

UDC 342(091)(477)"9/1925"

**Zablotskyi Volodymyr Valentynovych,**  
*Doctor of sciences in Public Administration, Associate Professor, Professor of the Dept. of Public Service and Management of Educational and Social Institutions, State institution "Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University", 92703 Starobilsk, Hoho square, 1, tel.: (050) 591 86 41, e-mail: zablotskiiv@gmail.com*

ORCID: 0000-0003-1032-8993

**Заблоцький Володимир Валентинович,**  
*доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, професор кафедри публічної служби та управління навчальними й соціальними закладами ДЗ "Луганський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка", 92703, м. Старобільськ, пл. Гоголя, 1, тел.: (050) 591 86 41, e-mail: zablotskiiv@gmail.com*

ORCID: 0000-0003-1032-8993

**Заблоцький Владимир Валентинович,**  
*доктор наук по государственному управлению, доцент, профессор кафедры публичной службы и управления учебными и социальными учреждениями, ГУ "Луганский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко", 92703 м. Старобельск, пл. Гоголя, 1, тел.: (050) 591 86 41, e-mail: zablotskiiv@gmail.com*

ORCID: 0000-0003-1032-8993



---

## TRANSFORMATION OF STATE FORMATIONS ON THE TERRITORY OF UKRAINE IN IX – THE FIRST QUARTER OF XX CENTURIES

**Abstract.** The sources and models of state formations, that were appearing, forming, transforming and disappearing on the territory of Ukraine during almost ten centuries, are analyzed in the article that allows to clear up nature and essence of such important questions as genesis of historical, philosophical, economical knowledge in the sphere of state-forming processes and to define national features and basic tendencies of state-forming processes. It is marked the necessity of impartial, without ideological, civilization preferences, research of sources and forms of state formations that will allow to find out nature and essence of state-forming processes that have taken place on the terri-

tory of Ukraine and their influence on development of national science of state administration.

It is proved that completeness and exactness of conclusions and suggestions concerning further development of Ukrainian society exactly depend on the high level of authenticity of historical sources in wide sense of its meaning. It is offered to appeal open mindedly to historical demand of our predecessors once more as it is impossible to improve the system of state bodies without simultaneous improvement of interrelated with it the systems of local self-government, that collectively present the united system of public authority in the state. It makes actual the problem of determination of scientific bases of state-forming processes based on taking into account historical, mental and cultural inheritance of our people that absorbed more than millennial experience of realization of state power and local self-government of all people and ethnic groups that lived on the Ukrainian territories and laid the strong foundation of the whole paradigm of modern public management, that is especially important in our time, when realization of administrative reform, processes of decentralization and democratization Ukrainian society came into practice.

**Keywords:** public administration, state-forming processes, primary sources of information, state power, local self-government, state-administrative thought, historical traditions, state formations.

## **ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ ДЕРЖАВНИХ УТВОРЕНЬ НА ТЕРЕНАХ УКРАЇНИ В ІХ – ПЕРШІЙ ЧВЕРТІ ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ**

**Анотація.** Проаналізовано джерельну базу та моделі державних утворень, які виникали, формувались, трансформувались та зникали на теренах України протягом майже десяти століть, що дозволяє з'ясувати природу і сутність таких важливих питань, як генеза історичних, філософських, економічних знань у площині державотворчих процесів і визначити національні особливості та основні тенденції розвитку державотворюючих процесів. Наголошено на необхідності неупередженого, без ідеологічних, цивілізаційних уподобань, дослідження джерельної бази та форм державних утворень, що дозволить з'ясувати природу і сутність державотворчих процесів, які відбувалися на теренах України та їх вплив на розвиток вітчизняної науки державного управління. Доведено, що саме від високого рівня достовірності історичних джерел, в широкому сенсі цього значення, залежить повнота і точність висновків та пропозицій щодо подальшого розвитку українського суспільства. Запропоновано ще раз неупереджено звернутися до історичного попиту наших попередників, адже неможливо вдосконалити систему органів державної влади без одночасного вдосконалення взаємопов'язаної з нею системи місцевого самоврядування, що в сукупності становлять єдину систему публічної влади в державі. Це актуалізує проблему визначення наукових основ державотворчих процесів на ґрунті врахування історичного, ментально-культурного спадку нашого народу, що ввібрав у себе більше ніж тисячолітній досвід здійснення державної влади й місцевого самоврядування

