

### **Mykola Izha**

- ▶ Odessa Regional Institute for Public Administration of the National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine
- ▶ e-mail: director@oridu.odessa.ua
- ▶ ORCID: 0000-0001-7221-4794

### **Andrii Maiev**

- ▶ Odessa Regional Institute for Public Administration of the National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine
- ▶ e-mail: ua197307@ukr.net
- ▶ ORCID: 0000-0001-9333-2933

## HISTORICAL FOUNDATION OF REGIONAL ADMINISTRATION IN UKRAINE

### | Abstract

- ▶ *Goal* – the article deals with the regional administration initiation and evolution of the Ukrainian lands in the context of statehood origin and national traditions of governance formation.
- ▶ *Research methodology* – the methodological basis of the work consists in comprehensive, interdisciplinary, systemic and historical approaches to the analysis of regional administration development. Synthesis, generalization, comparison, observation, retrospective analysis as well as other general scientific methods were used while research conducting. In particular, the historical method was applied to realize a retrospective analysis of the emergence and evolution of domestic administrative traditions.
- ▶ *Score/results* – democracy, elections, ability to self-organization, restriction of central power by self-government elements are considered its characteristic elements of domestic administrative features. National administrative traditions and historical experience is presented as an important component within the process of introducing European principles and standards of public administration and reform implementation in the modern Ukraine.

- ▶ *Originality/value* – the originality and novelty of the scientific paper lies in the definition of national administrative traditions that contribute to the adaptation of foreign experience for the regional administration development and the factors limiting its use. In modern Ukraine, there are practically no fundamental studies examining the problems of adapting the European administrative experience in an organic relationship with the domestic tradition of governance. Therefore, the research remains relevant in the scientific and practical aspects.

| **Key words:** regional administration, administrative-territorial structure, national administrative traditions.

## 1. Introduction

The need for a comprehensive reform of territorial power organization and the creation of an effective regional administration was one of the main issues, among other, Ukraine faced after its independence was reestablished in 1991. The European perspective of Ukraine caused the need for detailed study of European principles and standards of governance. The issues of studying and adapting the European experience of regional administration, as well as the formation of a national tradition of governance are thoroughly covered in the works of numerous scholars. In our opinion, the problems of introducing the best European administrative practices in Ukraine should be examined in an organic correlation and take into account the national administrative tradition and history of Ukraine.

Most existing countries have been established and developed as a nation-states, while Ukraine became a fully sovereign state only at the end of the XX century. The modern Ukraine includes territories that had been under the authority of various empires for centuries. This has influenced the formation of national administrative traditions.

Prominent Ukrainians (B. Khmelnyckyj, M. Drahomanov, M. Hrushevskyj, and others) demonstrated new, progressive public administration concepts that had a positive impact on the future of the state and global administrative science. Therefore, we have the grounds to speak about the national Ukrainian traditions of governance. However, due to a number of historical and political reasons, many progressive ideas have not been put into practice.

Petro Nadolishnyj notes that domestic administrative values can be compared with modern European administrative value systems, consisting of legality,

democracy, responsibility, accountability, impartiality, integrity, ethics, etc. But the Ukrainian nation was forced to live according to other people's rules for centuries. As a result, there was an abyss between their values and standards [Nadolishnyj, 2015: 171].

Therefore, it is important to carry out the further development of public administration and regional administration, not only through the study and use of the best foreign experience, but also on the basis of national features and state-building traditions.

## 2. Origins of Ukrainian statehood

The oldest state formations existed in the territory of modern Ukraine in the middle of I millennium BC. Greek cities-states Olbia, Chersonesus, and Panticapaeum were slave-owning, aristocratic or democratic republics with well-developed state institutions. The people's assembly united all free citizens, but men older than 25 years old were the legislative authority in cities.

Written records about the Slavs' statehood appeared in the XI–XII centuries. In *The Tale of Bygone Years*, Nestor the Chronicler mentions the creation of an alliance of Slavic tribes in the middle of the Dnieper, called "Ros" or "Rus" in the VI century. In the VIII–IX centuries, this alliance united several dozen tribes with a center in Kyiv and occupied a considerable territory that could be compared with the size of the Byzantine Empire [*Povest vremennykh...*].

In the IX century, a large state, subsequently called Kyivan Rus, was formed in a territory populated by the Eastern Slavs. We believe the foundations of Ukrainian statehood were laid during this period.

Kyivan Rus was an early feudal monarchy, characterized by a weakness of central power and fragmentation of territory. Along with the central government, a local government with princes existed. Central and local administrations were not separated one from another. The territorial units of the state were headed by military commanders: foremen, *sotniks*, and a thousand different chiefs.

The central princes' power in Kyivan Rus was limited by the people's self-government element – the city council, known as viche. It was not a body of representatives, but a meeting of all adult men, where unanimity was required for decision-making. Viche assemblies were irregular; they did not have a clear status, but still served as a decisive feature of the rule of law in the state as a means of legitimizing one or another important decision. They considered

issues related to the whole principality, adopted rulings, elected princes, and concluded agreements with them. These facts give us reason to consider viche as a model of “Ukrainian parliamentarism” [Knyazev, Bakaev, Vasylevska, 2010: 7].

