciu miesięcy kadencji prezydenta* (tłum. i oprac. A. Pogłódek), „Przegląd Sejmowy” 2018, nr 3, pp. 193 – 201; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Mołdawia*, [in:] *Sądowa kontrola administracji publicznej w Europie*, ed. E. Wójcicka, Warszawa 2017, pp. 182 – 193; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Sąd Konstytucyjny w Mołdawii*, [in:] *Prawa człowieka - współczesne zjawiska, wyzwania, zagrożenia*, ed. A. Kalisz, Sosnowiec 2015, pp. 193 – 205; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Instytucja Adwokatów Parlamentarnych w Mołdawii w latach 1997 - 2014*, [in:] *Problemy realizacji regionalnych standardów ochrony praw człowieka w praktyce ustrojowej państw*, ed. J. Jaskiernia, Warszawa 2015, pp. 627 – 644; Pogłódek A., Zientarski P., *Status administracyjno-prawny partii politycznych w Mołdawii*, [in:] *Instytucjonalne gwarancje zasady pluralizmu politycznego w Polsce na tle standardów europejskich*, eds. B. Szmulik, M. Paździor, Lublin 2014, pp. 425 – 442; Pogłódek A., *Najwyższa Rada Sądownictwa w Mołdawii*, [in:] *Uniwersalny i regionalny wymiar ochrony praw człowieka. Nowe wyzwania - nowe rozwiązania*, tom 2., ed. J. Jaskiernia, Warszawa 2014, pp. 702 – 712; Pogłódek A., *Instytucja referendum ogólnokrajowego w Mołdawii*, "Wrocławskie Studia Politologiczne" 2014, nr 17, pp. 142-156.

## Territorial autonomies

Currently, territorial autonomies exist in many countries around the world. Autonomy is an area with its authorities (usually legislative and executive), in which the processes of legal, political, administrative, economic and financial decentralization within a unitary state are advanced, which delegates some of its powers to the autonomous region. Autonomy will always be created „from above” by the act of the central authorities. Thus, territorial autonomy occurs in unitary states. The basic act is based on the basic act, and within its autonomous unit, its constitutional act, ie the statute. The systemically internal organization of autonomy must be in accordance with the rules of the state system in which it exists. Usually also autonomous status can be abolished by central authorities without the consent of the autonomous authority. The autonomous subject has the right to independently regulate specific matters within the limits of its competences. In some cases, this means the right to issue local laws. In each case, however, the legal acts of an autonomous entity are only valid within its borders and must comply with state law. Autonomy in the cultural dimension means the right of the autonomous area to preserve its cultural, linguistic or religious identity. An important issue is also the independence of the autonomous unit in terms of budget and finances. Establishment of autonomy is related to the presence of national minorities in the area, historical, cultural or geographical conditions of some parts of the country. For these reasons, the autonomous regions have their own regional symbols, as well as the possibility of establishing their official language. Currently, obtaining autonomous status, just like federalization, is one of the ways to implement the principle of self-determination of nations while respecting the integrity of territorially existing states. The following works have been created in this area:

Pogłódek A., Nowak K, *Akty ustrojowe Terytorium Autonomicznego Gagauzji*, Warszawa 2017;  
Pogłódek A., *Konstytucja Nachiczewańskiej Republiki Autonomicznej*, Warszawa 2015.

## Selected issue concerning Poland

My scientific achievements, created after the defense of doctorate, also include works devoted to Poland:

Szmulik B., Pogłódek A., *The constitutional complaint in the polish supreme law*, "Espaço Jurídico Journal of Law" 2016, nr 1 (vol. 17) pp. 29 – 46; Szmulik B., Pogłódek A., *Wolność sumienia i religii. Rozważania nad artykułem 53 Konstytucji Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, [in:] *W kręgu zagadnień konstytucjonalizmu oraz współczesnego państwa*, ed. V. Serzhanova, Rzeszów 2015, pp. 232-255; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Państwowa Komisja Wyborcza - w poszukiwaniu modelu ustrojowego*, [in:] *Aktualne problemy prawa wyborczego*, eds. B. Banaszak, A. Bisztyga, A. Feja-Paszkiewicz, Zielona Góra 2015, pp. 307 – 318; Pogłódek A., *O potrzebie regulacji lobbingu prowadzonego przez organizacje pozarządowe finansowane z zagranicy*, [in:] *Jawność i jej ograniczenia*, Tom IX *Zadania i kompetencje*, ed. B. Szmulik, Warszawa 2015, pp. 376 – 384; Szmulik B., Pogłódek A., *"Nikt nie może być poddany eksperymentom naukowym w tym medycznym, bez dobrowolnie wyrażonej zgody". Komentarz do Artykułu 39 Konstytucji Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, [in:] *Ewolucja władzy wykonawczej w krajach Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej w okresie transformacji ustrojowej 1989 - 2014 r.*, eds. B. Szmulik, M. Paździor, Lublin 2015, pp. 283 – 294; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Rec. Finansowanie świadczeń opieki zdrowotnej*, eds. M. Dziubińska, J. Kostrubiec, A. Janus, T.



Sroka, P. Szcześniak, Warszawa 2014, *"Studia Iuridica Lublinensia"* 2014, T. 23, pp. 164-168; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Glosa do wyroku Trybunału Konstytucyjnego z dnia 7.11.2013 r. (K 31/12) w sprawie oceny konstytucyjności trybu uchwalania ustawy z 18.08.2011 r. o zmianie ustawy - Prawo o ustroju sądów powszechnych oraz niektórych innych ustaw*, "Krajowa Rada Sądownictwa" 2014, nr 3 (24), pp. 5-9; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Z problematyki zasadniczego podziału terytorialnego państwa polskiego po 1989 roku*, [in:] *Reformy ustrojowe w Polsce 1989-1998-?*, red. T. Stanisławski, B. Przywora, Ł. Jurek, Lublin 2014, pp. 89-100; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Rzecznik Praw Ubezpieczonych w Polsce - stan obecny i perspektywy zmian*, [in:] *Z najnowszej problematyki prawa publicznego i prawa prywatnego*, eds. T. Stanisławski, B. Przywora, Ł. Jurek, P. Świtał, Lublin 2014, pp. 25-37.