всіх народів і етносів, які мешкали на українських теренах та заклав міцний фундамент всієї парадигми сучасного публічного врядування, що є особливо важливим у наш час, коли у практичну площину перейшли реалізація адміністративної реформи, процеси децентралізації та демократизації українського суспільства.

**Ключові слова:** публічне управління, державотворчі процеси, першоджерела, державна влада, місцеве самоврядування, державно-управлінська думка, історичні традиції, державні формування.

## **ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫХ ОБРАЗОВАНИЙ НА ТЕРРИТОРИИ УКРАИНЫ В IX – ПЕРВОЙ ЧЕТВЕРТИ XX СТОЛЕТИЯ**

**Аннотация.** Проанализирована источниковедческая база и модели государственных образований, которые возникали, формировались, трансформировались и исчезали на территории современной Украины в течении почти десяти столетий, что позволило исследовать природу и суть таких важных вопросов, как генезис исторических, философских, экономических знаний в свете государственно-образующих процессов и определить национальные особенности возникновения и развития государственных образований. Обращено внимание на необходимость объективного, непредвзятого, без идеологических, цивилизационных, субъективных оценок, исследования источников и форм государственных образований, что позволит глубоко изучить природу и суть процессов, которые происходили в средние века на территории современной Украины, а также их влияние на развитие отечественной науки государственного управления. Доказано, что именно от высокого уровня достоверности исторических источников, в широком смысле этого значения, зависит полнота и точность выводов и предложений относительно дальнейшего развития украинского общества. Предложено еще раз беспристрастно и объективно обратиться к историческому опыту наших предков, так как невозможно усовершенствовать систему органов государственной власти без одновременного совершенствования взаимосвязанной с ней системы местного самоуправления, что в совокупности составляют единую систему публичной власти в государстве. Развитие государственно-образующих процессов на основе учета исторического, ментально-культурного наследия нашего народа, который вобрал в себя более чем тысячелетний опыт организации государственной власти и местного самоуправления всех народов и этносов, населявших территорию современной Украины, позволяет заложить прочный фундамент всей парадигмы современного публичного управления, который так необходим в наше время, когда в практическую плоскость перешли реализация административной реформы, процессы децентрализации и демократизации украинского общества.

**Ключевые слова:** публичное управление, государственнообразующие процессы, первоисточники, государственная власть, местное самоуправление, исторические традиции, государственные образования.

**Target setting.** The objective analysis of processes of state forming genesis on the territory of Ukraine needs further scientific researches of native and foreign researchers, taking into account historical events and political tendencies, features of state forming European traditions that take beginning from the depths of ancient epoch. It is very important because most ideas about the character, specific features of state formations that have appeared on the Ukrainian territory are based not on the careful and impartial analysis of primary sources of information but on ideological or religious prejudices.

Thus in order to form an objective idea about historical traditions of Ukrainian state-forming, it is necessary to appeal to native and foreign primary sources of information, analyse their history and reasons of formation, and also to investigate historical and political events that induced chroniclers and reporters of middle ages to edit literate sources, performing political, religious or personal orders. It is a very important question both for historians and specialists in the field of state administration.

