



UDC: 351.82

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2019-17-2-286-295>

Chorna Kateryna Pavlivna,

PhD. of Law, Associated Professor, Professor of the Department of Business law, labour rights and civil-law disciplines, Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Kyiv, tel.: (044) 258 21 24, e-mail: katernachornackp@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-0318-5237

Чорна Катерина Павлівна,

кандидат юридичних наук, доцент, професор кафедри господарського, трудового права та цивільно-правових дисциплін, Міжрегіональна Академія управління персоналом, Київ, тел.: (044) 258 21 24, e-mail: katernachornackp@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-0318-5237

Черная Екатерина Павловна,

кандидат юридических наук, профессор кафедры хозяйственного, трудового пра-

ва и гражданско-правовых дисциплин, Межрегиональная Академия управления персоналом, Киев, тел.: (044) 258 21 24, e-mail: katernachornackp@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-0318-5237

UKRAINIAN STATE PAVEL SKROROPADSKY: PECULIARITIES OF NATIONAL MILITARY AUTOCRACY

Abstract. The proposed research is an analysis of state-building attempts in Ukrainian territories during the period of the Ukrainian revolution, namely, during the time of the Ukrainian State of Pavlo Skoropadsky.

It contains a detailed description of the Hetman government describes features of the interaction of central and local government, the influence of foreign protectorate for the creation, operation and collapse of the Hetman regime that, despite this, wearing the national character. Special attention is given to the reform and innovation, characteristics and reasoning autocracy in management profession officials, outlining future plans for state building and cause of the fall of the Ukrainian state. Investigated that large industrial and agricultural bourgeoisie has created its own representative body – the Council of Industry, Trade, Finance and Agriculture, which was intended to promote the restoration of pre-revolutionary

economic system (Protofis) with its branches in provinces. Thus, experiencing harassment by the Hetman's administration, who was a prisoner of economic agreements with Germany and Austria-Hungary, and resisting landowners who wanted to restore the old land and property, the masses were enemies of the new order, which, in fact, contributed the most crash Hetman's government.

The work presented evidence to suggest practical steps towards an independent state made the times Skoropadskiy: the creation authorities, the struggle for the country, implementation of strong internal and active foreign policy, legislative regulation of public life; Separately, the historical lessons of the described experience of national state construction are emphasized.

Keywords: Hetman, Ukrainian State, Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian State, Ukrainian Sejm, foreign protectorate, State guard, Protofis, provincial elders, atamans, Directory of the UPR.

УКРАЇНЬСЬКА ДЕРЖАВА ПАВЛА СКОРОПАДСЬКОГО: ОСОБЛИВОСТІ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ ВІЙСЬКОВОЇ АВТОКРАТІЇ

Анотація. У запропонованому дослідженні проаналізовано державотворчі процеси на українських теренах у період української революції, а саме — за часів Української держави Павла Скоропадського.

Подано детальний опис діяльності гетьманського уряду, схарактеризовано особливості взаємодії центральної та місцевої влади, досліджено вплив іноземного протекторату на створення, функціонування та крах гетьманського режиму, який, незважаючи на це, носив національний характер. Особливу увагу приділено розгляду реформ та нововведень, характеристики та аргументації автократії в управлінні, професіограмам урядовців, окресленню майбутніх планів державного будівництва та причинам падіння Української держави. Досліджено, що велика промислова і сільськогосподарська буржуазія утворила власний представницький орган — Раду промисловості, торгівлі, фінансів та сільського господарства, яка мала на меті сприяти реставрації дореволюційного господарського устрою (Протофіс) зі своїми філіями у губерніях. Таким чином, зазнаючи утисків з боку гетьманської адміністрації, яка перебувала у полоні економічних домовленостей з Німеччиною та Австро-Угорщиною, та чинячи опір поміщикам, які прагли повернути колишні угіддя і майно, народні маси ставали ворогами нових порядків, що, по суті, найбільше посприяло крахові гетьманського урядування.

Наведено докази, що свідчать про реальні кроки на шляху до самостійної держави, здійснені за часів П. Скоропадського: створення владних структур, боротьба за території країни, провадження рішучої внутрішньої та активної зовнішньої політики, законодавче регулювання суспільного життя; окремо наголошено на історичних уроках описуваного досвіду національного державного будівництва.

