

УДК 351(477)

Maryna Kozyreva, PhD in History, Vasyl
Sukhomlynskyi Mykolayiv National University

NATIONAL ZONING IN UKRAINE IN THE 1920-1930's AS THE HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE OF STATE BUILDING

The article defines the role of the national zoning in the Soviet Ukraine in the system of administrative-territorial reform in the 1920 and 1930's, its place and degree of efficiency in the process of state building in the republic. Moreover, the experience of operation and liquidation process of national administrative and territorial units in Ukraine at a crucial period of domestic and international history actualizes the re-search question of efficiency of these entities for modern scholars. It is noted that numerous administrative and territorial reforms were initiated during the establishment of the Soviet power in Ukraine. It is stressed that the reforms in this sphere were aimed at the elimination of pre-revolutionary administrative-territorial division. The conclusion is made that administrative and territorial reform in Ukraine in 1923, carried out in a hurry, did not take into account the ethnic composition of inhabitants and historical forms of management. Therefore, deterioration of the situation due to the ignorance of the national factor in the presence of diverse ethnic composition of the country forced the Bolshevik leaders to make certain concessions in the form of the national zoning. Therefore, the national regions of Ukraine as administrative and territorial units proved to be inefficient and were abolished in the late 1930s.

Keywords: national zoning, administrative and territorial reform, state building.

Козырева М.Е. Національне районування в Україні 20-30 рр. XX ст. як історичний досвід державотворення

Визначається роль національного районування в системі адміністративно-територіально-го реформування в радянській Україні 20-30 рр. XX ст., його місце та ступінь ефективності в процесі державотворення в республіці.

Ключові слова: національне районування, адміністративно-територіальне реформування, державотворення.

Козырева М.Э. Национальное районирование в Украине 20-30 гг. XX ст. как исторический опыт государственного строительства

Определяется роль национального районирования в системе административно-территориального реформирования в советской Украине 20-30 гг. XX ст., его место и степень эффективности в процессе государственного строительства в республике.

Ключевые слова: национальное районирование, административно-территориальное реформирование, государственное строительство.

Statement of the problem

The experience of operation and liquidation process of national administrative and territorial units in Ukraine at a crucial period of domestic and international history actualizes the research question of efficiency of these entities for modern scholars. Despite hypercritical attention of national experts to the issues of national coverage of national zoning's place in the practice of national and state building, this topic still remains far from being solved. The influence of creation of national administrative and territorial units on the processes of state formation in the UkrSSR needs further clarification.

Analysis of recent researches and publications

The problems of public administration have been the subject of consideration of V. Averyanov, G. Atamanchuk, V. Babkin, V. Bebik, F. Burchak, B. Gajewski, V. Knyazev, V. Kremen, G. Lelikov, V. Lugovoi, I. Nadolny, N. Nyzhnyk, Y. Pakhomov, A. Petrishin, V. Rebkalo, S. Ryabov, V. Semchyk, V. Sirenko, A. Skrypnyuk, V. Skuratovskiy, V. Tsvetkov, V. Yatsuba and others.

The study of common problems of ethnonational issues was made in the works of V. Evtukh, N. Kuras, B. Naulko, S. Kulchytsky, O. Rafalsky, M. Panchuk, L. Polevoi, I. Panibudlasky, Y. Ry-marenko, V. Soldatenko, B. Chirka, L. Yakubova, I. Vermenych, O. Danilchenko, M. Dmitrienko, V.

Gorbyk, H. Yefimenko, V. Marochko, V. Serhiychuk, M. Zhurba etc.

The national issues gained substantial coverage in the works of I. Kulinich, N. Kryvets, S. Bobylyeva, N. Ostashevoyi-Wenger, Shevchuk, O. Beznosov, A. Beznosova, A. Rublev, N. Rublev, M. Kostiuk, T. Zaretsky, V. Orlyanskaya and others.

An important contribution to the development of the studied problem has been made by the foreign experts D. Mace, A. Graziosi, A. Aysfeld, L. Malinowski, V. Chebotaryov etc.