**Analysis of recent researches and publications.** Working of the known for modern science historical sources predetermines the necessity concerning taking into account of certain aspects from reinterpretation of the already formed source and historiography base. E. Afonin, S. Bondar, M. Hazizov, V. Zhurska, V. Kononenko, I. Katushev, V. Nikityn, V. Riezniak, I. Shlikhta and others research the historical sources in Ukraine. Famous native scientists M. Horielov, O. Motsia, O. Rafalskyi investigate the range of problems of the

state and civilization in Ukraine. Realization of comparative analysis of state-administrative idea sources and conditions of origin and existence of state formations on the Ukrainian territory is very important for further development of civil society in Ukraine.

**The purpose of the article** consists in realization of state forming national features as strong basis for building of national model of state administration based on national traditions and national mentality of Ukrainians.

**The statement of basic materials.** During the second millennium social, political and state-forming processes on the European continent were taking place enough slowly, as a result there were destruction, restoration, consolidation and integration, were formed different state constructions that were gradually improving to the effective for that time models of state administration. It is necessary to mark that establishment and development of the state formations that appeared on the Ukrainian territory could not exist isolated from the existing in those times European system of the states and principles of power.

So, Byzantine historian Procopius of Caesarea in a book "War with goths" described the tribes of slavs (slavs), that "are not managed by one man and since olden times live in democracy" [1].

Territories that since olden times were inhabited by slavs had considerable natural resources that created conditions for development of trade connections with people that inhabited Caucasus, Transcaucasus, Middle and Front Asia. It is necessary to mark that the initial processes of statehood forma-

tion in its classic understanding took place in society that in most degree was tribal. This idea is confirmed by that society was transitional from tribal to feudal [2, p. 42].

Exactly it first of all gave Greek authors the right to confirm that the Slavs and Antes lived in “democracy” in their understanding of this term. A town’s meeting (veche) decided all soldiery and political questions. It also was the highest judicial power [3].

The important factor of historical inheritance of Ukrainian state formations are constancy of territories and presence of compact core of population, that realize its separateness and have will for self-organization [4, p. 29]. It creates a base on that the same organization or another form of the statehood is formed. Thus, objective pre-conditions (quantity of population, compact residence, geopolitical situation) and subjective (selfconsciousness, ideological unity and political will) are needed for self-reproduction of people at the level of society – state [4, p. 32–33].

Unlike European tradition, at the beginning of its existence princely power was not considered as such that had divine origin. “They did not want to admit according to importance of origin neither king nor prince. Only when some necessity happened, then they elected from their community the chieftain as the bravest and the most experienced man in knights affairs” [5, p. 55–56].

Thus, the state formations that created, developed and eventually declined on the territory of Ukraine, appeared as a result of society’s achievement of certain level of social, economical and political development as a result of

civilization conflicts and competition of different forms and state administration models. What is more, in certain periods of development of Ukrainian society presence of the national state was not considered by the European governors as a necessary and obligatory factor. The process of forming of the Ukrainian state is the index of society evolution within the framework of that there were deep changes that had important influence on motion of process of native state forming. In this understanding development and structure of formation of new forms of society social and political organization, in particular on the stage of transition to feudal model of the political system closely connected with the features of concrete historical and cultural conditions of activity, that is the result of experience of their economical, political and cultural life and determines the features of state organization forms. The times of Kievan Russia may be considered as the first experience of realization of state forming idea on the territory of Ukraine. As modern native researchers Yu. Myroshnychenko and S. Udovik point out, investigating the stages of Ukrainian statehood genesis, that exactly the Kyiv prince Volodymyr established frameworks of not only the state known as Kievan Russia but also one of seven civilizations that exist up to date, – Slavic orthodox [6, p. 136].

It is necessary to mark that I. Bieliaviev underlined that from times of prince Volodymyr the Great district councils (zemstvo) were ruled after the ancient ways on the basis of communal principles: the judgment of town’s meeting (veche) continued to have the value and princes in attitude toward

populace (zemshchina) could give no orders without town's meeting (veche). A prince with his armed force and populace (zemshchina) though operated jointly, and district councils (zemstvo) determined the prince power, but still they were not one unit [7, p. 40].