Ключові слова: гетьман, Українська Держава, Рада Міністрів Української Держави, Український Сейм, іноземний протекторат, Державна варта, Протофіс, губернські старости, отамани, Директорія УНР.

УКРАИНСКОЕ ГОСУДАРСТВО ПАВЛА СКОРОПАДСКОГО: ОСОБЕННОСТИ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ВОЕННОЙ АВТОКРАТИИ

Аннотация. В предложенном исследовании проанализированы государственно-созидательные процессы на украинской территории в период Украинской революции, а именно — во времена Украинского государства Павла Скоропадского.

Представлено подробное описание деятельности гетманского правительства, охарактеризованы особенности взаимодействия центральной и местной власти, исследовано влияние иностранного протектората на создание, функционирование и крах гетманского режима, который, несмотря на это, носил национальный характер. Особое внимание уделено рассмотрению реформ и нововведений, характеристике и аргументации автократии в управлении, профессиограмме чиновников, обрисовке будущих планов государственного строительства и причинам падения украинского государства. Доказано, что крупная промышленная и сельскохозяйственная буржуазия создала собственный представительный орган — Совет промышленности, торговли, финансов и сельского хозяйства, цель которого — способствовать реставрации дореволюционного хозяйственного устройства (Протофис) со своими филиалами в губерниях. Таким образом, испытывая давление со стороны гетманской администрации, которая находилась в плену экономических договоренностей с Германией и Австро-Венгрией, и сопротивляясь помещикам, которые хотели вернуть прежние угодья и имущество, народные массы становились врагами новых порядков, что, по сути, больше поспособствовало крушению гетманского управления.

В работе приведены доказательства, свидетельствующие о реальных шагах на пути к самостоятельному государству, совершенные во времена П. Скоропадского: создание властных структур, борьба за территории страны, производство решительной внутренней и активной внешней политики, законодательное регулирование общественной жизни; отдельно отмечены исторические уроки описываемого опыта национального государственного строительства.

Ключевые слова: гетьман, Украинское Государство, Совет Министров Украинского Государства, Украинский Сейм, иностранный протекторат, Государственная стража, Протофис, губернские старосты, атаманы, Директория УНР.

**Statement of the problem in the-
sis form and its connection with im-
portant scientific or practical tasks.**
After the defeat of the Ukrainian Cen-
tral Rada and the entry of German
and Austro-Hungarian troops into the
country, the formation of new govern-

ment institutions largely depended on
the allies and their geopolitical inte-
rests. The desire of the Ukrainian elite
to continue the national revolution
by reforming the internal and external
life found support from these forces,
which relied on the power of the Ukrai-

nian state, which stood in place of the UPR.

In historiography, there were quite frequent discussions on its assessment as a separate state entity: its characteristics as a puppet state, as a satellite state, as a temporary artificial autocratic formation organized by the occupation regime to meet domestic economic needs.

However, this period is more appropriate to consider as a bright progressive stage of the national state, characteristic of the Ukrainian revolution of 1917–1921, and special scientific attention is required by the fact that it in a short period of time (April–December 1918) the foundations of the future Institute of Ukrainian public service were established, — the form and content of its activities, professional requirements for civil servants, the emphasis on the rejection of political preferences, ethics of the employee and the moral principles, and these lessons are important today for the modern state, the main task of which is anti-corruption reform, primarily in the field of executive power, as well as the creation of effective technocratic management.

Analysis of research and publications. The source basis for the constructive scientific study of this problem were the works of contemporaries of the Ukrainian revolution of 1917–1921: first of all, the memories of the Head of the Ukrainian State P. Skoropadskyi [4, 14]; historical works of his colleague, an outstanding scientist and statesman D. Doroshenko [3]; memoirs of the reformer of the “white” movement and the Supreme commander of the southern troops of Russia P. Wrangel [5; 6], memories of

the Russian statesman V. Obolenskyi [9], political studies of V. Petriv [12]. Additional information to explore this theme is provide in the works of Ukrainian historian I. Kripyakevych [11], historiographical studies of modern scientists S. Kulchytskyi [1], O. Mironenko [2], V. Chekhov [10], O. Boyko [8]. The paper uses collective works on the history of public service and archival research materials of the governments of Ukraine in the twentieth century [7].

