

## THE GENESIS OF THE FORMATION OF THE TERRITORIAL ORGANIZATION SYSTEM OF POWER IN UKRAINE

Nadiia Senyshyn<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Candidate of the Department of Public government and administration of the Institute of Humanitarian Training and Public Administration of Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine, e-mail: senyshyn.nadiya@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4503-6974>

**Abstract.** *The article is devoted to the analysis of processes of Ukraine's transition from a rigidly centralized system of territorial organization of power of the Soviet type to a modern system of decentralized type. The objective of the article is to determine the subject matter, content and forms of the societal institution of territorial organization of power in the modern scientific discourse of public administration through the analysis of the genesis of formation and modernization of the territorial organization of power in modern Ukraine in the period from 1990 to 2020. The subject matter and content of the political and territorial organization of the system of the state public power institutions, which is called the "territorial organization of government" is highlighted. It is substantiated that in order to effectively perform the functions of government regarding regulating public relations, the state organizes its internal territorial organization, divides its territory into administrative units of different levels, types and legal status, which is designed to ensure optimal form of the state unity of central and local governments, the most rational and adequate system of building the state apparatus, effective exercising of powers and running the country by the latter.*

*The historical way of political and territorial organization of public power of Ukraine from the beginning of its independence to the present has been characterized. It is concluded that the main task of modernization of the system of territorial organization of power at the present stage of development of society is to ensure completion of decentralization processes and creation of new amalgamated territorial communities, integrity and unity of the public and state body as well as its components, to carry out ubiquity and continuity of administrative, organizational and regulatory activities of the system of public administration bodies aimed at improving the economic, social, environmental, etc. situation and well-being of citizens.*

**Keywords:** *territorial organization of government, state, state policy, public administration, local self-government.*

**JEL Classification:** H10, H70, H79, K40

**Formulas:** 0; **fig.:**0; **tabl.:**1; **bibl.:** 24

**Introduction.** Ukraine emerged as a new independent state in late 1991 and immediately faced huge problems of state-formation, as the young country's striving to be democratic and social required not only a radical breakdown of social relations, but also a breakdown of the system of government institutions and the entire system of territorial organization of government that our state had inherited from the Soviet party-economic-repressive machine. It took other nations and countries a dozen years to go through the path from totalitarianism to democracy, while we wanted to do it in the shortest time possible. The history and theory of the science of public administration shows that the success of any state is associated with a number of different factors of historical, geographical, political, economic, social, cultural, demographic, etc. nature, among which the territorial and political dimension is one of the basic ones. For Ukraine, this has become one of the negative factors, as the problem of administrative and territorial division of our state, both historically and

today, has proved to be complex and painful. The genesis of forming the division that exists in Ukraine has no regularity, consistent logic of domestic development, as it was the case in most countries of the world. This is not surprising, since Ukraine itself did not have its own statehood, but at different times it was scattered with its separate territories around different states, where these territories were to be subordinated to the interests of the dominating countries.

In our opinion, the deep influence of geographical territory on peculiarities of molding of certain forms and models of political power as an expression of state existence of society indicates the importance of such territorial organization of power in modern states, which would best meet particular cultural and historical conditions of ethnogenesis of a given people. This determines the topicality of this scientific study.

**Literature review.** Source analysis of modern Ukrainian scientific discourse of problematics of the subject matter and content of the territorial organization of the state public power, its impact on the processes of state formation, building and implementation of the state economic, social and security policy by the state executive bodies and local governments shows that considerable research attention of a wide range of scientists and practitioners is paid to the abovementioned topics in independent Ukraine. In particular, among the latest publications on the depicted topic we can note the works of such scientists as S. Adamovich [1], N. Agafonova [2], P. Bilyk [4], I. Vereshchuk [5], M. Dnistriansky [8], I Zhovnirchuk [9], E. Keba [10], O. Kuchabsky [11], V. Lytvyn [12], O. Radchenko [16], O. Stohova [19], L. Chmyryova and N. Fedyai [21].

**Aims.** The objective of the article is to determine the subject matter, content and forms of the societal institution of territorial organization of power in the modern scientific discourse of public administration through the analysis of the genesis of formation and modernization of the territorial organization of power in modern Ukraine in the period from 1990 to 2020.

**Methods.** The methodology of this study implies the use of historical and comparative approach, the study of documents, events and political processes in modernization processes of the system of territorial power in Ukraine.