One of the indexes of state development is a level of trade relations. Frensis Dvornik marked that the Kyiv state had supported the brisk relationships with the Latin West, considering itself an equal in rights partner in the European community of nations [8].

The Arabic and Persian geographers reported that main employment of the Rus was fur and slaves trade, the exchange of that took place for money. The Scandinavian sagas, French epic compositions show Kievan Russia as the state that occupied an important place in the system of European political, economical and cultural relations [6].

As a result of fight against Byzantium Kievan Russia got a right for unlimited trade on Danube, Dnister and Dnieper.

As for the forms of the political system of the Kyiv state of IX–X centuries, in our point of view there is enough successful its determination as the “armed force state”, as exactly the highest ranks of prince's armed force formed a ruling clan for a long time. In addition this ruling clan carried out collection of contribution, judicial functions and protecting from military expansion [9].

At this time the political system is formed in that democracy of the cities-states with monarchical principles are united [8].

A wide range of scientists consider that social and economical situation

that was in the cities of Kievan Russia in the end of X the beginning of XI centuries substantially influenced on transformation of such state forming phenomenon as a “town's meeting (veche)”. So a town's meeting (veche) and elective people began to rule the cities in this period. There was a very powerful clan of craftsmen and tradesmen exactly in cities. They formed political power that beginning from the second half of XI century took an active part in the cities management and had their forms of political organization, one of that was a town's meeting (veche) [10].

The example of princely power limitation may be an existing for that time court system. A prince could judge only his vassals, members of prince's armed forces and servants. Princely jurisdiction did not spread to all mass of population, in particular members of communities [11].

Princes for the decision of major questions convened a town's meeting (veche) from the representatives of the highest ranks of tribal gentlefolks and city-dwellers. It is necessary to mark that even Mongol-Tatar Yoke and behaviours introduced by Tatars could not break the mode of populace (zemshchina) that had the strong arrangement from the very beginning. Thus self-governing populace (zemshchina) under Tatars also had its own arrangement, elective chiefs, even territorial troops with commanders of an army (waywodes) separately from princely troops [7, p. 59–63].

From the middle of XI century there is in Kievan Russia strengthening of appanaged princes, that predetermines development of the process of country

feudal division. At this time in writing sources church-ascetic direction appears next to ideology of monarchy of great princes. The most known representatives of this direction were Kyiv Pechersk hegumen of Feodosiya and Nestor the Chronicler. The feudal division and wars weakened the state that in future resulted in the decline of Kievan Russia and establishment almost for three centuries of Tartar Mongol Yoke, that ruined state principles, economy and culture of the state and resulted in advancement on the first plan of church that actually the least suffered from the invasion of invaders. It is necessary to mark that an Orthodox Church from the times of its existence always was in the privileged state on the territory of the Old Russian state [12, p. 119].

The fact that Ukrainian lands for the long time were under the power of other states that belonged to different civilizations: West European (Lithuania, Poland, Austro-Hungary) and East European (Russian empire) could not affect the characteristic features of Ukrainian state forming and establishment of the whole system of territorial organization of public power. That is why a wide range of primary sources of information estimated the organization of local self-government and state administration in a different way that resulted in opposition of “westerners” and “slavophiles”. There is an idea among scientists that bicentenary period from the middle of 14 century to the Union of Lublin of 1563 was enough rare phenomenon in the history of Ukraine. In this period (the beginning of 14 century) Lithuania played the role of collector of separate Belarussian and Ukrainian lands. A foreign threat compelled Lithuania

to the signature of two unions with Poland (the Union of Krewo of 1385 and the Union of Lublin of 1563).