Formulation of the purpose of the article:

- to highlight the mechanisms of formation of central government bodies, local authorities in the Ukrainian State and the principles of their interaction;
- to consider the features of the German and Austro-Hungarian protectorate and characterize the level of foreign influence on political events and government steps in the described period of the Ukrainian revolution;
- to study the ratio of management reforms and restorations in the activities of the Hetman government;
- to emphasize national features in the Hetman administration and to prove the importance of this historical lesson.

Presentation of the main material of the study with the justification of the results. Pavlo Skoropadskyi, the head of the proclaimed Ukrainian State officially took power from the delegates of the all-Ukrainian peasant Congress, convened by the Central Rada in April of 1918 — historians call this moment a coup d'état initiated by the high command of Germany. The foreign role in management was quite reasoned: having found itself in a difficult situ-

ation after the end of the First World War, caused by the threat of the red and white guard, the previous government of the UPR was forced to agree to the protectorate of the Fourth Union, primarily Germany and Austria-Hungary — in exchange for territorial concessions (return of Kholmshchyna, Pildliashia, providing conditions for the autonomous development of Eastern Galicia); an important condition of this agreement was the exchange of prisoners of war, a return to mutually beneficial economic relations [1].

At the same time, the last important government steps were taken by the Council of People's Ministers, which was evacuated to Volyn: The law on the citizenship of the UPR and the introduction of the national currency — hryvnia, the state emblem (trident) was approved, the Gregorian calendar was introduced. And it was the lack of domestic and international support, the spread of the Bolshevik threat, the destruction of the legitimate power vertical that caused the coup d'état in Kyiv in April of 1918, and the subsequent achievements in the field of national policy belonged to the new government.

Officially, the parliamentary course of the state remained unchanged, since the law "On the temporary state structure", which prescribed the status of citizens, noted that the legislative and judicial power would belong to the Hetman only until the election of the Parliament, the Ukrainian Sejm, by all citizens of the Ukrainian State [2].

Consequently, the partnership with the Fourth Union was caused by the acute need of the Ukrainian authorities for armed assistance and no less urgent

need of strategic partners, Austria-Hungary and Germany, in agricultural and industrial Ukrainian raw materials, and this pushed the latter to strengthen the military presence in the Ukrainian lands, which fulfilled its important mission: in the spring of 1918, the Bolsheviks left the territory of the UNR, where more than 450,000 German and Austro-Hungarian soldiers were concentrated [3].

The figure of the leader of this state Pavlo Skoropadskyi is of particular scientific interest to researchers. The higher German command saw in him a ruler who had all the signs of traditional legitimacy: aristocratic origin (Hetman's lineage), military experience and high rank, noble education, special respect for Ukrainian national traditions, loyal attitude to foreign patrons — all this should contribute to the approval of Pavlo Skoropadskyi as the head of state. The Hetman was aware of the temporality of his own individual ruling (before the Parliament), even more — he denied monarchism, but he considered autocracy to be the only possible way out in the conditions of the general political and economic crisis, which covered the then society [4].

Despite an undemocratic rise to power and a sizeable German protectorate, the period of existence of the Hetman regime in Ukrainian territory was a continuation of ancient Ukrainian traditions in government, and the newly created Ukrainian state had all the signs of an independent state formation. First of all, this was evidenced by the strong position of the head of state, who had all the legislative (before the declared convocation of the Ukrainian Sejm) and Executive power in

the country; he was also the “Supreme Governor” — the commander of the army and Navy and had the right to form a government almost independently. The new leader of the state, abandoning the monarchical plans, at the beginning of his state activity hoped for broad support of Austria, in alliance with which he saw an independent future of Ukraine [5]. There was a serious reason for this: in addition to the readiness of Austria-Hungary to take under its wing the weighty rest of the neighboring lands, for the new Ukrainian government it the fact that the territorial subjects of this Empire, in contrast to tsarist Russia, de facto had the status of relatively independent parts of the Empire (with all the appropriate rights, liberties and representations allowed in the monarchy was worth a lot; therefore, the forced reorientation to the future (not Bolshevik) Russia will be for the Hetman, according to eyewitnesses, the only possible conscious state choice, but perhaps the most personal political disappointment [6].