**Results.** A scientific approach to the study of any societal phenomenon involves a preliminary definition of its subject matter as well as categorical and conceptual definition. In the context of the chosen topic, we note that at the present stage of human civilization the most particular form of institutionalization of structured life of human communities is the state, a democratic understanding of which is established as a "political and territorial organization of public power" in the science of public administration [4, p. 33]. A similar view is shared, in particular, by Iryna Vereshchuk, a people's deputy and former head of Rava-Ruska, who notes that "geographical space is an important configurator of the public administration system, which under certain conditions can serve as a factor of disintegration or integration of social, economic and managerial processes, and is the basis for the formation of the public administration system" [5, p. 261].

So let us find out what a «territorial organization of power» is and when and how a need for political and territorial division of the geographical space of society and the state arose.

In the modern administrative and legal sense, the territorial organization of power is "the system of public authorities (local executive bodies, territorial bodies of central executive bodies and local governments) and the relationship between them formed in accordance with the administrative and territorial structure of the state and has features of functioning at its various levels. This system is defined by the Constitution of Ukraine and mainly by the domestic administrative legislation" [10, p. 123].

In the public and administration dimension, it is a scientifically substantiated localization of interconnected spatial combinations of systems and forms of organization of power, which is based on the normative, legal and legislative basis and political organization of society and covers, as a rule, three levels of territorial organization of power in the state structure, including macro level which is the territory of the country; meso level which is the territorial organization of power of oblasts, regions; micro level which is the spatial organization of local self-government (villages, towns, cities) [9, p. 17]. As V. Lytvyn rightly emphasizes, such a division "should ideally reflect the specifics of internal "territorial tectonics", i.e. the size of the territory controlled by a particular society/community, population density, optimality of the communication system, historically formed features of settling, a role of cities as centres of gravity" [12, p. 59].

Thus, in order to perform functions of power and management, effective operation of the state apparatus, the state organizes its internal territorial organization, divides its territory into administrative units of different levels, types and legal status. This is designed to ensure an optimal form of state unity of central and local public authorities, the most rational and adequate system of building the state apparatus, an effective exercise of their powers and governance in terms of ruling the country. In particular, a well-known Polish scientist T. Kaczmarek explains the need for territorialisation of management by the fact that even the most rational organization of the central administration cannot ensure proper performance of public tasks within the whole state. Thus, implementation of regulatory, organizational functions of the state cannot be carried out without territorial administration, and multilevel management today is an essential element of the implementation of the state's tasks [23, p. 37].

When choosing a form of territorial organization of power, the key is to find and choose optimal parameters of relations and interactions of central, regional and local levels of government, as well as compliance with a number of other criteria in terms of prevailing values and mentality of the nation-building people (nation). M. Dniestryznsky defines the mentioned criteria, including the following: a) a number of hierarchical levels of the administrative and territorial system should correlate with the size of the country, the number and location of its population at high level; b) sizes of administrative units of the same level should not contrast too much against each other; c) each administrative unit must be integral, communicatively connected,

with a favourable location of its administrative centre, which would have the necessary human and infrastructural potential [8, p. 139].

The fundamental importance of the territorial organization of power is revealed by the fact that the Basic Law of any state obligatory incorporates the relevant political and territorial relationship of political interests and social forces, peculiarities of regulation of power and social relations arising from the organization and exercise of power in the public administration system of the country.

All the historical diversity of the territorial organization of the state power is embedded in five main forms, namely, direct people's power or democracy, unitarism, federalism, confederation, empire. The problem for the young independent Ukraine, which emerged as such in 1991, is that in its prehistory, as various Ukrainian lands belonged to empires, unitary states and the totalitarian federation of the USSR for a long time. That is why it was clear from the very first days of independence that first of all it was necessary to break the system of power relations of the totalitarian society and introduce fundamentally new criteria, mechanisms and structures of public administration into political and social practice. In scientific circles and among the progressive democratic political elite there was a clear understanding of the need to build a fundamentally new system of territorial organization of power which is in many respects complete opposite of the rigidly centralized hierarchy of state bodies of the USSR. At the dawn of independence the leader of the democratic opposition V.M. Chornovil stressed that the constitution that was in force at the time was the Stalinist one: "this is the Constitution of the centralist unitary state. Our state was conceived to be a union, as a real federation of socialist independent republics with a broad, the broadest self-government." [6, p. 462–463].