The union of Poland and Lithuania for The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth resulted in setting of domination of catholic church and permanent persecution of Orthodoxy. M. Kostomarov marked that “state and public composition, historical and folk character of Poland and Rus though take the beginning from the same tribes, became not only different but also enemies. For many centuries Poland and Rus conducted continuous, stubborn, consistent fight” [9]. For the completeness of picture of the Slavic behaviours in 16–17 centuries it is necessary to remind that simultaneously with the increase of Polish noble seims and small seims, Moscow territorial cathedrals, in the heath develop Cossack communities that in their stems (in Ukraine) or districts (in Moscow territories) have tradition of old town’s meetings (veche), what is more in Ukraine these archaic public gatherings began to come under the influence of Polish classic republican ideas [13, p. 32].

It is possible to consider as a new quality stage of state formations on the Ukrainian territories the appearance of Cossack republic as Umland Andreas and Bredis Inhmar noticed that along with origin of Cossack Hetmanate appeared another Ukrainian proto-state formation that played an important role in modern national identity. Cossacks founded on the banks of river Dnieper a military republic with a representative body — Cossack Rada (General Military Council ) the members of that elected a military chief-hetman. Cossacks’ love for freedom and proto-state

ruling until now influence on the idea of Ukrainians about themselves [14].

After formation in 1722 of Collegium of Little Russia, Russian power considered conditional territory of Zaporizhian Host not autonomous state but internal province of Russia [15, p. 286]. The last institutes of the political system of Cossack Hetmanate stopped to exist in 1781–1872, where instead of old regiments and sotnias (Cossack squadron) were established the deputies of the Russian type, that ruined the old management system of state territory Ukraine – Cossack Hetmanate and its traditional Cossack administrative political arrangement.

It is impossible to agree with M. Drahomanov who considered that new scientific experience of the ancient free behaviours in Europe had shown that they had given the citizens certain system of self-government and corporate life, very clumsily according to our present ideas, but such that developed for those citizens habit to control the public affairs and ability to use written rights in laws. Such experience not only showed new prospects in historical and political science but also gave scientific principles for new public competitions. These competitions head for that in the new constitutional states ideal determination after populosity of certain rights became actual, and in conjunction with that parliamentarism became less fictitious [13, p. 34].

The period of the first quarter of XX century became the bright splash of state forming processes on the territory of Ukraine when as a result of rapid revolutionary events and World War I took place the quick falling of the Russian empire and origin of the state

formations in the period of 1917–1921 years, that practically had all attributes of the classic state. With proclamation of Ukrainian People's Republic the first real attempt to reform the institutes of public power were done. At the same time most of western leaders did not consider Ukraine as independent state. They tried to use the Ukrainian question in their own interests. It is necessary to add to it that political and administrative celebs did not succeed in organizing army, state machine, conducting social and economical reforms, consolidating social tops and social bottoms round the national idea. All of it became reasons for defeat of the national state and its political celebs.

Further development of Ukraine till 1991 is related to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. From 1991 the new stage of development of state forming processes begins in Ukraine.

**Conclusions.** History testifies that Ukraine as the state has an experience of such periods when the basic attributes of the state were formed but absence of consolidation of society, uncertainty of strategy and priorities brought to elimination of the state formations that appeared with such laborious efforts. Therefore researches from the primary sources of information to the newest scientific works of the process of public management institutes development and their co-operation on the territory of Ukraine allow to renew a source base so necessary for further scientific researches, moreover that and today there are a lot of problem questions concerning forming of the Ukrainian national state, that not only are little-investigated but also remain unknown and does not have demand of wide pub-



lic, and for researchers of the problems of state administration, in particular in part of determination of optimal vectors of community development, tasks and forms of fight for becoming of Ukrainian state. It is necessary to understand basic principles of ideology of public administration in a wide plan as a system of integral orientations both individual and societies on the whole, systems of ideas, principles, aims, that are generally accepted and that orient society on providing of integrity and durability of the state, consolidation of all association with the aim of its social, economical and cultural development.