Research objectives

The article defines the role of national zoning in the Soviet Ukraine in the system of administrative-territorial reform in the 1920 and 1930's, its place and degree of efficiency in the process of state building in the republic.

Results

General socio-economic and political crisis in Ukraine at the end of the civil war has demonstrated the fragility of the Soviet regime, despite the military victory.

The beginning of the 1920s in Ukraine was marked by the explosive escalation of interethnic relations, the direct basis of which was in a catastrophic deterioration of economic conditions of all ethnic groups of the republic [1, p.329]. It occurred against the backdrop of ongoing changes made by the Soviet authorities in Ukraine, which were aimed at liquidation of pre-revolutionary zoning [2, p. 70-72]. The main focus of these changes was in destroying the binding of commercial areas to the administrative and territorial boundaries [3, p.18], which resulted in shredding previously integrated administratively and economically 'volosts' and in extremely exacerbating land issue as the result of the tragic consequences of the famine 1921-1923.

With the introduction of a new administrative-territorial division of Ukraine in March 1923 with the consolidation of 'volosts' in the districts and 'povity' - in the counties [4, p.79], a four degree system of governance (centre – 'guberniya' -

vicinity – 'rayon') was formed in the republic. This reform that was carried out in a hurry, did not take into account neither the ethnic composition of residents, nor the historical forms of management.

The severity of confrontation had forced the Bolshevik leaders to make certain concessions initially in the socio-economic sphere (the introduction of the NEP), and later in the national question (indigenization policy).

The Bolshevik concept of state building was beyond national and state building, because its

purpose was in universal approval of communism, which had to rise above national and state boundaries. The unified centralized state was supposed to become the best form of the set task's realization, because centralization was considered to be the guarantee of implementing the revolutionary transformations and solving economic, political, and spiritual problems. The principles of the pro-letarian state have been copied from the practice of party building, which then provided the indivisible growth of state and party organisms. The initiation of indigenization has become a forced tactical retreat from the theory of Marxism in order to preserve the territorial integrity of the Soviet state. It allowed federal leadership to ensure a certain respite to re-group forces by reducing the centrifugal political processes and to thoroughly prepare multinational country's transition to socialism. Indigenization policy was to promote the popularization of basic social and economic policies of the Soviet government among ethnic components of the country, and eventually its introduction by their representatives.

The policy concept of indigenization of the state apparatus was proposed at the Twelfth Congress of the CPSU (b) in April 1923. In union scale the indigenization was not considered as an independent socio-cultural program but as a tool to implement other more important social and economic projects. However, the event that was considered as a subsidiary, turned into a separate program in the local environment.

At the same time the Resolution of the Sovnarkom UkrSSR and VUTSVK "On measures to ensure equality of languages and to support the development of the Ukrainian language" from the 1st of August, 1923, which is defined by the researchers as the rising point of indigenization policy in

Ukraine, not only did not initiate the creation of national administrative and territorial units, but also made it unnecessary through the detailed regulation of the use of languages of ethnic minorities that had to cause indigenization of the personnel of the executive committees at all levels. However, the incredible ethnic diversity of the country that was on the pre-industrial stage of development, defined internal contradictions and complexity of its administrative-territorial structure [5, p.144-145].

The Soviet government began to consider the earmarking of national village and districts councils as a factor capable of simultaneously not only slightly improving the socio-economic situation and to some extent meeting national and cultural needs of the population, but, more importantly,

of economic regionalization proposed in 1921 by Moscow State Planning Commission, initiated by Lenin. This principle of zoning was seen by Russian Bolshevik leadership as the basis not only of economic activity (at the same time references were made on the prerevolutionary experience - the creation of economic counties by the relevant ministries), but the administrative division of the entire Soviet space. The committee under the chairmanship of M. Kalinin was created by the USSR Central Executive Committee, generally adopting the idea of the State Planning Commission, proposed to align it with the national structure of the Union and recommended to zone two areas - the Urals and the North Caucasus as an experiment [10].