The administrative-territorial organization (ATO) in Kyivan Rus, provided for the division of the state on the lands. The lands were divided into separate principalities or *volosts*. A *volost* consisted of several *vervs*, and a *verv* consisted of several settlements. The largest rural settlement (*pogost*) was the center of a *verv*. The *verv* was a peasants’ self-government organ, based on the principles of direct electoral democracy and collective decision-making.

The achievements of the Kyivan Rus statehood include, first of all, the viche principle, which embodied the idea of the people’s power and the right to interfere in the prince’s affairs. The lack of monarchical absolutism was a characteristic feature of the princely power in Kyivan Rus. While decision making, the prince always consulted with the *boyars*. The *boyar* council (*rada*) constituted a counterweight to the prince’s uniqueness [Knyazev, Bakaev, Vasylevska, 2010: 7].

The Galician-Volyn state became the heiress of Kyivan Rus. It existed from the end of the XII to the middle of the XIV century, and arose as a result of the unification of Volyn and Galician principalities. As in Kyivan Rus, the central government in the Galician-Volyn state belonged to the prince, who concentrated legislative, executive, and judicial branches of power in his hands. At the same time, the boyar council played an important role in the state. The boyars formed a kind of opposition to the prince and defied his aspirations to autocracy [Vilzhinskyj, Popov, 2016: 31].

In the beginning of the XIV century, Magdeburg Law was introduced in the cities of the Ukrainian lands. It was granted to cities by the Prince of Lithuania or the King of Poland and was issued by the Magdeburg Diplomas, which played the role of the city’s charters. According to Magdeburg Law principles, the city council (magistrate) was the main body of the city’s self-government. It served as a city council and court in civil cases, and consisted of *voit* (head of the magistrate), his assistants (burmisters), and two boards, *rada* and *lava*, elected by the city population [Bakumenko et al., 2009: 298].

In Ukraine, the Trans-Carpathian cities, which were part of the Hungarian kingdom (Khust, Tiachiv, Vyshkovo), were the first to receive the self-government rights. In 1339, those rights were granted to the city of Sanok, and in 1356, to Lviv. By the middle of the XVII century, the Magdeburg law existed in most of the major cities of Ukraine.

Magdeburg Law formed the European liberalism and democracy foundations. It provided for an elective system of city administrators and court. Thanks to Magdeburg Law (and later the Lithuanian Charter). Ukraine significantly differs in its right from Russia, its traditions and nature of legal awareness, and state creation. The influence of the Magdeburg Law on socio-political, social, and legal life shaped the new principles of national mentality that were not characteristic for Russian urban culture, which never knew the Magdeburg Law norms [Hrabovskyj, Stavroyani, Shklyar, 2020].

It is important to draw attention to the different nature of the relations between the Galician-Volyn principality and Moscovia with the Mongol-Tatar state. In the Moscow State, there was a large-scale convergence of local and Mongol-Tatar cultures, including legal and state ones. While the Volodymyr-Suzdal and the Moscow principality recognized the Golden Horde Khan power, the Galician-Volyn principality acted actively against foreign domination.

Therefore, during this period, the separate traditions of Ukrainian state governance and the difference in the “historical upbringing” between Ukrainians and Russians were felt. Later on, it caused the difference between Ukrainian and Russian mentality [Knyazev, Bakaev, Vasylevska, 2010: 8].

After the collapse of the Galician-Volyn state in 1340, Ukrainian lands were part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Kingdom of Poland, as well as the Hungarian Kingdom and the Moldavian Principality. The Polish-Lithuanian era of Ukrainian statehood began.

In 1569, the unification of Poland and the Lithuanian-Russian principality lead to the creation of the Rzeczpospolita – a large feudal federal state. At the same time, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, as well as the Polish Crown, remained independent political bodies with separate administrative departments, including the treasury, army, and judicial-legal system [Yakovenko, 2018: 131].

The King, the State Council, and the *Seim* were the supreme state power bodies. The voivodship headed by the *voivoda* was the largest administrative unit. *Seimik* played the role of an executive body in the voivodship. Ukrainian voivodeships of the Rzeczpospolita were divided into lands, counties (*poviats*), and *starostvos*.

The Statute of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, issued in different editions during the years 1529, 1566, and 1588, became the main legal document of the state. Its provisions were in force in the Ukrainian lands until the middle of the XIX century. The second Lithuanian Statute of 1566 radically reformed the system of government, finally endorsing the idea of a self-governing, gentry state, similar to the type of major political structures found in the Polish Kingdom.

The Zaporizhyan Sich, a social-political and military-administrative organization of the Ukrainian Cossacks, was of great importance for the establishment of Ukrainian statehood. The Sich was created by the ataman Dmytro Vyshneveckyj in 1552–1556. The military Cossack Council, attended by all Cossacks, was the highest authority in the Sich. The council elected the Chief (*koshevyi*) ataman, the Cossack leadership, and solved the most important issues.