## REFERENCES

1. *Kesariiskii P.* (1996). *Voina s gotami* [War with the Goths]. — M.: Aritos, b. 3. — P. 336 [in Russian].
2. *Kotliar N. F.* (1995). *O sotsialnoi sushchnosti Drevnerusskogo gosudarstva IX pervoi poloviny X v. Drevneishye gosudarstva Vostochnoi Evropy: materialy i issledovaniia. 1992–1993 gody* [About social sense of Ancient Rus state in IX the first half of X century. The most ancient states of Eastern Europe: materials and researches. 1992–1993 years]. — M. [in Russian].
3. *Alekseev S.* (2009). *Slavianskaia Evropa V–VIII vekov* [Slavic Europe of V–VIII centuries]. — M.: Veche. — P. 536 [in Russian].
4. *Kremen V. H.* (2007). *Filosofiiia natsionalnoi idei. Liudyna. Osvita. Sotsium.* [Philosophy of national idea. Human. Education. Society]. — K.: Hramota. — P. 576 [in Ukrainian].
5. *Hvanini O.* (2009). *Khronika Yevropeiskoi Sarmatii* [Chronicle of European Sarmatia]. — K.: Publishing house “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy”. — P. 1006 [in Ukrainian].
6. *Myroshnychenko Yu. R.* (2011). *Rus-Ukraina: stanovlennia derzhavnosti. Tom 1. Rus-Ukraina z naidavnishykh chasiv* [Rus-Ukraine: establishment of stateness. Volume 1. Rus-Ukraine from the most ancient times till empire creation]. — K.: Vakler. — P. 744 [in Ukrainian].
7. *Beliaev I.* (1905). *Sudby zhemschiny i vybornogo nachala na Rusi* [Destiny of populace (zemshchina) and elective begin in Rus]. — M.: imperatorskoe obshchestvo istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete [emperor’s society of history and Russian antiquities at Moscow university]. — P. 136 [in Russian].
8. *Dvornik F.* (2000). *Sloviany v Yevropeiskii istorii ta tsyvilizatsii* [The Slavs in European history and civilization]. — K.: Dukh i Litera, p. 528 [in Ukrainian].
9. *Kostomarov M. I.* (1839). *Bohdan Khmelnytsky* [Bohdan Khmelnytsky]. — StPb.: Kozhannikov [in Russian].
10. *Heliun T. V., Melnikova Ye. A.* (2006). *Drevneishee gosudarstvo Vostochnoi Evropy: 2004: Politicheskie instituty Drevnei Rusi* [The most ancient state of Eastern Europe: 2004: Political institutions of Ancient Rus]. — P. 438 [in Russian].
11. *Yushkov S.* (1992). *Narysy z istorii vynyknennia i pochatkovoho rozvytku feodalizmu Kyivskoi Rusi* [The Sketches of history of origin and initial development of Kievan Russia feudal system]. — K.: Naukova dumka. — P. 352 [in Ukrainian].
12. *Zamaliiev A. F.* (1981). *Mysliteli Kievskoi Rusi* [Sophists of Kievan Russia]. — K.: Vyshcha shkola. — P.158 [in Russian].
13. *Drahomanov M. P.* (1907). *Stari khartii vilnostei: istorychni narysy* [Old charters of liberties: historical sketches]. — K.: Ranok. — P. 84 [in Ukrainian].

14. *Umland A.* (2009). Postsovetskii paradox: demokratiia v Ukraine, avtokratiia v Rossii [Postsoviet paradox: democracy in Ukraine, autocracy in Russia]. — Retrieved from: <http://blogs.korrespondent.net/celebrities/blog/forum/2004/a57324>
15. *Kliuchevskii V. O.* (1959). Sochineniia v 8 tomah. Tom 8. Issledovaniia, retsenzii, rechi(1890–1905). [Essays in 8 volumes. — Volume 8. Researches, reviews, speeches (1890–1905)]. — M.: Sotsiekhiz. — P. 426 [in Russian].