

Ruslan Demchyshak*

**THE FORMS OF GOVERNMENT
AND THE TYPOLOGY OF POLITICAL REGIMES
IN UKRAINIAN SOCIALIST-ORIENTED POLITICAL
THOUGHT OF WESTERN UKRAINE
IN THE INTERWAR PERIOD OF THE 20TH CENTURY**

Research of domestic political thought and practices of political organization possess an important value in our time not only in terms of actualization of political science inheritance of the Ukrainian thinkers, but, foremost, as a optimal use of ideological and theoretical works and practical experience of the past. In the time of their development, state-political institutes in Ukraine have become especially important forms of state research, in particular on the matters of the scientific heritage of the Ukrainian political theoreticians thought on the subject of the analysis of forms of government and typology of political regimes, whose value for modern political theory and practice of state-building is undisputed.

Some aspects of the theoretician' viewpoints of Ukrainian political thought of Western Ukraine socialists were investigated in Boris Kukhta¹ and Tatiana Khodak's² works. The manifestos of parties' became the subject of a number of historical researches.³ However, political science component of the analysis of this problem, especially on the subject of the state has remained largely unexplored.

* dr Ruslan Demczyszak, docent katedry politologii i stosunków międzynarodowych Narodowego Uniwersytetu „Lwowska Politechnika”, e-mail: ruslan.dem74@gmail.com.

¹ B. Kukhta, *Z istoriyi ukrayins'koyi politychnoyi dumky pershoyi polovyny XX st.*, L'viv 1993.

² T. Khodak, *Derzhavno-pravova dumka v Zakhidniy Ukraini (1919–1939 rr.)*, avtorref. dyp. na zdobuttya nauk. stupenya kand. yuryd. nauk, Kyiv 2008.

³ M. Kuhutyak, *Halychyna: storinky istoriyi. Narys suspil'no-politychnoho rukhu (XX st.–1939)*, Ivano-Frankiv'sk 1993; P. Kul'chyts'kyi, *Ukrayina mizh dvoma viynamy (1921–1939 rr.)*,

The aim of this study is to clarify the issues and forms of government typology of political regimes and the process of Ukrainian state-building in Ukrainian political socialist-oriented thought of Western Ukraine.

“The state is a juridically united group of people on some certain area with the constant independent authority” – the following definition of the state was proposed by Matviy Stakhiv (member of USRP), who is a theoretician of Ukrainian organized socialism, one of the brightest representatives of Ukrainian political socialist-oriented thought of Western Ukraine. This formulation is similar to those definitions which were suggested by modern political science, in particular to the provisions of the juridical theory of the state’s origin, considering it as a juridical form of organization and functioning of the political authority. According to Stakhiv, the state is disclosed because of its basic characteristics such as a territory, population and authority thus “people are the most important foundation of the state”.⁴ Meaning of the state as a category of political science is manifested, in the opinion of the ideologists of socialism, not only by its importance as a mechanical system of government establishment, but as well as a combination of the government and the people; a system of institutions through which the authority is realized with the aim of ensuring security, order and development of state’s territory and its population. It is worth to pay attention to a fact that in relationship between the state and citizens the priority is recognized according to the last (state is for man, not man is for the State). In our opinion, protection of human rights and freedom, security and welfare are declared as the main duty of the state, which indicates the liberal origins and modern nature of Ukrainian socialism.

Through the prism of political science Ukrainian political socialist oriented thought of Western Ukraine also considers state forms, distinguishing two classic forms of state’s government such as monarchy and republic. The legitimacy of the monarch’s power is determined by “his own right to reign” (the source of power is the monarch), while the republic power “must come from the people and is always elected” (the people are the source of power).⁵ In the sequence of historical development three types of monarchies are distinguished: an elective monarchy, an absolute monarchy and a constitutional monarchy. It was a clear realization that the forms of government do not fully include the understanding of forms of the state.

Kyyiv 1999; I.Raykivs’kyy, *Ukrayins’ka sotsial-demokratychna partiya (1928–1939 rr.)*, Ivano-Frankivs’k 1995.

⁴ M. Stakhiv, *Pro derzhavu*, L’viv 1935, p. 9.

⁵ Ibidem, p. 22.