In his 1990 election program, Vyacheslav Maksymovych wrote that "Ukraine must reject Moscow's centralism but it must also renounce the Kiev dictatorship." "I think that having suffered from totalitarianism and imperial centralism, a free Ukraine will gain lasting immunity against all kinds of dictatorships, one-party regimes, infallible leaders, parties and doctrines. And my people will not want to change the Moscow centralism thrown externally to their native Kyiv one, but it will follow a path of traditional democratic self-government known since the princely and Cossack times." [22].

V.M. Chornovil imagined a future Ukraine as a "federal state, i.e. a union of lands that have developed as such historically and bear natural and climatic, cultural and ethnographic, linguistic and dialectal, household and other differences that create a unique face of a unified nation. I see such lands as Kyiv region, Podillya, Volyn, Galicia, Bukovina, Transcarpathia, Hetmanate, Slobozhanshchina, Zaporozhye, Donetsk region, Tavria (the Black Sea territory) as part of the Ukrainian People's Republic and I see Crimea as an independent neighbour, or an autonomous republic in alliance with Ukraine" [6, p. 579].

The same position was taken by the Constitutional Commission established in October 1990, which published its new Constitution draft on January 29, 1992, which "provided for the introduction of administrative autonomy (i.e. formation of state territorial units) at the level of regions (lands) and the Republic of Crimea on the

basis of segregation of normative, constituent, control and executive functions, which were to be carried out by the councils and executive committees of oblasts (lands), respectively" [2, p. 72]. In the autumn of 1992, this draft was even submitted for public discussion, during which Ukrainians submitted about 50,000 comments and suggestions. The elaboration of the said proposals resulted in a new draft as amended on May 27, 1993. The new draft also provided for federalization and a bicameral parliament, in which one of the chambers, the Council of Territories, was designed to reflect the interests of Ukrainian lands. The draft was submitted to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine for consideration, where, with the active opposition of the Communists, on the one hand, and the "red directors" and the new-born bourgeoisie (who advocated strong centralized power) on the other, the proposed changes were never adopted and put into force.

At that time the main opponents of federalization were the Communists and they were present as the majority in the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine of the first convocation, led by their leader Leonid Kravchuk, who was good at centralized ruling the country and did not want to risk giving power away to the regions. In addition, it should be noted that the territorial organization of power in Ukraine at the time of gaining independence was characterized by a significant splitting up of administrative districts (there were 605 of them) and village and town councils (there were more than 10.5 thousand at that time), which made public and administration processes more complicated.

It was clear that in the case of granting broad autonomy and powers to local governments, which were formed in conditions of a rigid centralized party government and in fact had neither skills, nor necessary knowledge, nor psychological willingness to take over responsibility, the existing system of public authorities at the local level could collapse due to failure to perform its tasks. That is why, as noted by O. Stogov, all attempts to reform the territorial organization of power in Ukraine over the past century have aimed at creating a model that is the most convenient for management from the centre. Each stage is characterized by compliance with the requirements of the current political system, rather than striving to meet needs of citizens [19, p. 231]. This was one of the reasons why attraction to highly centralized unitary state has taken root in our country, where decentralization processes began only after the victory of the 2014 Revolution of Dignity.

At the beginning of independence, Ukraine lost its chance for rapid democratization by breaking the old totalitarian system of territorial organization of power and replacing it with a new one, typical for most democratic countries, with a tendency to maximize the powers of local authorities on a subsidiary basis. However, the leaders of our state did not risk carrying out radical reforms (as, for example, our neighbours in Poland did at that time), but tried to change the system of territorial organization of power by minor modernizations, which despite numerous projects and proposals of scientists and experts did not affect the regional division.

First of all, in March 1992 on the initiative of L.M. Kravchuk, the first reform of the territorial organization of power was carried out since the time Ukraine became independent. The said reform boiled down to the fact that "local councils at all levels

were destatised and relieved of local government functions. This function was entrusted to local state administrations headed by representatives of the President of Ukraine, who were appointed to districts and regions, as well as the cities of Kyiv and Sevastopol "[1, p. 10].