No less important feature of the state is the content and form of functioning of its own government, the Council of Ministers headed by Otaman (Chairman of the Council of Ministers), the government, which significantly contributed to the development of the national Institute of public service. Thus, the ministries of internal and foreign affairs, industry, finance and trade, agriculture, public education, public health, and religion (religious Affairs) were established; the Ministers of military and judicial affairs, the Controller General and the Secretary General (head of the General office) were appointed. Gradually, a prototype of the modern system

of Executive power was formed: the ministries were divided into departments and offices, comrades of Ministers (deputies) and other employees also got on a professional basis; names and powers were changed, staff schedules and cost estimates were reasoned. Similar but less successful reforms have been carried out in the judicial sphere. All civil servants and judges, as well as the military, gave a solemn oath to faithfully serve the Ukrainian State [7].

The Ukrainian State had a pre-revolutionary territorial and administrative structure; its certain features were reflected in the system of local self-government (the Institute of provincial chiefs, which was engaged in the Ministry of internal Affairs) [8]. A characteristic feature of local government was its formation in accordance with the previous experience of the participants: important positions were often given to former Russian officials and officials of the time of the UPR, without regard to national origin and political sympathy. Usually this often provoked conflicts, especially given the fact that during the Hetman regime in Ukraine a lot of former landowners returned who demanded the government’s own land and condition, as well as considerable compensation for the losses caused by the revolution. The situation was complicated by contradictions in the city councils and zemstvo district and volost councils, which often consisted of representatives of the estates, loyal not only to the leaders of the White guard, who saw in the Ukrainian state a member of the future Federation of the former peoples of the Russian Empire, and even to the monarchists (especially in the southern provinces with their pre-

revolutionary views and the remnants of the administrative system) [9].

In the system of local self-government Hetman government sought to rely on the middle class, in particular, on the well-off peasantry, with this goal was revived the Institute of the Cossacks coralink organization and Otaman management, which operated in parallel with the provincial Presidium [10]. In addition, the great industrial and agricultural bourgeoisie formed its own representative body – the Council of industry, trade, finance and agriculture, which was aimed at promoting the restoration of the pre-revolutionary economic system (Protophis) with its branches in the provinces. Thus, suffering harassment by the Hetman administration, which was in captivity of economic agreements with Germany and Austria-Hungary, and resisting the landowners who wanted to return the former lands and property, the masses became enemies of the new order, which, in fact, most contributed to the collapse of the Hetman administration.

Given the constant external threat and internal civil conflicts, one of the main issues of state building was the organization of state protection-the restructuring of the army, aviation and Navy, which, according to the general conclusion of historians, were brought to the highest combat capability of the time during the reign of pPavlo Skoropadskyi [11]. The same applies to the internal security forces, in particular, the state guard, which at the beginning of its existence carried out not only the functions of the police, but also carried out border and customs control, was responsible for the military intelligence and personal security of the Hetman

and the government: created by the decree of the Chairman of the government of the new loyal to the former police officers and officials, the professional and state police in the middle of 1918 numbered up to 60 thousand employees and was a strong pillar of the regime. At the same time VPS, future voluntary people's squads, began its activities, as well as precinct and street committees for the protection of public order – the involvement of the local population led by him, including law enforcement was one of the unrealized initiatives proclaimed more Stolypin reforms [12].