The state's criteria of another typology has become "the different nature of authority" (political regime is a demonstration of this typology in the modern political science).⁶ Based on this criterion Matthew Stakhiv has distinguished such forms of government organization as democracy, aristocracy, theocracy, and dictatorship of the plutocracy. Democracy is a political regime in which "power comes only from the people's will"; when it's the aristocracy regime the state's authority "is created by only one noble class"; theocracy involves identification of terrestrial power with religion power, state's power implementation of state is done by "sacred class"; if it is plutocracy the power is done by "class of the richest"; dictatorship involves concentrating all power in the hands of one person or group of people, total control over society state bureaucracy, can be "recognized itself clearly as the dictatorship" or can be veiled under another regime.⁷

Essentially, regimes were classified as democratic and undemocratic. Moreover, the dictatorship was seen as a kind of power, which is transitional or to democracy or to a harder (compared to dictatorship) regime of power (in modern political science it is a totalitarian regime). Recalling, that modern political science holds the same point of view. Based on the analysis of the communist and fascist ideologies and political regimes which were established in a number of countries in the interwar era (notably in Nazi Germany and Stalin's USSR), common features of communist and fascist regimes were allocated by the theoreticians of Ukrainian political socialist oriented thought of Western Ukraine.

"These are common features for these two movements: 1) Dictatorship is similarly adored and every possibilities to destroy every idea of democracy are used; 2) They equally despise the masses, and support that people have to dutifully obey to dictator and his entourage who create a new gentry; 3) Holding their power fascism and communism are similar – used cruel and bloody system of a terror at the same time killing millions people who have their own thought; 4) Fascists and communists equally do not acknowledge individual liberty, freedom of thought and speech, freedom of organizations and science; 5) both directions equally aspired to state capitalism which has to harness all people under the command of the dictator's entourage to labor".⁸ "The only difference between them «is that the communists instead of the word» nation", which has to hide

⁶ Ibidem, p. 23.

⁷ Ibidem, p. 23–27.

⁸ M. Stakhiv, *Demokratiya, sotsializm ta natsional'na sprava*, L'viv 1936, p. 41.

fascist dictatorship, put the word «proletariat», which has to mask commissar dictatorship that ultimately is no different from the Nazi”.⁹

In fact, signs of totalitarianism were determined before the explosion of World War II, long before the advent of the studies of this phenomenon were acknowledged in modern political science classic. This fact certainly is evidence of Ukrainian political thought’s maturity of the interwar period and the high level of scientific analysis of its theoreticians. The ideologists of Ukrainian political thought of Western Ukraine socialist oriented uniquely positioned themselves as adherents of democracy. They have identified the following principles and signs of this regime: 1) Nation is the only source of power and the bearer of sovereignty (“Nation itself, all its members together are the bearers of power and independence”); 2) Personal and civil rights and freedoms (including freedom of political organizations) are inviolatable, in relations “person – state” the priority is recognized by the first; 3) Equality of all before the law; 4) The only way of forming government is “free election”; 5) The separation of powers into three branches: legislative, executive and judicial; 6) The high level of political culture and general education of citizens (“without education and proper information, masses cannot decide about state affairs”); 7) The free development of the press, without which “democratic system is impossible”.¹⁰

It should be stated that most of the proclaimed principles are at the same time the legal states characteristics.

It was considered the problem of rights and freedoms in close connection with democracy as one of its basic characteristics. Personal rights and freedoms were allocated (privacy of citizens); civil rights and freedom: security of person, inviolability of the dwelling and property of citizens (“state authorities were not allowed to autocratically arrest citizens, were not allowed to do the home or personal revisions, were not allowed to confiscate the property”); special emphasis was placed on freedom of faith and belief: religious freedom, freedom of speech and printing; political freedom is considered no less important (considered as a condition and guarantee compliance with all the other freedoms), to which the freedom of realization mass actions and creating social and political organizations are attributed.¹¹

⁹ M. Stakhiv, *Do dzherel nashoyi syly*, L’viv 1936, p. 11.

¹⁰ M. Stakhiv, *Pro derzhavu...*, p. 22–25.

¹¹ M. Stakhiv, *Vlada narodu: rozvytok ideyi demokratiyi v novishykh chasakh*, L’viv 1935, p. 27.