Making reforms of the institutions of territorial organization of local power, which was carried out as part of the administrative and territorial division of the Soviet type without sufficient scientific justification, mostly based on empirical experience, resulted in creation of a cumbersome and inefficient government system, which led to further significant disparities in social and economic development of regions in Ukraine. It soon became clear that the institution of the President's Representatives had not paid off; the country had been covered by a wave of economic collapse, hyperinflation, non-payment of salaries and pensions, resulting in a political crisis and a sharp confrontation between the President and the Parliament. As O. Kuchabsky notes in this regard, "Conflicts and inconsistencies between the President and Parliament have affected uncertainty, inconsistencies and fluctuations in the implementation of the territorial governance model. As a result, during 1992-1995 Ukraine underwent three reforms of the state executive power and local self-government." [11, p. 411].

During 1991-1993, many options of the territorial organization of power in Ukraine were disclosed publicly, which were developed by various enthusiastic scientists, experts and politicians, and entire research institutes. According to N. Agafonova, "during this period a number of drafts of the Constitution of Ukraine was developed, in particular, the Draft Constitution of Ukraine (Slavic Federal Hetmanate of Kievan Rus – Ukraine) (1991); Draft Constitution of Ukraine (submitted by the Khmelnytsky Regional Council of Deputies with an explanatory note of V. Nazarov in 1992), the Draft Constitution of Ukraine (authored by Vladimir Zolotarev, Dmitry Dzhangirov, Vladimir Timokhin (1992)), the Draft Constitution of Ukraine (prepared by Serge Volkonsky in 1992), the Draft Constitution of Ukraine in version of May 27<sup>th</sup>, 1993 (prepared by the author team consisting of Kozyubra M.I., Kopeychikova V.V., Matsyuk A.R., Tikhonova E.A., Tsvika M.V., Yuzkova L.P., etc.); the Draft Constitution of Ukraine of the Humanitarian Ecumenical Research Fund "RAH" (prepared by A. Dombrovsky in 1993); the Draft Constitution (Basic Law) of Ukraine (prepared by the Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists in 1994)" [3, p. 35].

Mainly, it was envisaged to consolidate the existing regions with receiving back their historical names and territorial boundaries. Thus, in 1993, a team of experts from the National Institute for Strategic Studies under the President of Ukraine, headed by V.A. Popovkin, proposed dividing Ukraine into the following ten economic areas-regions: 1) Donbass - Donetsk, Luhansk region; 2) Ekaterinoslav Dnieper region - Dnepropetrovsk, Zaporozhye region; 3) Sloboda Ukraine - Poltava, Sumy, Kharkiv regions; 4) Kyiv Polissya - Zhytomyr, Kyiv, Chernihiv regions; 5) Odessa-Tavriya (Northern Black Sea territory) - Mykolaiv, Odessa, Kherson regions; 6) Ukrainian Carpathians - Transcarpathian, Ivano-Frankivsk, Lviv, Chernovtsy regions; 7) Podillya - Vinnitsa, Ternopil, Khmelnytsky regions; 8) Middle Dnieper

region - Kirovograd, Cherkasy regions; 9) Volyn Polissya - Volyn, Rivne regions; 10) Crimea - the Autonomous Republic of Crimea [21].

In 1994, Lviv professor O.I. Shabliiy approached the consolidation of Ukraine's regions more radically from a standpoint of social and economic zoning. According to him, it would be expedient to divide our state into six regions, which could later become the basis for the federal division of Ukraine: 1) Central area consisting of Kyiv, Zhytomyr, Chernihiv, Cherkasy and Vinnitsa regions; 2) Western area consisting of Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Transcarpathia, Chernovtsy, Ternopil, Khmelnytsky, Rivne, Volyn regions; 3) North-eastern area consisting of Kharkiv, Sumy, Poltava regions; 4) Eastern area consisting of Donetsk and Luhansk regions; 5) Central-Eastern area consisting of Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhia, Kirovohrad regions; 6) Southern area consisting of Odessa, Mykolaiv, Kherson regions and the Autonomous Republic of Crimea [21].

Another professor, D. Koptiv, expressed a similar position of the federal system consisting of 12 lands. The movement towards federalism at that time was led by the chairman of the Luhansk regional council and at the same time the president of the Ukrainian Association of Local and Regional Authorities Viktor Tikhonov.

It should be noted that the idea of federalism did not have mass support, moreover, it was rejected by the ruling group led by the "red director" Leonid Kuchma, who all his life acted exclusively in the rigid centralized vertical of a large defence enterprise, which had always been "Yuzhmash" headed by him. Therefore, in the course of fierce political debates and open confrontation between the institutions of the President and the Verkhovna Rada against the background of the political crisis threatening the impeachment for the former and the dissolution of the latter, the Constitution of Ukraine of 1996 was adopted during a night voting that preserved the Soviet system of territorial organization of power in Ukraine with its division into 24 oblasts, a region with a special status Crimea and two cities with a special status, i.e. Kyiv and Sevastopol.