The Sich consisted of *kurins*, or administrative-military units, which at the same time were self-government communities and separate military divisions headed by the *kurin* ataman.

The Zaporizhyan Army had military and territorial divisions. Just like the army, the Zaporizhyan community was divided into thirty-eight *kurins*, while territorially it consisted of at first five, and later eight *palankas* [Yavornyckyj, 2019].

The XVII–XVIII centuries are considered to be the period of the Cossack state (Hetmanate). In those times, the Ukrainian state finally acquired the form of the Cossack republic.

The Hetmanate had practically all the signs of the state: a territory with defined borders, central and local government, armed forces, as well as court and diplomatic recognition. The General Council (*Rada*) was the highest authority. It elected general officers and the Hetman among the nominees proposed by the Cossack leadership. The Hetman was assisted in administering all internal governance and foreign policy matters by the government, which consisted of the general leadership. They implemented the cabinet of ministers' functions and at the same time served the general military headquarters [Mycyk, Bazhan, Vlasov, 2018].

Bohdan Khmelnyckyj liquidated voivodeships and *poviats*, replacing them with regiments and hundreds. Regiments and hundreds' administrations were headed by colonels and centurions (*sotniks*). City atamans, carrying out not only military but also civilian power within their competence, ran the cities. The posts of all government structures were elective.

During the times of the Ukrainian Cossack state, both the Cossack self-government and the city self-government under the Magdeburg law existed. At the turn of the XIX–XX centuries, this principle formed the basis for M. Draho-manov's "community socialism" and the Ukrainian People's Republic Constitution [Nadolishnyj, 2015: 171].

Thus, during 1648–1657, B. Khmelnyckyj managed to create a Ukrainian national state, demonstrating progressive approaches to the formation of state and local government institutions.

The implementation of democratic governance ideas in Ukrainian history begins during the Cossack state time. The military-political organization of the Ukrainian Cossacks is characterized by historians as a Cossack Christian republic [Bezverkhnyuk, Sakhanenko, Topalova, 2008: 76].

The Constitution by Pylyp Orlyk, which is one of the first European constitutions, is an outstanding creation of Ukrainian and world political and philosophical thought that was founded on democratic principles. Through the election procedures of general and other leadership, the Constitution inherited and normalized the usual practice of the general Cossack parliamentarism of the Zaporizhian Sich. It introduced representative parliamentarism and ensured independence from the Hetman's will for elected officials [Shyshkyn, 2007]. "The capital city of Kyiv and other Ukrainian cities with their magistrates and with all their legally granted rights and privileges must be strictly preserved. This is adopted by a special act and entrusted with further confirmation by the Hetman's authority" [*Dohovory i postanovy...*, clause XIII].

Although the provisions of the Constitution by Pylyp Orlyk have never been practically applied, this document clearly expressed the national idea in its political and legal sense. The Constitution can be considered in the context of the development of European legal awareness, which in the theoretical works of Hobbes, Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Rousseau outstripped its time, clarifying rather the future than the present.

Only after having compared the ideas reflected in the Constitution by Pylyp Orlyk with those prevailing in the neighboring states, we would be able to properly evaluate the meaning of this document. At those times, only England, the Netherlands and Switzerland began to embody the constitutionalism principles in political and legal practice. Consequently, it can be argued that the Ukrainian nation-creation ideals advanced over at least half a century the general socio-political development of the Eastern European region states [Knyazev, Bakaev, Vasylevska, 2010: 17].

### 3. Ukrainian lands under the other states authority

Thus, we can assume that state entities exhibiting the signs of an independent state existed on Ukrainian lands during different time periods. However, Ukrainians failed to preserve that statehood and fell under the rule of powerful neighbouring states.

In 1686, as a result of the peace treaty conclusion between Rzeczpospolita and the Moscow State, the territory of Hetman Ukraine was divided between the two countries. In Right-Bank Ukraine, which became part of the Rzeczpospolita, the regimental-centennial system was gradually replaced by a *voivodship-poviat* organization and was finally liquidated in 1714.

On the Left-Bank Ukraine, which joined the Moscow State, the regimental-centennial system was preserved for some time. However, during the second half of the XVIII century, the process of accelerated incorporation of Ukrainian lands and their inclusion in the imperial system of governance continued. The Novorossijsk province (*guberniya*) was created from part of the Zaporizyan and Hetmanate lands. The Sloboda-Ukrainian province was formed in the Sloboda Regiment territory. Subsequently, parts of both counties were transferred to the newly formed Azov province. Provinces were divided into districts (*poviats*) [Izha, 2011: 237].

At the end of the XVIII century, as a result of the three partitions of Poland, the Russo-Turkish wars, and the Hetmanate and Zaporozhyan Sich liquidation, the Ukrainian lands were divided between the Russian and Austrian empires.