The ideologists of Ukrainian political socialist oriented thought of Western Ukraine the differentiation of party considered as social consequence and it was viewed as a natural phenomenon of a democratic political process. Political parties had to reflect the interests of different social groups, each of which claims on realization of influence on the courses of state policy. It was especially emphasized, that there is necessity to observance social's equality by socialists, when "the law does not make any difference to some person's position".¹²

The distribution of power was one of the central problems of the state and its forms. Theoretician of Ukrainian political socialist oriented thought of Western Ukraine proclaimed the "independence" of the three branches of government – legislative, executive and judicial as necessary condition for democratic development, when "their mutual validity should be well-organized so that between those authorities was balance, namely, that one had no advantage over the second and could not enslave citizens".¹³ It is seen clearly stood out principle of balance of power, i.e., the system of checks and balances that political science defines a mandatory element of the democratic political process.

At the same time, Volodymyr Starosolskyi, the representative of Ukrainian political socialist oriented thought of Western Ukraine criticized Montesquieu's theory about the separation of powers, thinking that this division is not possible, not only in the sense of balance and independence of powers, but also in terms of their functions and competencies. Thus, claimed thinker, the term "executive power" was created by the political theory and accepted by practice is "false and does not correspond to the true sense of the state activity of which it is determined by".¹⁴ On the one hand, the term is too wide because it covers judicial power, which also executes laws and therefore partly endowed with executive power, on the other hand is too narrow, because executive power also issues separate normative and legal acts i.e. has practical elements of the legislature. Basically, Starosolskyi refused to make absolute statements about the division of powers into three branches, motivating the fact that none of three powers are not only a carrier of power, it is believed that is exclusively accomplished by it. Thinker suggests using the term "administration" instead of "executive power".

People are the source of legislative power. M. Stakhiv claimed, that "in direct democracy legislative power itself is created by the whole nation. In a representative democracy the nation makes the decision by voting about who should

¹² Ibidem, p. 28.

¹³ M. Stakhiv, *Pro derzhavu...*, p. 20.

¹⁴ V. Starosol's'kyy, *Politychne pravo: kurs lektsiy*, Rehensburh–Novyy Ul'm 1950, p. 241.

make laws on behalf of it". Thus, democracy has been divided into direct and representative. Executive power is called to execute the laws which were accepted by the parliament. Judicial power should operate on the basis of full independence and specialization. Matthew Stakhiv separately defines public-political institution "Head" (leader) of the state and therefore "the home authority", which in monarchies is hereditary monarch, and in republics it is elected president. Moreover, the head of state does not belong to any of the branches of government.

Based on analysis of the credential's balance in the power triangle "president – government – parliament", the system of government has been classified, in a way close to proposed by the modern political science, by division of republics into the presidential, parliamentary and mixed. "In some states, the president himself is the leader of the government and he is responsible for his policies. (...) In other only refers executive power, but is not responsible for its policy, because only ministers are responsible to the legislature. (...) Finally, there is a mixed system where the president is irresponsible, but can execute some governmental acts himself".¹⁵

V. Starosolskyi thoroughly analyzed the competence of powers in accordance with the principle of separation of powers. Thinker emphasizes the interdependence of the competencies of the form of government and form of state in general, as the division of the monarchy and the republic is not the only classification. Thus, the powers of the supreme power (head of state) with a relatively large decrease in non-parliamentary states as the implementation of the principle of popular sovereignty state. It is obvious thinker's statement is about greater compliance with the principles of parliamentary democracy form of government.

In the context of the power's separation V. Starosolskyi assigned specific role to supreme power that is the institute of the president, depending on the form of government under the monarchy or republic, according to monarch or president. "On a background of the division of authorities there was a necessity of establishment, that is not overcome by a «division» itself and it would retain connection between them and would give a guarantee, that unity of the state will not be broken by divergence in an act three different «authorities». This is the supreme power".¹⁶ The method of electing the head of state – directly by the people or the legislature depends on the government's form. Popularly elected head of state certainly has more significant political and legal status. The President has

¹⁵ M. Stakhiv, *Pro derzhavu...*, p. 30.

¹⁶ V. Starosol's'kyi, *Politychne pravo...*, p. 185.

a special privileged position in the civil and criminal law, which in modern constitutional law is defined as inviolability at the time of his authority.

Ukrainian political thought in Western Ukraine socialist orientation it was approved that an indicator of democracy and civic self-organization is the level of development of local self-government, when the “own affairs are discussed themselves by concerned citizens through their trusted people, not through the state officials”. Such following types of local government were called: social (level of settlement), district and county.