This resulted in the half-hearted nature of the changes and transformations that were being introduced, combining new democratic structures (by their form) and old authoritarian mechanisms of their activities (by their nature). All attempts to harmoniously combine ethical and liberal models of the state resulted in the emergence of only hybrid power creatures, where totalitarian power and society relations dominated over democratic forms. In many cases, some government institutions duplicated the competencies and powers of others, leading to aggravations in relations and confrontations both between branches of government at the central level and between government structures at the oblast and region levels.

The objective compromise of the Constitution of 1996 very quickly exercised its regulatory potential and began to hamper the democratic development of the state. The administrative and territorial structure of Ukraine was increasingly becoming a brake for democratic transformations; it required radical reforming due to its inconsistency with the new conditions for building a legal, social democratic state with a market economy, democratic principles of people's power and the strategic orientation of our country to the European perspective and European values [16, p.

275]. In many cases, some government institutions duplicated the competencies and powers of others, leading to aggravations in relations and confrontations both between branches of government at the central level and between government structures at the oblast and region levels. The constant confrontations between the President of Ukraine, its executive branch, on the one hand, and the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, on the other, escalated into a large-scale confrontation involving a large part of Ukrainian society, which significantly reduced influence of the state power on the regulation of social processes, and eventually resulted into the "Orange Revolution".

The Orange Revolution closed down the topic of the federal type of territorial organization of power in Ukraine for a long time because of its obvious attraction to separatism and a threat of further collapse of Ukrainian statehood itself. At the same time, the flaws of the still existing post-Soviet system became increasingly apparent, leading to a truly revolutionary project of reforming the territorial organization of power in Ukraine, "Reform for Man", led by Roman Bezsmertny, who became the Deputy Prime Minister for Administrative Reform under the President Viktor Yushchenko's government.

The purpose of this reform was as follows:

- "– to form the territorial community organizationally, financially and materially capable to perform both its own functions as well as those delegated to it by the state;
- to create conditions for improving life of the population;
- to ensure spatio-temporal equal access of all citizens (regardless of their place of residence) to resources of development of human potential, including the whole complex of social and cultural institutions with the rendering various services (in the field of education, culture, health care, trade, etc.);
- to observe social standards guaranteed by the state for each of its citizens, regardless of place of residence;
- to use natural, economic, labour, scientific and other potentials of territories in an effective way" [18, c. 16].

Unfortunately, like most of the reforms initiated by the "Orange Team", this reform has remained on paper, also due to inability of democratic leaders to agree among themselves and due to their inability to establish effective communication with their own people, which manifested itself in the fact that the main ideologist of reforms Roman Bezsmertny was thrown into with tomatoes and eggs in his home Makariv district during the presentation of his project. The discrepancy between the principles declared by the Orange Revolution and the state and administrative practice of its leaders became a serious source of political instability, low legitimacy of the Orange government and a brake on further democratization of the Ukrainian statehood [20, p. 34].

With the defeat of Viktor Yushchenko in the 2010 presidential election and the Donetsk clan led by Viktor Yanukovich coming to power which tended to centralize power and concentrate all the country's resources in the same hand, the reform of the territorial organization of power was immediately forgotten. Political corruption flourished in the country [17], which already posed a threat to the national security of

the state, as the "purchase of carcasses" of deputies and formation of a ruling faction of more than 300 deputies posed a serious threat to change the Constitution of Ukraine to please the political expediency of the Party of Regions.

The political corruption of the regional clan and their leader Viktor Yanukovich caused the Revolution of Dignity, one of the most successful reforms of which the decentralization reform was, which is de facto a reform of the territorial organization of power. In this regard, in April 2014 the Government approved the main conceptual document, i.e. the Concept of reforming local self-government and territorial organization of power, the main direction of which was the reorganization of the district (subregional) level of administrative and territorial structure of Ukraine which will be the basis for the organization and operation of public authorities locally, of the relevant local governments [14].