In the administrations of those territories, the emperors relied first and foremost on the army and bureaucracy. The imperial bureaucrats, unlike Ukrainian Cossack leadership and Polish gentry, emphasized centralized governance. Thus, Ukrainians were part of a political system that radically differed from the one they were accustomed to.

All administrative power was concentrated in the hands of the governor, and later in the vicegerent, appointed by the emperor. “The Kingdom” was divided into 18 *okrugs* (districts), 12 of which constituted the Ukrainian share of the region. Bukovina (without an ethnic division) was a separate district until 1861. Thus, at the end of the XVIII century, the Hapsburg Empire included a large part of Ukraine. The Western Ukrainian lands occupied an area of 70 thousand km<sup>2</sup> with a population of 3.5 million people – of which 2.4 million were Ukrainians.

The Western Ukraine entry into the Austrian Empire took place at the time of modernization reforms. In particular, rural communities were granted self-government rights in 1784, while serfdom still existed in the Ukrainian lands of the Russian Empire.

A general imperial administrative system was introduced in the Ukrainian lands of the Russian Empire. Governorates general consisting of several provinces were created. Four governorates general, Kyiv, Kharkiv, Malorossijsk,



and Novorossijsk, united Ukrainian lands. The full power in the new formations belonged to the governor-general. He was appointed and dismissed personally by the emperor and had almost unlimited power (military, administrative, judicial, and financial) in the territory entrusted to him. By the Tsar's Decree of 1831, the Magdeburg Law was abolished for all cities except Kyiv, which ultimately also had it abolished in 1835 [Bakumenko et al., 2009: 304].

In the second half of the XIX century, the economic development of the empire, the serfdom abolition, and the acquisition of civil rights by the peasants led to a call for the reformation of the public administration system. In particular, the *zemska* reform, which radically changed the regional administration system and introduced self-government elements, was of great importance for the Ukrainian lands.

On January 1, 1864 "The Regulations on Province and Poviats Zemstvo Institutions" entered into force. *Zemstvo* self-government institutions were created in 33 provinces. The reform was carried out only in six of the nine provinces comprising Ukrainian lands, (Kharkiv, Poltava, Chernyiv, Kherson, Ekaterinoslav, and Tavrijska). Three western provinces of the Right-bank were not covered by the reform for political reasons. In those provinces, there were many people of Polish origin among the landowners, who sympathized with the Polish national liberation movement. *Zemstvos* were introduced in Right-bank Ukraine only in 1912.

Province and *poviat zemstvo* assemblies and their executive structures – province and *poviat zemstvo* boards (*uprava*) became *zemstvo* self-government institutions. In accordance with the Regulations, the *zemstvo poviat* board "consisted of a chairman and two members elected for three years by the *poviat zemstvo* assembly from the number of persons participating in it" [Polozhenije..., 1864].

*Zemstvo* self-government covered almost the entire spectrum of social life. In particular, medical care in the Ukrainian provinces was improved. While in 1866 there were only 11 *poviat zemstvo* doctors in the entire Poltava county, in 1876 their number doubled, and in 1904 the number of *poviat zemstvo* doctors increased to 75 [Veselovskij, 1909: 704].

Although *zemstvo* and city self-government bodies were independent within their powers and did not obey the government administration, they carried out their activities under the supervision of the governors and the Minister of the Interior. The governor's institute in the second half of the XIX and early XX centuries can be defined as a local government body, which was endowed with

state authority powers to administer the province, having the right to participate in the resolution of judiciary issues and the activities of *zemstvo*, city and class self-government institutions [Vorobej, 2008: 8].

At the same time, *zemstvo* and city boards were accountable to the representative self-government bodies: *zemstvo* assemblies and city *dumas*. Thus, we can speak of the coexistence of two systems of administration in place: the state regional administration and *zemstvo* and city self-government.

The *zemstvo* formation is a good example of administrative reform. The introduction of electoral, all-class, independent, local self-government was a significant step in the political culture development of the country, where the majority of the population consisted of peasants only just released from the serfdom.

The administrative-territorial division of the Ukrainian lands formed by the middle of the XIX century had existed until the end of the First World War (1914–1918). The Ukrainian lands within the Russian and Austrian empires were in different conditions, which led to differences in their development. The state organization and administrative system in the Austrian Empire and Austria-Hungary, in contrast to the Russian Empire, had a certain set of democratic institutions. The Ukrainian lands enjoyed some autonomous rights. The regional and local self-government was available, though it functioned under the strict control of the central government administration. This general situation largely contributed to the preservation of Ukrainian and democratic governance tradition [Bakumenko et al., 2009: 307].

#### 4. Regional administration in the era of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1920

Despite the fact that the Ukrainian lands belonged to different countries, the process of formation of the Ukrainian statehood principles did not stop. The patriotic democratic administrative tradition continued in M. Drahomanov and M. Hrushevskij's writings, which to a large extent became the harbingers of the Ukrainian national-democratic revolution of 1917–1920.