In the performance of foreign policy, the main problems were attempts to clearly delineate the North-Eastern borders of the state and attempts to establish relations with the Entente countries (or with its individual entities). With the support of the countries of the Fourth Union and their geopolitical partners (all of these states had official representations in Kyiv) and the recognition of the Ukrainian State by the majority of European countries, the Ukrainian government carried out foreign activities as a full-fledged subject of international relations, recognizing the right to state-building behind all the national outskirts of the former Russian Empire and seeking to unite the ethnic Ukrainian lands and Crimea (on the rights of autonomy) within the Ukrainian State. The Ukrainian State was recognized by 30 states, including Bolshevik Russia. Despite numerous criticisms of the political pro-Russian (white guard) policy of Pavlo Skoropadskyi, without regard to the real protectorate of Germany and Austria-Hungary, many laws and other acts (and there were more than 500) of the

government of the Ukrainian State testified to the Ukrainization of social and political life. The central administrative apparatus consisted mainly of ethnic Ukrainians. Ukrainian was recognized as the official language, national symbols and national system of state awards were widely used, Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, National Historical Museum, National library and National archive were founded, Ukrainian universities were opened. The study of the Ukrainian language and literature has become mandatory. The process of Ukrainization affected the visual, musical and theatrical art, history of Ukraine, national law, religion; at the same time, the rights of national minorities (Jews, Crimean Tatars and others) to free national – cultural and spiritual development were also recognized – all these governmental steps convincingly prove the existence of a solid national spiritual basis in the development of the Ukrainian State (even if there was a foreign substrate in management).

Summary. The activities of the Hetman government was another step towards the creation of the state in Ukraine, initiated by the allies of the Ukrainian State led by Hetman Pavlo Skoropadskyi, which appeared instead of the UPR, even today remains a bright lesson of the formation of national state building in the Ukrainian expanses. In addition, the period of existence of the Hetmanate was a triumph of the executive power, because never in Ukrainian history the government had such broad powers and was not so deprived of control of the legislature. However, it was under the strict supervision of the head of state and his foreign patrons and represented himself as a provisional au-

thority. The leader of the state and his colleagues were aware of the delays and shortcomings of autocracy and all the risks of conservatism, which replaced socialism (social democracy), declared in the programs of the Central Council, and which was based on the form of national cossack traditions, and the content of activities – on strict monarchism and authoritarian methods of management, characteristic of management in pre-revolutionary Imperial Russia. As for the Hetman himself, “the unification of the Slavic lands of Austria and Ukraine and the creation of an independent and independent Ukraine was his only lifelong task” [13]. The head of the Ukrainian state gave the following assessment to the whole government: “I do not want to say that the central offices worked well, there were many people who were unsuitable due to their knowledge and their moral qualities, but it took time to disinfect all these institutions” [14]. It is the lack of time to establish effective governance, the people’s discontent with foreign mercantile patronage, the intensification of political struggle in the state and caused an uprising against the Hetman, which, in the absence of military support of allies engaged in territorial and political divisions in their own States, it ended with the coming to power of the Directory. In any case, the ruling of Pavlo Skoropadskyi should be considered as another (although initiated by foreign patrons) historical attempt of Ukrainians to build their own state model, however, not in the previous, declared by the Central Rada democratic pro-socialist format, but in the form of autocracy, built on the principles of military Ukrainian conservatism.

