

# The case about rf and tatarstan delegation of authorities

[Business](#)



THE CASE ABOUT RF AND TATARSTAN DELEGATION OF AUTHORITIES 1. Why Tatarstan was succeeded to be the “elected” region in terms of its’ authorities? As far as I could understand, the reasons why Tatarstan was chosen for delegation of Authorities and this Agreement are mostly historical.

Historical and political preconditions of Tatarstan turned in such way, that Russian Federation and Tatarstan were nearly in equal position. For example, Tatarstan was independent co-founder of USSR, Tatarstan did not participate in election of State Duma in December 1993, Tatarstan did not sign the Federative Agreement in 1992.

This shows the level of independence of Tatarstan from Russian Federation. In my opinion, Tatarstan was not very powerful republic, thus, to keep on developing it needed an alliance. It had political independence, but in terms of resources and power it did not have much. Russia, on the other hand, wanted to avoid appearance of another country just in the very heart of it.

To avoid repeat of Chechnya Case, Russian Authorities decided to change the way they behave about it. Instead of gaining power using military forces, Russian Federation took the way of diplomacy and political alliance.

Thus, we can say that both sides needed this agreement, both sides could benefit from it, but in my opinion, Tatarstan would need it more than Russia, in the case of different location. 2. Suggest some more or less objective criteria to select regions for establishing special favorable regime of relations with the federal center.

This question in my point of view cannot have theoretical solution, because in any different case there would be new accomplishments and new terms, that would challenge the theory pretty much.

But still, some tips could be defined. I think that in century of innovations and technological development, very important aspect would be potential rate of development of the region. It's not important how much the region is developed, it's much more vital - how can we develop it. In what way we can grow industry, or culture or trade or any other side of life of country.

This criterion is very subjective, I understand this, but this is more an advantage than a disadvantage.

Because government should realize itself, for what reason it needs the region, why it is necessary to develop favorable relations with this or that region, in what way it could be profitable. From history of Russian Empire we know examples of having totally useless for Empire regions (Poland) and caused a lot of trouble in tries to keep it quiet and not rebelling. 3. What is the author's opinion on respect of whether special delegation of authorities between Tatarstan and RF is a good thing? Do you agree with him and why?

On example of RF and Tatarstan Agreement we can see how idea of federal construction, integration and decentralization actually works.

Author has very positive opinion about creating decentralized country and going on forward in development of this way. I do not have any real opinion about this, but if we look at 70 years of centralized country, and look at what do we have to suffer afterwards, I would say that decentralization is the right

way to develop country federal structure, so that all the knowledge and all the experience is circulating among regions, and let develop the weak.