In particular, M. Drahomanov developed a constitutional draft in 1884 for the reorganization of the Russian Empire into a decentralized federal state divided into oblasts. According to the document, local self-government was carried out at the community level (villages and towns), *volost*, district (*poviat*), and *oblast*. It was represented by an assembly or elective council. All persons having

attained the age of 21 had the right to vote and the right to be elected to any representative assembly [Drahomanov, 1884].

M. Drahomanov consistently adhered to the democracy principles and made a significant contribution to the development of the national tradition of democratic governance. He included the right to elect as well as an open public affairs realization, taking into account minority interests in the list of democratic rights of the people. After proclaiming freedom as the main goal, the scientist promoted a democratically organized system, in which the interests of the state would not conflict with the interests of the peoples that inhabit it, as well as with the interests of each person [Bezverkhnyuk, Sakhanenko, Topalova, 2008: 76].

M. Hrushevskyj presenting his draft of the future constitutional order in the paper *Constitutional Issues and Ukrainians in Russia* [Hrushevskyj, 1905], which further developed Drahomanov's ideas. Hrushevskyj proposed a mechanism for national-territorial decentralization of the Russian Empire: the people would form national oblast councils (*seims*) by direct secret ballot, and those ones – the national parliament. National *seims* would have wide powers to administer their respective territories.

Due to its high theoretical value, the federal constitutional and legal concept for political independence of Ukraine by M. Drahomanov, which used as a basis and creatively developed by M. Hrushevskyj, was the focus of domestic political and legal thought for a long time. It pointed out the most desirable form of Ukrainian national self-determination. Most of political and legal ideas by Drahomanov and Hrushevskyj remain relevant in the context of modern state building. Both thinkers' ideas for the perfection and development of constitutional and legal institutions of sovereign Ukraine as constitutional system general principles, a person's legal status, a form of the state, local self-government etc. are very valuable [Komzyuk, 2009: 153].

In 1917, the Ukrainian Central *Rada*, which was the first elected parliamentary body in Ukraine's history, gave impetus for radical changes in Ukrainian lands. The Third Universal, adopted on November 22, 1917, proclaimed the creation of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UPR), an autonomous state within the Russian Republic, which would become a federation of free and equal people [III Universal...].

In 1917–1918, the administrative-territorial structure, which created the division into provinces, was preserved. Provinces were divided into *poviats*, *volosts*, rural communities, and cities. Province, *poviat*, and *volost* commissars of the Central *Rada* governed local authorities.

At the same time, M. Hrushevskyy developed an administrative-territorial system concept, which involved the liquidation of the provincial-*poviat* division. His ideas were reflected in the UPR Law “On Ukraine’s Division on the Lands” adopted on March 6, 1918. According to this law, the UPR would be divided into 32 lands [Pro podil Ukrainy..., clause 1, 2]. However, the reform failed. Instead, the commissars running the local self-government bodies, including the boards, different levels of deputy councils, and land committees, constituted state administration in the UPR until the end of April 1918.

The UPR Constitution, adopted on April 29, 1918, laid the political and legal foundation for the establishment of a democratic society, and was of great importance for the process of the Ukrainian statehood revival. The Constitution proclaimed the territory indivisible and gave the lands, *volosts*, and communities broad self-government rights, thus following the principle of decentralization closely [Konstytuciya Ukrainskoj..., clause 5].

The Constitution provided for the parallel existence of boards (state administrations) and councils (self-government bodies). Article 26 was an attempt to follow the principle of decentralization and prevent the interference of central government in local self-government matters. According to article 26, “elected councils and executive boards of communities, *volosts* and lands deal with every kind of local matter. They are the only direct local government authorities: The UPR ministers only control and coordinate their activities (§ 50), without interfering with affairs, incumbent to the Councils and Executive boards” [Konstytuciya Ukrainskoj..., clause 26].

The adoption of the Constitution is another indication that Ukraine has made a significant contribution to the formation of a modern system of European administrative values and standards.

The progressive, democratic ideas outlined in the Constitution of the UPR were not implemented, because it never came into force. On April 29, 1918, the Hetmanate was proclaimed, and thus changed the form of government from a republic to a monarchy. General Pavlo Skoropadskyy was elected to be the Hetman.

Through active foreign policy and diplomatic efforts, Skoropadskyy expanded the boundaries of the Ukrainian state to include several *poviats* and the city of Mariupol. However, despite this success, Skoropadskyy was forced to give up power under pressure from his political opponents on December 14, 1918. After this, the Ukrainian People’s Republic was renewed, and the Directory of the UPR rule started.

At the same time, the defeat of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in World War I and its disintegration created conditions for statehood restoration in the Western Ukrainian lands. On October 18, 1918, the Imperial Parliament deputies formed the Ukrainian National Council in Lviv, which on November 1, 1918 proclaimed the creation of a Ukrainian state in Galicia and Bukovina named the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (WUPR).