## Other countries

My scientific achievements also include works devoted to selected constitutional issues of other countries. Belong to them:

Pogłódek A., *Legislatywa i egzekutywa w Armenii po reformie konstytucyjnej z 6 grudnia 2015 r.*, [in:] *Nowe wyzwania i rozwiązania w europejskim systemie ochrony praw człowieka*, eds. J. Jaskiernia, K. Spryszak, Toruń 2018, pp. 617-636; Pogłódek A., *Glosa do wyroku Trybunału Konstytucyjnego Republiki Kolumbii z dnia 15 grudnia 2014 r. (sygn. T-970/14)*, „Przegląd Sejmowy” 2017, nr 5, pp. 167-175; Pogłódek A., *Glosa do wyroku Trybunału Konstytucyjnego Republiki Kolumbii z dnia 18 stycznia 2017 r. (sygn. C-005/17)*, „Przegląd Sejmowy” 2017, nr 4, pp. 158-172; Pogłódek A., *Instytucja recall we współczesnych konstytucjach*, [in:] *Idea wolności i niezależności w państwie demokratycznym – perspektywa praw jednostki*, eds. M. Grzesik-Kulesza, G. Pastuszko, Rzeszów 2017, pp. 378-393; Pogłódek A., *Zasada podziału władzy w Konstytucji Tunezji z 2014 roku*, [in:] *Ochrona praw człowieka w Afryce. Aksjologia - instytucje - nowe wyzwania - praktyka*, eds. J. Jaskiernia, K. Spryszak, Toruń 2017, pp. 362 – 385; Pogłódek A., Przywora B., *Zasady podziału władzy w Turcji*, [in:] *Zasady podziału władzy we współczesnych państwach europejskich*, eds. S. Grabowska, R. Grabowski, T.2, Rzeszów 2016, pp. 341 – 352; Pogłódek A., *Pozycja ustrojowa Ombudsmana na Łotwie*, "Przegląd Prawa Konstytucyjnego" 2015, z. 3, pp. 149 – 162; Pogłódek A., *Instytucja Kanclerza Sprawiedliwości jako organ ochrony praw człowieka w Estonii*, [in:] *Środki ochrony praw człowieka w państwach postsocjalistycznych. Zagadnienia wybrane*, eds. A. Frankiewicz-Bodynek, A. Pawlak, Kraków 2015, pp. 259-272; Pogłódek A., *Instytucja Obrońcy Ludu w Republice Rumunii*, [in:] *Instytucje ochrony praw człowieka*, red. B. Szmulik, A. Pogłódek, B. Przywora, Warszawa 2015, pp. 223 – 236; Поглюдек А., *Конституционная реформа на Украине - необходимый шаг к миру и безопасности*, [w:] *Безопасность постсоветского пространства: новые вызовы и угрозы*, eds. Z. Stankiewicz, T. Stępniewski, A. Szabaciuk, Lublin - Moskwa 2014, pp. 439 – 449; Pogłódek A., *Rec. Systemy polityczne państw bałkańskich*, eds. T. Bichta, M. Podolak, Lublin 2012, "Przegląd Prawa Konstytucyjnego" 2013, nr 4, pp. 259-264; Pogłódek A., *Rola drugiej izby w procesie zmiany konstytucji na przykładzie Rumunii*, [in:] *Ewolucja demokracji przedstawicielskiej w krajach Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej*, eds. M. Paździor, B. Szmulik, Lublin 2013, pp. 281-297.

Finally, the slogans devoted to various political and political issues should also be included in this group, see:



Pogłódek A., *Dyktatura wojskowa* (pp. 115 – 116); *Federacja* (s. 147 – 148); *Konfederacja* (pp. 212 – 213); *Mikropaństwo* (pp. 263 – 264); *Narko-państwo* (pp. 278 – 279); *Organizacja Narodów i Ludów Niereprezentowanych* (pp. 323 – 324); *Państwa nieuznawane* (pp. 336 – 337); *Państwo regionalne* (s. 341 – 342); *Państwo stowarzyszone* (pp. 343 – 344); *Protektorat* (pp. 432 – 433); *Rząd faktyczny* (pp. 474 – 475) [in:] *Leksykon bezpieczeństwa. Wybrane pojęcia*, eds. K. Dziubińska - Wójcik, R. Niedźwiecki, W. Saletra, A. Zagórska, Kielce 2016.

**Other aspects of my scientific activity as well as information about didactic achievements, scientific cooperation and popularization of science are included in number 4.**

#### **6. Scientific plans for the future**

In the future I intend to develop discussed in a previous section the directions of research. In particular, I intend to continue to work on the structures of selected entities of the Russian Federation (m.in. Bashkortostan, Buryatia, Kalmykia and Tuva), political issues of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. Currently, during the publishing process there are two monographs on the constitutional system of Nagorno-Karabakh in the years 2006-2007 and the constitutional system of Transnistria. In terms of territorial autonomy of research, I am going to include the autonomy of existing outside the Commonwealth of independent States. The new test area will be the issue of Ibero-American States the unique constitutional and selected countries of Africa and the far East.

Andrzej Pogłódek