When specified developments of the central government had been finding practical use, a wave of not only the general and national zoning had already been passed in Ukraine but the preparation to eliminate provincial division had been launched by 1925. The recognition of the USSR Central Executive Committee on zoning that these administrative-territorial transformations in Ukraine had passed by it was demonstrative in the question of the degree of central and republican authorities' coordination.

Created national areas had been identified from above, and not had been determined independently [5, p.143]. Although the emphasis in nation-building had not been made on the political self-determination, but on the national-territorial autonomy [5, p.138], the Bolshevik government from the beginning viewed the formation of national districts and village councils as a weapon of implementation of a proper language policy. Therefore, the national territorial units in areas of a compact ethnic minority settlement had become not only the territorial autonomies of a particular ethnic group, but more the national-territorial units with the office administration in national languages.

The proposals to finally put an end to the pre-revolutionary division by eliminating 'gubernii' were put forward as early as during the administrative-territorial reform in 1923. It was then prevented by H. Rakowski. He then rightly believed that the expansion of management subjects to forty counties would complicate the work of the central party and Soviet organs too much. However, the next republican leadership agreed to eliminate 'gubernias'. So a three-stage system of management (center - vicinity - district) was established in Ukraine in 1925 [4, p.79].

The transition to vicinity system was considered as more acceptable by the Ukrainian higher

authorities in comparison with the oblast division proposed by the Federal State Planning Commission. The proposal of the latter was in the formation of two regions (southwestern with the center in Kiev and southern and industrial with the center in Kharkiv), which included not only the territory of Ukraine, but also the Crimean ASSR and the part of the Don Army Oblast that was outside of the Ukrainian territory [12]. The proposed administrative variant by the State Planning Commission would expand the control capabilities of the Union center; whereas under the district system both projected oblasts would actually merge into one within the borders of the UkrSSR strengthening managerial positions of the Ukrainian political leadership. The Union authority, though agreed with the proposals of the Ukrainian side under the pressure of the "national moment", from the beginning viewed it as a temporary one for the period not exceeding 3-5 years. Thus, from the very beginning the stabilization of the administrative-territorial system was not on the agenda.

The liquidation of provinces, as all previous Soviet administrative-territorial changes in Ukraine, was carried out in a hurry. Despite expectations of the Republican leadership it did not promote the reduction of costs spent on the Soviet apparatus [13]. Redistribution of functions and property of the dissolved 'gubernias' agencies to vicinities' structures, which needed a certain time period for establishing new conditions of work, brought confusion in management. Accumulation of the next administrative-territorial reform on the national zoning was reflected on the character and on the timing of the measures.

Some specificity was viewed in practice with community of state statutes in the national zoning. If the active position of the German settlers in the protection of their identity and the existence of vast population that lived compactly contributed to the primarily creation of the German national districts in the republic, then often different sequence had been among some ethnic groups. For example, the Jewish national zoning began with the formation of not areas, but village councils on the basis of the old Hebrew colonies and towns; districts due to the dispersion of settlement were singled out later when implementing controversial in its results resettlement program of the Jews on the land [14, p.145-146]. The reasons for the introduction of certain administrative and territorial units were also differed. Creation of the Polish national areas near the border with Poland was seen as a basis for promotion of the social-

ist revolution in the West [15, p.203]: after the lost war the Soviet authorities did not abandon attempts to make an expansion into Poland in order to create Polish socialist republic. At the same time the Polish population of Naddniprianska Ukraine was seen as the fifth column for this mission, and the UkrSSR was assigned the role of the Polish national ground for the implementation of this policy [15, p.74].

The peculiarity of the situation in the national areas consisted in the fact that with the inclusion of foreign village and town councils to their composition, the full range of activities associated with the introduction of indigenization was necessary to exercise with respect to them. Extremely important was the problem of linguistic personnel training, which required knowledge of the language of the majority population of the district at the district level, the Ukrainian language for the relations with the higher bodies, and language of some ethnic group with the inclusion of the foreign administrative and territorial units to the district. These guidelines created double or even triple language press for those responsible managers as well as technical staff of district level of governance. Their level of language training was often far from the desired.