The reunification of the two Ukrainian republics had extraordinary political significance for the idea of a united Ukrainian state. The UPR and the WUPR signed "The Pre-Accession Treaty on further reunification of both Ukrainian states into one state unit" on December 1, 1918 in the city of Fastov. According to the document, "the Western Ukrainian People's Republic as a part of the indivisible Ukrainian People's Republic obtains territorial autonomy" [Peredvstupnyj dohovir..., clause 4]. After that, the WUPR was renamed the UPR Western *oblast*.

The Reunification Act embodied the Ukrainian people's dream about an independent state. It became an example of Ukrainians' self-identification, and their need for ethnic and territorial consolidation. However, in practice, the Reunification Act remained purely declarative and the real union was not realized. The document was denounced at the end of 1919.

In accordance with the Riga Peace Treaty signed on March 18, 1921, the Ukrainian lands were de facto divided between Soviet Russia, Poland, Romania, and Czechoslovakia.

The voivodship structure was established on the Ukrainian lands, which became part of Poland. Transcarpathia became part of Czechoslovakia and was divided into 14 *poviats*, and those in turn were split up into 478 communities. Finally, Northern Bukovina and Southern Bessarabia were ruled by Romania. The Ukrainian lands between the Prut and the Dniester rivers were combined with indigenous Romanian territories into one province – Bukovina. The Khotyn region and Southern Bessarabia constituted the province of Bessarabia.

The Soviet power was being gradually established on the other part of the Ukrainian lands. The new official name of the state was given to parallel that of Soviet Russia – the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic (SSR). The Ukrainian SSR had formal features of an independent state until December 30, 1922, when it became part of the USSR. Formally, the Ukrainian SSR joined the Soviet Union on a federal basis. In fact, it was annexed and thus lost its nominal independence.

In the Soviet era, the Ukrainians were in an environment characterized by authoritarianism and lack of democracy, which was entirely distant from their mentality. The non-acceptance of the new orders by the Ukrainian people is

confirmed by the powerful rebellion movement of 1919–1922, which resulted in the self-proclaimed Kholodnyi Yar Republic, whose authorities were recognized by dozens of villages and *khutors* in the territory of the Kholodnyi Yar forest area. The Republic was sometimes compared with Vandeia; its power was real and made the invaders to take it into account by the end of the 1920s [Koval, 2020].

The defeat of the Ukrainian national-democratic revolution is explained by the following internal factors: the lack of consensus on the prospects for the country's development, the constant fluctuations between socialist and general democratic approaches to the country's reform, the contradiction in the socio-economic transformation implementation, and the disregard for the organization of power "in place". Some of the external factors included military interventions of neighbouring states and the fact that Western democracies ignored Ukrainian needs [Kovbasiuk et al., 2012: 149].

## 5. Conclusions

Formation of the national tradition of governance and the regional administration principles took place both on its own and through the adaptation of foreign origin samples. The democratic character is a characteristic feature of national administrative tradition. It was reflected in the creation of state institutions; more specifically, in their interaction with each other and with the public.

Starting from the period of the ancient Ukrainian state, liberalism and a contractual basis of relations between the authorities and the people were typical features of the Ukrainian political and legal system. Administrative models that were alien to the Ukrainian mentality were rejected by popular consciousness.

Since the Kyievan Rus times, democratic traditions of governance were laid down, which were expressed in the limitation of central power by self-government elements. The regional administration system was formed, where local leaders were appointed by the central authorities. The Kyivan Rus was founded on powerful, self-organized, and self-sufficient communities (*vervs*), based on the principles of direct democracy, as well as electoral and collective decision-making.

A significant contribution to the development of democratic traditions of governance was made during the Cossack-Republican statehood with its electoral system for all local administrative bodies. The process of democratically forming Ukrainian national statehood and its many mechanisms, which was

originally initiated during the Zaporizhian Sich, did not stop despite the fact that the Ukrainian lands were part of different states.

Local self-government traditions also exist in Ukraine. Administration in Ukrainian cities and regions was traditionally based on the use of different historical local self-government forms (Viche law, Magdeburg law, Cossack self-government, *zemstvo*, etc.). This corresponded to the general tendencies of European civilization development.

The progressive development of democratic administrative traditions was interrupted by the loss of Ukrainian state independence in the twenties of the last century. The failure to create an independent Ukrainian state in 1917–1920 is explained by both internal and external causes. The main internal reason was the lack of unity in the actions of Ukrainian national forces that could not compromise in the name of national interests. The external causes consisted of the aggressive imperial policy of Bolshevik Russia and the refusal of Western states to support the independence struggle of the Ukrainian people. In this context, we can draw historical parallels with the present, where Ukraine faces a major socio-political crisis and a real danger of losing its territories due to a lack of unity amongst the political elite. Historical experience reveals the need for unity and dedicated work for the sake of preserving the country and its restoration within the borders of 1991.