Based on the principles of popular sovereignty, the only way of forming government was to declare the election. The election of the legislature in a representative democracy was seen as a procedure for transferring power from its carrier i.e. people to parliamentarians. Much attention was paid to the principles of the organization and conduct of elections as a central element of the democratic political process. The right to vote in a democracy was universal, equal, secret, direct and proportional (the latter concerned the elections on party lists). The condition of preservation of democracy was proclaimed only “free and unadulterated” elections, which policy tools should have become: statutory punishment on all those that “would violate the purity of elections, in particular, complete freedom of election campaigning; «impartial control of the legality of the election»; appropriate control of the voting process and counting of votes”¹⁷.

The theorists of Ukrainian political thought in Western Ukraine socialist orientation constructed model of the future Ukrainian state according to the above described views on the institutional framework of the state. The organization of state power in Ukraine after independence must be a republican form of government and a democratic type of political regime. “Power in the people’s labour state can not be monarchist, that is, where there is the royal court of the king with the king’s supporters – gentry; this also can not be the power of dictatorial (fascist) that doesn’t listen to anyone, only is advised by military force; it must be the power of the republican, that is chosen by the people and it is responsible to the people”¹⁸.

The only possible way of forming government and local governments in the Ukrainian state could only be elections. “Everything should be elected: Ambassadors to the Council of State, advisers to the regional councils, district councils and community councils. Elections must be secret, equal and direct

¹⁷ M. Stakhiv, *Pro derzhavu...*, p. 42.

¹⁸ *Pravo narodu. Prystupnyy vyklad prohramy USRP*, L’viv 1926, p. 39.

(not through the voters). Judges, wardens, mayor and priests they all should be elected, not appointed. Only low officials may be appointed”.¹⁹

The condition for the preservation of democracy and respect for the rights and freedoms of citizens of Ukraine was proclaimed as the distribution of power providing the balance between the branches. Particular attention was paid to the priority of human rights and freedoms. Freedom of speech, of social and political organizations, mass actions was seen as a means of public control over the state. “It is not enough to choose the power, it is also needed to observe and monitor. In order to achieve freedom of criticism, in newspapers, on assemblies and meetings, etc. There should be freedom (the will) to gather in communities and organizations, set up the partnership, organize the strike. You can not arrest anyone without a court order. You can not force anyone to go to a foreign school, speak a foreign language, or move to another religion”.²⁰ Religious freedom and the right of national-cultural autonomy were highly placed, in particular the rights of national minorities regarding to the development of the native language that confirmed the civility and tolerance of Ukrainian political thought in Western Ukraine socialist sense. The socialists considered it appropriate to eliminate such punishment as the death penalty and life imprisonment. (Recall that today the elimination of the death penalty is a necessary condition of the Council of Europe participating countries).

Ukrainian organized socialism in Western Ukraine in the interwar period (socialist workers’ party – the Ukrainian socialist radical party and the social democratic party Ukrainian social democratic party), have kept the perspective of social justice and national equality, protection of rights and also human and nation’s freedoms. Moral dilemma in the politics of the socialists was decided in favor of the compatibility of politics and morality. USDP, which occupied left position in the party political spectrum, has focused more on social slogans. While the ideologues of the party argued that stateless socialist people’s national liberation is no less important than social. “Obtaining the national state is a major and immediate goal of the whole politics of enslaved people, this is its history to be or not to be”²¹.

Summarizing, we can state that theorists Ukrainian political thought in Western Ukraine socialist made a certain contribution to the development of political science, in particular, the perspective of the state and its forms. Classification

¹⁹ Ibidem, p. 40.

²⁰ Ibidem.

²¹ V. Levyns’kyi, *Shcho take polityka*, Praha–Berlin 1923, p. 38.

of political regimes to democratic and undemocratic which is based on the analysis of common characteristics of fascist and Communist ideologies and political regimes of Nazi Germany and the Stalinist Soviet Union it had been defined the characteristics of totalitarianism long before the advent of this phenomenon was recognized in contemporary political science as classic.

Scientific contributions were made to the studies of forms of government, separation of powers and system of control and balance between its branches, state-political institutions of the President, Parliament and government, the problems of rights and freedoms, the electoral process. The Ukrainian state was seen by socialists as socialist in content and national in form of a democratic Republic with broad powers of local governments, fair and transparent elections, political and ideological pluralism, and the priority of rights and freedoms. All the above mentioned, certainly, testifies the maturity of the Ukrainian political thought of the interwar period and a high level of scientific analysis of its theoreticians.