After that, the Action Plan for its implementation was approved, which launched the reform, during which 982 united territorial communities (UTCs) were voluntarily established in Ukraine in 2015-2019, in which 11 million people live. These UTCs incorporated about 4,500 former local councils. Such pace of inter-municipal consolidation is called very high by international experts [7]. The recently adopted Law of Ukraine *On Voluntary Association of Territorial Communities* of May 14, 2020 No 157-VIII [13] became an important step, which provided the legal basis for the formation of a capable basic level of local self-government. This law also introduced the institution of elders in UTCs, who represent interests of village residents in the community council (as of mid-2020, 3,207 representatives of local territorial communities were already working as UTC elders or acting elders in Ukrainian villages).

The approval of a new administrative and territorial structure of the basic level on June 12, 2020 by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine has become the most recent step. According to it, after the local elections in Ukraine there will be 1,469 territorial communities that will cover the entire territory of the country. Finally, on July 17, 2020, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine adopted Resolution No 3650 *On the Formation and Liquidation of Districts* [15]. From now on, instead of the former 490 districts, 136 administrative districts will function in Ukraine in 24 oblasts and the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (Table 1).

**Discussion.** Thus, only 30 years later after gaining independence, Ukraine became able to carry out a real reform of the territorial organization of power and get a democratic political and territorial dimension of the placing and functioning of many-tiered institutions of public governance that subordinate to different levels of power and that are integrated into a holistic system of public governance which is designed to carry out organizing, regulating and putting in order influence of the state on public and community life, to ensure the sovereignty, unity and integrity of the state and its territorial entities, to promote self-preservation, reproduction and development of the people, realization of legal rights, freedoms and interests of every citizen.

**Table 1. The nature of changes in the system of territorial organization of power in Ukraine**

Indicator		As of 1991	1996 – 2014	As of 2020
<i>Type of government</i>		Centralized unitary state	Unitary state with one federal element – the Autonomous Republic of Crimea	Decentralized unitary state with one federal element - the Autonomous Republic of the Crimea
<i>Regional level</i>		<b>25 oblasts</b> <b>2 cities</b> with special status	<b>24 oblasts</b> 1 the Autonomous Republic of Crimea <b>2 cities</b> with special status	<b>24 oblasts</b> 1 the Autonomous Republic of Crimea <b>2 cities</b> with special status
<i>Subregional level</i>		<b>605</b> administrative districts, including <b>485</b> village districts	<b>490</b> administrative districts	<b>136</b> administrative districts
<i>Basic level:</i>	<i>Territorial communities</i>	<b>11159</b> city, town and village councils (with some councils incorporating the others)	<b>11512</b> (with the presence of "matryoshka dolls" – with some communities incorporating the others)	<b>1470</b> fully independent united territorial communities
	<i>Populated localities</i>	<b>436 cities</b> , of which <b>145 cities</b> of regional subordination <b>927</b> urban-type villages <b>800</b> towns  <b>28840</b> villages	<b>2 cities</b> with special status <b>187 cities</b> of regional significance <b>159 city-district centres</b> <b>272 cities</b> of district significance <b>882</b> urban-type villages <b>1168</b> towns <b>27207</b> villages	<b>2 cities</b> with special status <b>459</b> cities <b>2050</b> towns <b>27207</b> villages

Source: official web portal of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine

Of course, it is too early to say about real results of this reform, as they will show themselves only during a decade. However, from the legislative, political and administrative perspective a certain administrative and territorial foundation has already been established in Ukraine to ensure integrity and unity of the public and state body and its components, the universality and continuity of administrative, organizational and regulatory activities of public administration aimed at improving economic, social, environmental, cultural, etc. situation and well-being of citizens.

**Conclusions.** The historical way of political and territorial organization of public power of Ukraine from the beginning of its independence to the present has been characterized. It is concluded that the main task of modernization of the system of territorial organization of power at the present stage of development of society is to ensure completion of decentralization processes and creation of new amalgamated territorial communities, integrity and unity of the public and state body as well as its components, to carry out ubiquity and continuity of administrative, organizational and regulatory activities of the system of public administration bodies aimed at improving the economic, social, environmental, etc. situation and well-being of citizens.

#### References:

- Adamovych, S. V. (2013), "Attempts to reform the administrative-territorial system in Ukraine (1990 - 2012)", *Prykarpatskyi visnyk NTSh. Dumka*, № 3(23), pp. 9-20.
- Turchynov, O. V. (2009), *Administratyvno-terytorialnyi ustroii Ukrainy. Istoriiia. Suchasnist. Perspektyvy* [Administrative and territorial structure of Ukraine. History. Modernity. Perspectives], Heoprynt, Kyiv, Ukraine, 616 p.