## | References

- III Universal Ukrainskoj Centralnoi Rady vid 20.11.1917 r. || III Універсал Української Центральної Ради від 20.11.1917 р., [electronic resource] <http://rada.gov.ua/site/const/universal-3.html> [date of access: 1.02.2019].
- Bakumenko V. et al., 2009, *Derzhavne upravlinnya: osnovy teorii, istoriya i praktyka*, Odesa || Бакуменко В. та ін., 2009, *Державне управління: основи теорії, історія і практика*, Одеса.
- Bezverkhnyuk T.M., Sakhanenko S.E., Topalova E.Kh., 2008, *Yevropejski standarty vryaduvannya na rehionalnomu rivni: monohrafiya*, Odesa || Безверхнюк Т.М., Саханенко С.Є., Топалова Е.Х., 2008, *Європейські стандарти врядування регіональному рівні: монографія*, Одеса.
- Dohovory i postanovy prav i svobod viiskovykh mizh Yasnovelmozhnym Yoho Mylosti ranom Pylypot Orlykom, novoobranym hetmanom Vijska Zaporizkoho, i mizh heneralnymi osobamy, polkovnykamy i tym zhe Vijskom Zaporizkym z povnoyu*

*zhodoiu z obokh storin. Zatverdzheni pry vilnomu obranni formalnoiu prysyahoiu vidtoho zh Yasnovelmozhnoho Hetmana. Pidtverdzheni 5 kvitnya 1710 roku vid Rizdva Khrystovoho* || *Договори і постанови прав і свобод військових між Ясновельможним Його Милості паном Пилипом Орликом, новообраним гетьманом Війська Запорізького, і між генеральними особами, полковниками і тим же Військом Запорізьким з повною згодою з обох сторін. Затверджені при вільному обранні формальною присягою від того ж Ясновельможного Гетьмана. Підтверджені 5 квітня 1710 року від Різдва Христового* [electronic resource] <http://static.rada.hov.ua/site/const/istoriya/1710.html> [date of access: 11.12.2018].

- Drahomanov M., *Projekt osnovanii ustava ukraïnskoho obshhestva "Volnyj soïuz – Vilna spilka"* || *Проект оснований Устава українського общества «Вольный Союз» – «Вільна Спілка»*, [electronic resource] <http://constituanta.blohsport.com/2011/08/1884.html> [date of access: 5.04.2018].
- Hrabovskij S., Stavroyani S., Shklyar L., 1995, *Narysy z istorii ukraïnskoho derzhavotvorennya*, Kyiv || Грабовський С., Ставроян С., Шкляр Л., 1995, *Нариси з історії українського державотворення*, Київ, [electronic resource] <https://lawbook.online/pahe/niua/ist/ist-21--idz-ax288--nf-5.html> [date of access: 24.05.2019].
- Hrushevskij M., 1905, *Konstytuciïni pytannya i ukraïnstvo v Rosii. Konstytuciïnij projekt* || Грушевський М., *Конституційне питання і українство в Росії. Конституційний проект*, [electronic resource] <http://constituanta.blohsport.com/2011/08/1905.html> [date of access: 3.02.2020].
- Izha M., 2011, *Systema rehionalnoho upravlinnya: svitovij dosvid i Ukraïna*, Odesa || Іжа М., 2011, *Система регіонального управління: світовий досвід і Україна*, Одеса.
- Knyazev V., Bakaev Yu., Vasylevska T., 2010, *Tradycii demokratychnoho vryaduvannya v istorii ukraïnskoho derzhavotvorennya*, Kyiv || Князев В.М., Бакаєв Ю.В., Василевська Т.Е., *Традиції демократичного врядування в історії українського державотворення*, Київ.
- Komzyuk L., 2009, *Porivnyalnyi analiz konstytuciïnykh projektiv M. Drahomanova i M. Hrushevskoho 1884 i 1905 rokiv u konteksti evoliucii koncepcii samostiïnosti Ukraïny kïncya XIX – pochatku XX st.*, "Porivnyalno-pravovi doslidzhennya", No. 1, p. 148–154 || Комзюк Л., 2009, *Порівняльний аналіз конституційних проектів Драгоманова і Грушевського 1884 і 1905 років у контексті еволюції концепцій самостійності України кінця XIX – початку XX століть*, «Порівняльно-правові дослідження», № 1, с. 148–154.
- Konstytuciya Ukraïnskoj Narodnoj Respubliky (Statut pro derzhavnyi ustriï, prava i vilnosti UNR) vid 29.04.1918 || Конституція Української Народної Республіки (Статут про державний устрій, права і вільності УНР) від 29.04.1918, [electronic resource] <https://zakon.rada.hov.ua/laws/show/n0002300-18> [date of access: 26.02.2020].