Ukrainian political thought in Western Ukraine in the interwar period of the twentieth century different ideological directions requires further investigation as to the subject entity and the classification of forms of the state and other political issues.

Bibliography

- Demchyshak R., *Natsional'ne pytannya v diyal'nosti ukrayins'kykh politychnykh partiy Zakhidnoyi Ukrayiny sotsialistychnoho spryamuvannya: 1920–1930–i roky*, Naukovi pratsi: Naukovo-metodychnyy zhurnal. – Mykolayiv, 2009 – T.110.
- Khodak T., *Derzhavno-pravova dumka v Zakhidniy Ukraini (1919–1939 rr.)*, avtoref. dys. na zdobuttya nauk. stupenya kand. yuryd. nauk. – K., 2008.
- Kuhutyak M., *Halychyna: storinky istoriyi. Narys suspil'no-politychnoho rukhu (XX st.–1939)*, Ivano-Frankivs'k 1993.
- Kukhta B., *Z istoriyi ukrayins'koyi politychnoyi dumky pershoi polovyny XX st.*, L'viv 1993.
- Kul'chyts'kyy S., *Ukrayina mizh dvoma viynamy (1921–1939 rr.)*, Kyiv 1999.
- Levyns'kyy V., *Shcho take polityka*, Praha–Berlin 1923.
- Pravo narodu. Prystupnyy vyklad prohramy USRP*, L'viv 1926.
- Raykivs'kyy I., *Ukrayins'ka sotsial-demokratychna partiya (1928–1939 rr.)*, Ivano-Frankivs'k 1995.

Semkiv O., *Politolohiya. Kinets' KhIKh – persha polovyna XX st.*, Khrestomatiya, L'viv 1996.

Stakhiv M., *Demokratiya, sotsializm ta natsional'na sprava*, L'viv 1936.

Stakhiv M., *Do dzherel nashoyi syly*, L'viv 1936.

Stakhiv M., *Pro derzhavu*, L'viv 1935.

Stakhiv M., *Vlada narodu: rozvytok ideyi demokratiyi v novishykh chasakh*, L'viv 1935.

Starosol's'kyi V., *Politychne pravo: kurs lektsiy*, Rehensburh–Novyy Ul'm 1950.

Vdovychyn I., *Svoboda osoby v praviy ukrayins'kiy politychniy dumtsi (20–30 rr. XX st.)*, Ivano-Frankivs'k 2010.

Summary

Persuasion of theorists of Ukrainian political opinion of Western Ukraine, publicism and position papers of socialistic aspiration parties for the purpose the analysis of forms and institutional bases of the state are investigated. Payment of the Ukrainian thinkers-socialists in the range of problems of classification of the political regimes, determination of their signs are analysed. The scientific contribution of theorists of Ukrainian political opinion of socialistic aspiration out to research of forms state government, principle of distribution of power and system of inhibitions and counterbalances between its branches, state-political institutes of country's, parliament and government, problem of rights and freedoms of person, electoral process, local self-government leader are found out. Political priorities of scientists and ideologists of Ukrainian organized socialism are investigated, their constructions of process are exposed.

Keywords: state, socialism, political opinion, political regime, distribution of power

**FORMA RZĄDU I TYPOLOGII USTROJÓW POLITYCZNYCH
W SOCJALISTYCZNIE UKIERUNKOWANEJ MYŚLI POLITYCZNEJ
NA UKRAINIE ZACHODNIEJ
W OKRESIE MIĘDZYWOJENNYM XX WIEKU**

Streszczenie

W artykule zaprezentowano badania dotyczące poglądów teoretyków myśli politycznej na Ukrainie Zachodniej, zaprezentowanych w publicystyce i dokumentach programowych socjalistycznych partii politycznych w celu analizy instytucjonalnych form państwa. Przeanalizowano wkład ukraińskich socjalistycznych myślicieli do sklasyfikowania problematyki reżimów politycznych i określenia ich zasadności. Zaakcentowano naukowy wniosek teoretyków ukraińskiej myśli politycznej o socjalistycznej orientacji w badanie form ustroju politycznego, podziału władzy, kontroli i równowagi między organami władzy, państwowych i politycznych instytucji prezydenta, parlamentu i rządu, kwestie praw człowieka, procesu wyborczego, samorządu terytorialnego.

Słowa kluczowe: rząd, socjalizm, myśl polityczna, ustrój polityczny, podział władzy