It should be borne in mind that the main border of conflict in Ukraine took place not between ethnic groups and their mentalities, but in socio-economic relations, opposites in economic and political interests of different populations groups, which had remained as rudiments of sustainable forms of social coexistence throughout the NEP. The most important factor in this controversy was the land issue, especially attempts of its solution by the Bolshevik government in the conditions of the critical short-age of land in certain regions. Hence, the resettlement campaign added ethnic dimension to chronic social crisis [5, p.150].

The Constitution of the UkrSSR of 1929 cemented the possibility of creation of national administrative and territorial units. However, the guarantee of equality before the law and protection of political rights exclusively of the working masses in the conditions of mandatory implementation of decisions and orders of the central institutions by the local executive committees, rigid hierarchy of the executive bodies of power and significant limitation of voting rights gave the caste character to the Soviet democracy of the 1920-30's, depriving the wider ethnic minority groups from political rights [5, p.136-137]. The extraordinary polyethnic population, which extremely complicated the implementation of national languages in everyday

public life, became a decisive factor in phasing out the multilingualism [5, p.151], which affected further administrative and territorial changes.

With the requirements for maximum centralization of administration the sixteenth Congress of the CPSU (b) in 1930 decided to strengthen the district level of government, which played a special role in the campaign of complete collectivization [9, p.8]. 'Okruzs' were eliminated and districts came under the direct management of the center by the Resolution of the VUTSVK and SNK the UkrSSR from the 2nd of September, 1930. Creation of a two-tier management system (district - center) in Ukraine, contrary to the expectations of the Soviet leadership, significantly complicated the administration efficiency. Activities of central bodies were almost paralyzed because of many small problems that arose in hundreds of rural districts [9, p.8]. Their management from the capital of the republic proved to be absolutely impossible: center, which previously somehow coped with four dozen counties, could not handle the five hundred objects under its direct subordination. Most noticeable this situation was in rural areas that were almost completely isolated from the administrative center in the midst of complete collectivization. The administrative factor played a significant role in that situation in the agricultural sector of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic in 1931-1932 that was significantly worse than in any region of the country [4, p.78-79], becoming a prelude to the famine of 1932-1933.

Rapidly increasing disorganization of administration had put at risk the realization of certain state radical socio-economic transformations and demanded urgent intervention. In February of 1932 the leadership of Ukraine gained the agreement from Kremlin to create five areas, territories of which were almost twice bigger than the former 'gubernias' [4, p.79]. The fourth extraordinary session of the UkrSSR VUTSVK of the twelfth convocation on the 9th of February, 1932 confirmed this decision. Therefore, a three-stage system of management (center - region - district) was established in the republic.

Conducting administrative-territorial reforms in 1930 and 1932

had disorganizing consequences for the whole administrative system of Ukraine that evolved through trial and mistakes, and its imperfections had led to further territorial changes in the republic. Significant sizes of established regions were obstacles to an effective establishment of vertical hierarchy of management. This had raised ques-

tions about their downsizing [4, p.79-80]. These processes also affected the national zoning.

Administrative-territorial changes of the end of the 1920s and the 1930s, under the conditions of the curtailment of the NEP, the implementation of complete collectivization and the loss of economic identity by national districts, initiated the elimination of “undesirable” for the government districts while simultaneously forming new districts with the national status. And if the emergence of new districts most often became the mechanical consequence of the administrative reallocation from the top, the destruction of others often also showed the internal changes in the environment of different ethnic groups. For example, the administrative reorganization in 1930 of Khortytskyi German and in 1932 of Sartanskii and Manhuskoho Greek districts only legislatively stated

the transformation of large villages that constituted them into the suburbs due to the steady trend of urbanization as a result of the outflow of significant groups of farmers unwilling to join the collective farms [17, p.402]. At the same time national districts that remained had been increasingly used by the government as means of political control and a convenient base for mass arrests.