- Koval R., *Nacherk do istorii Kholodnoyarskoj orhanizacii 1917–1922 rokov* || *Начерк до історії Холодноярської організації 1917–1922 років*, [electronic resource] <http://res.in.ua/nacherk-do-istoriyi-holodnoyarsekoyi-orhanizaciyi-1917-1922-ro.html> [date of access: 26.02.2020].
- Kovbasiuk Yu. et al., 2012, *Derzhavne upravlinnya: pidruchnik u 2 t.*, Vol. 1, Kyiv || Ковбасюк Ю. та ін., 2012, *Державне управління: підручник у 2 т.*, т. 1, Київ.
- Мусук Ю., Bazhan O., Vlasov V., 2008, *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Kyiv || Мищик Ю.А., Бажан О.Г., Власов В.С., 2008, *Історія України*, Київ, [electronic resource] [http://www.ebk.net.ua/Book/history/mitsyk\\_iu/part6/603.htm](http://www.ebk.net.ua/Book/history/mitsyk_iu/part6/603.htm) [date of access: 4.04.2018].
- Nadolishnyj P., 2015, *Konsepciya demokratychnoho vryaduvannya: zmiana paradyhmy u postanovci problem publicznego upravlinnya (revoliuciya hidnosti chy “tak zvana revoliuciya hidnosti”?)*, “Aktualni problemy derzhavoho upravlinnya”, Issue 3 (63), p. 169–177 || Надолишний П., 2015, *Концепція демократичного врядування: зміна парадигми у постановці проблем публічного управління (Револуція гідності чи «так звана Револуція гідності»?)*, «Актуальні проблеми державного управління», вип. 3 (63), с. 169–177.
- Peredvstupnyj dohovor, zaklyuchenyj dnya 1 hrudnya 1918 roku v m. Fastovi mizh Ukrainскоу Narodnoу Respublikоу i Zakhidno-Ukrainsкоу Narodnoу Respublikоу pro mayuchu nastupytu zluku obokh ukrainskykh derzhav v odnu derzhavnu odynucu* || *Передвступний договір, заключений дня 1 грудня 1918 року в м. Фастові між Українською Народною Республікою й Західно-Українською Народною Республікою про маючу наступити злуку обох українських держав в одну державну одиницю*, [electronic resource] <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/n0011300-18> [date of access: 2.08.2017].
- Polozhenije o gubernskikh i uiezdnjkh zemskykh ucherezhdennyakh*, 1864 || *Положение о губернских и уездных земских учреждениях*, [electronic resource] [http://vasilieva.narod.ru/mu/stat\\_rab/books/mpsf/4-3.htm](http://vasilieva.narod.ru/mu/stat_rab/books/mpsf/4-3.htm) [date of access: 17.11.2019].
- Povest vremennykh let* || *Повесть временных лет*, [електронний ресурс] <http://lib.misto.kiev.ua/HISTORY/RUSSYA/povest.txt#top> [date of access: 24.04.2018].
- Pro podil Ukrainy na zemli. Zakon Ukrainскоj Narodnoj Respubliky vid 6.03.1918 r. || Про поділ України на землі. Закон Української Народної Республіки від 06.03.1918 р., [electronic resource] [http://yury108.blohsport.com/2012/08/1918\\_31.html](http://yury108.blohsport.com/2012/08/1918_31.html) [date of access: 22.06.2018].
- Shyshkyn V., 2007, *Konstituciya, operedivshaya vremya* || Шишкин В., 2007, *Конституция, опередившая время*, [electronic resource] <https://day.kyiv.ua/ru/article/istoriya-i-ya/konstituciya-operedivshaya-vremya> [date of access: 27.02.2020].
- Veselovskij V., 1909, *Istoriya zemstva za sorok let*, St. Peterburg || Веселовский В., 1909, *История земства за сорок лет*, Ст. Петербург.
- Vilzhinskij V., Popov M., 2016, *Reformuvannya systemy mistsevoho samovryaduvannya v Ukraini z urakhuvannyam nacionalnykh tradyicii vryaduvannya*, Odesa || Вілжінський В.М., Попов М.П., 2016, *Реформування системи місцевого самоврядування в Україні з урахуванням національних традицій врядування*, Одеса.

- Vorobej R., 2008, *Formuvannya ta stanovlennya systemy miscevykh orhaniv derzhavnoj vlady ta upravlinnya v Ukraini u druhij polovyni XIX – na pochatku XX stolittya (na prykladi Chernyhivskoj hubernii)*, avtoreferat dySSERTACII..., 25.00.01, Kyiv || Воробей Р., 2008, *Формування та становлення системи місцевих органів державної влади та управління в Україні у другій половині XIX – на початку XX століття (на прикладі Чернігівської губернії)*, автореферат дисертації..., 25.00.01, Київ.
- Yakovenko N., 1997, *Narys istorii Ukrainy z naidavnishykh chasiv do kincya XVIII st.*, Kyiv || Яковенко Н., 1997, *Нарис історії України з найдавніших часів до кінця XVIII ст.*, Київ, [electronic resource] <http://history.franko.lviv.ua/PDF%20Final/Jakovenko.pdf> [date of access: 7.09.2018].
- Yavornyckyj D., 1990, *Istoriya Zaporizkykh kozakiv*, Kyiv || Яворницький Д., 1990, *Історія запорозьких козаків*, Київ, [electronic resource] <http://museum.dp.ua/zaporozhyeterritorial.html> [date of access: 6.01.2019].