3. Ahafonova, N. (2016), "Issues of development of constitutional reform in modern Ukraine", *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu zakonodavstva Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy*, № 1, pp. 32-42.
4. Bilyk, P. (2001), "The concept and legal essence of the management category "region", *Pravo Ukrainy*, №11, pp. 32-35.
5. Vereshchuk, I. (2015), "A systematic approach to the study of administrative-territorial organization", *Efektivnist derzhavnoho upravlinnia*, №42, pp. 255–265.
6. Chornovil, V. (2009), *Tvory u desiaty tomakh*. [Works in ten volumes], Smoloskyp, Kyiv, Ukraine, 1052 p.
7. The official site of Decentralization provides opportunities (2021), "Decentralization: general information", retrieved from : <https://decentralization.gov.ua/about>.
8. Dnistrianskyi, M. (2013), "Administrative and territorial structure of Ukraine: political and geographical problems of functioning and possibilities of optimization", *Naukovyi visnyk Skhidnoievropeiskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Lesi Ukrainky. Heohrafichni nauky*, pp. 138-143.
9. Zhovnirchuk, Ya. F. (2005), "Development of territorial organization of local self-government in Ukraine", Ph.D. Thesis, Public administration, National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, NADU, Kyiv, Ukraine, 20 p.
10. Keba, Ye. H. (2018), "The state of scientific research and legislation of Ukraine on the territorial organization of power as an object of administrative and legal support", *Chasopys Kyivskoho universytetu prava*, № 3, pp. 121-124.
11. Kuchabskyi, O. (2010), "Theoretical and methodological principles of the administrative-territorial organization of Ukraine", Abstract of Doctor of sciences, Public administration, National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, Kharkiv, Ukraine, 517 p.
12. Lytvyn, V. M. (2015), "Administrative-territorial structure of Ukraine: retrospective vision and prospects of reform", *Visnyk Natsionalnoi akademii nauk Ukrainy*, № 8, pp. 58-70.
13. The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (2020), The Law of Ukraine "About voluntary association of territorial communities", retrieved from : <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/157-19#Text>.
14. Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (2014), "On approval of the Concept of reforming local self-government and territorial organization of power in Ukraine", retrieved from : <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/333-2014-%D1%80#Text>.
15. The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (2020), The Law of Ukraine "About formation and liquidation of areas", retrieved from : <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/807-IX#Text>.
16. Radchenko, O. V. (2008), "Anthropological nature of the value system of society", *Teoriia ta praktyka derzhavnoho upravlinnia*, №2 (21), pp. 275–282.
17. Radchenko, O. and Zadorozhnyi, S. (2019), "Political corruption as a threat to national security", *Derzhavno-upravlinski studii*, №1(16), retrieved from : <http://box5800.temp.domains/~ipkeduua/>.
18. Reform for man (2005), *Zbirnyk materialiv pro shliakhy realizatsii administratyvno-terytorialnoi reformy v Ukraini*, 237 p.
19. Stohova, O. V. (2019), "Administrative-territorial system in Ukraine: the main stages of formation and their characteristics", *Suchasne suspilstvo*, №1, pp. 221-232.
20. Bukhtatyi, O. Radchenko, O. and Holovchenko, H. (2015), *Ukraina mediina : na porozhni informatsiinoi revoliutsii* [Media Ukraine: on the threshold of the information revolution], SVS Panasenko, Kyiv, Ukraine, 208p.
21. Chmyrova, L. Yu. and Fediai, N. O. (2013), "Zoning of the territory of Ukraine as one of the factors of spatial socio-economic development of regions", *Efektivna ekonomika*, № 3, retrieved from : <http://www.economy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=1878>.
22. Chornovil (2021), "The idea of federalism and its transformation", retrieved from : <https://fakty.cv.ua/2017/08/chornovil-ideya-federalizmu-ta-jiji-transformatsiji/>.
23. Kaczmarek, T. (2005), *Struktury terytorialno-administracyjne i ich reformy w krajach europejskich*. Poznań : Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 391 p.
24. Akimov, O. (2020). PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: ROBUSTNESS AND THE SYSTEMIC GENESIS ASPECT. *Public Administration and Law Review*, (1), 46-54. <https://doi.org/10.36690/2674-5216-2020-1-46-54>.

**Received: December 21, 2020**

**Approved: January 24, 2021**