REFERENCES

1. *Kulchytskyi S.V.* (2004). Brestskiy (Beresteyskiy) myrnyi dohovir [Treaty of Brest-Litovsk]. Encyclopaedia of modern Ukraine in 30 t. T. 3. In Dziuba, I.M. and others (Eds.). National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. SSS. Coordinative bureau of the encyclopaedia of modern Ukraine. 443–444.
2. *Myronenko O. M.* (2005). Zakony pro tumchasovyi derzhavnyi ustrii Ukrainy [Laws on the temporary state system]. Encyclopaedia of modern Ukraine in 10 t. T. 3: E-Y. In Smolii V. A. and others (Eds.). Institute of History of Ukraine. NAS of Ukraine. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
3. *Doroshenko D.* (1930). 1917–1923: Ukrayinska hetmanska derzhava 1918 roku [1917–1923: Ukrainian hetman state of 1918]. History of Ukraine. Uzhhorod. 5–13.
4. *Skoropadskiy P.* (1995). Spohady, Kinets 1917 – hruden 1918 [Memoirs. End of 1917 – December 1918]. Kyiv: Philadelphia.
5. *Wrangel P. N.* (December 13, 2018). Zapysky. Knyha 1 [Letters. Book 1]. Retrieved from <http://militera.lib.ru/memo/russian/vrangel>.
6. *Wrangel P. N.* (December 13, 2018). Zapysky. Knyha 1 [Letters. Book 1]. Retrieved from <http://militera.lib.ru/memo/russian/vrangel>.
7. Uriady Ukrainy u XX stolitti [Governments of Ukraine in the 20th century]. (2001). Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
8. *Boyko O.* (2009). Terytoriia, kordony i administratyvno-terytorialnyi podil Ukrayinskoï Derzhavy Hetmana P. Skoropadskoho (1918) [Territory, borders and administrative and territorial division of Ukrainian State of Hetman P. Skoropadkyi (1918)]. Regional history of Ukraine. Collection of research articles. Issue 3.
9. *Obolenskyi V. A.* (December 12, 2018). Moia zhizn. Moi sovremenniki [My life. My contemporaries]. Retrieved from <http://www.rulit.me/books>
10. *Chekhovych V. A.* (2005). ZEMSTVA [Zemstvos]. Encyclopaedia of history of Ukraine. T. 3: E-Y. In Smolii V. A. and others (Eds.). NAS of Ukraine. Institute of History of Ukraine. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
11. *Krypiakovykh I.* (1992). Istoriia ukraïnskoho viiska [History of Ukrainian troop]. Lviv.
12. *Petriv V.* (December 12, 2018). Spomyny z chasiv ukraïnskoï revolutsii (1917–1921). Suspilne zhyttia v Kyievi [Memoirs from the times of Ukrainian Revolution (1917–1921). Social life in Kyiv]. P. 4. Retrieved from <http://history.org.ua>
13. *Wrangel P. N.* (December 13, 2018). Zapysky. Knyha 1 [Letters. Book 1]. Retrieved from <http://militera.lib.ru/memo/russian/vrangel>.
14. *Skoropadskiy P.* (1995). Spohady, Kinets 1917 – hruden 1918 [Memoirs. End of 1917 – December 1918]. Kyiv: Philadelphia.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Кульчицький С. В.* Брестський (Берестейський) мирний договір // Енциклопедія сучасної України : у 30 т. / ред. кол. І. М. Дзюба [та ін.]; НАН України, НТШ, Координаційне бюро енциклопедії сучасної України НАН України. – К., 2004. – Т. 3. – С. 443–444.
2. *Мироненко О. М.* Закони про тимчасовий державний устрій України // Енциклопедія історії України : у 10 т. / редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін.; Ін-т історії України НАН

- України. — К.: Наук. думка, 2005. — Т. 3: Е–Й. — С. 220.
3. *Дорошенко Д.* Історія України. 1917–1923 рр.: Українська гетьманська держава 1918 року. — Ужгород, 1930. — С. 5–13.
 4. *Скоропадський П.* Спогади. Кінець 1917 – грудень 1918. — Київ–Філадельфія, 1995. — 493 с.
 5. *Врангель П. Н.* Записки: Кн. 1 [Електронний ресурс]. URL: <http://militera.lib.ru/memo/russian/vrangel> (дата звернення: 13.12.2018)
 6. Там само.
 7. Уряди України у ХХ столітті. — Київ: Наукова думка, 2001. — 608 с.
 8. *Бойко Олена.* Територія, кордони і адміністративно-територіальний поділ Української Держави гетьмана П. Скоропадського (1918) // Регіональна історія України: зб. наук. ст. — 2009. — Вип. 3. — С. 223.
 9. *Оболенский Владимир Андреевич.* “Моя жизнь. Мои современники”. [Електронний ресурс]. URL:<http://www.rulit.me/books> (дата звернення: 12.12.2018)
 10. *Чехович В. А.* ЗЕМСТВА // Енциклопедія історії України: Т. 3: Е–Й / Редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін. НАН України. Ін-т історії України. — К.: Наук. думка, 2005. — 672 с.
 9. *Крип'якевич І.* Історія українського війська. — Львів, 1992. — С. 433.
 10. *Петрів В.* Спомини з часів української революції (1917–1921) Ч. 4 / Суспільне життя в Києві. [Електронний ресурс] URL: <http://history.org.ua> (дата звернення: 12.12.2018)
 11. Там само.
 12. *Скоропадський П.* Спогади. Кінець 1917 – грудень 1918. — Київ – Філадельфія, 1995. — С. 54.