The revised administrative and territorial division was enshrined in the Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR in 1937. However, changes had continued to occur in the future. As for adjustedness and reasonableness of the administrative-territorial reform in Ukraine in general and in the national zoning in particular, that despite the image of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet functionaries of economic, national and cultural practices as a clear systematic strategy of formational changes, all components of internal policy of the Bolsheviks lied in continuous political maneuvering under the strengthened party control and the capture of the “commanding heights” in all areas of society [5, p.152].

It is not surprising that the initial positive assessment of the practice of the national administrative and territorial units’ creation by the Soviet state structures had changed into the negative attitude to the very fact of their existence, which had gradually resulted in the ultimate elimination of these entities in the end of the 1930s.

Conclusions

The numerous administrative and territorial reforms were initiated during the establishment of the Soviet power in Ukraine. They were carried out on the basis of the abolition of private property and the persistent antireligious orientation, were aimed at the elimination of pre-revolutionary administrative-territorial division, which evoked dissatisfaction of the new state institutions due to, from their point of view, far too fragmentation. On the background of general unsettled land relationships and a number of taxation errors implemented measures had brought the situation in the country to crisis.

Administrative and territorial reform in Ukraine in 1923, carried out in a hurry, did not take into account the ethnic composition of inhabitants and historical forms of management. Therefore, deterioration of the situation due to the ignorance of the national factor in the presence of diverse ethnic composition of the country forced the Bolshevik leaders to make certain concessions in the form of the national zoning.

However, the effectiveness of these measures proved to be inefficient due to the combination of the national zoning stretched over time (from 1923 to 1939) with the reform of the pre-revolutionary administrative and territorial division as well as with the implementation of the economic zoning by all-Union structures under the conditions of outright secondariness of the first component.

Chronic administrative-territorial reorganizations were carried out not so much on the basis of scientific conclusions, but on the prevailing political considerations of public institutions at various levels. A frequent lack of thought and calculations of far-reaching consequences of the administrative-territorial division as a whole and particularly of the national zoning has contributed to the confusion in the management system and has not helped, despite the authorities hopes, to reduce costs spent on the Soviet apparatus.

The final abolishment of indigenization policy in the late 1930s had resulted in the elimination of all national regions of Ukraine as administrative and territorial units.

References

1. Yakubova L. Tsentralna komisiya natsionalnykh menshyn (TKHM) pry VUTVK ta yiyi mistsevi organy. 1924 – 1934 (Central Commission for National Minorities (TSKNM) at VUTSVK and its local bodies. 1924 – 1934) In Problemy istorii Ukrainy: fakty, sudzhennya, poshuky: mizhvidomchyi zb. nauk. prats. (Challenges of history of Ukraine: facts, thought, investigations: interdepartmental volume

of scientific works). – Volume 14. – Kyiv : Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy (Institute of history of Ukraine NAS Ukraine), 2005. – PP. 329-365.

2. Dmytriienko M.F. Zminy v administratyvno-teritorialnomu ustroiy Ukrainy v 1919-1920 rr. (Changes in the administrative and territorial division of Ukraine in 1919-1920) In *Ukraynskiy istorychnyi zhurnal* (Ukrainian scientific journal). – 2003. – № 6. – PP. 68-78.

3. Horbuk V.O., Skrypnyk P.I. Do pytannya pro rayonuvannya Ukrainy (On the question of zoning in Ukraine) In *Ukraynskiy istorychnyi zhurnal* (Ukrainian scientific journal). – 1995. – № 2. – PP. 17-27.

4. Kulchytskyi S.V. Holod 1932 r. v zatinku holodomoru-33 (Hunger of 1932 in the shadow of the Famine-33) In *Ukraynskiy istorychnyi zhurnal* (Ukrainian scientific journal). – 2006. – № 6. – PP. 77-97.

5. Yakubova L. Teoretychni aspekty doslidzhennya istorii etnichnykh menshyn USRR (Theoretical aspects of research of the history of ethnic minorities of the UkrSSR) In *Problemy istorii Ukrainy: fakty, sudzhennya, poshuky: mizhvidomchyi zb. nauk. prats.* (Challenges of history of Ukraine: facts, thought, investigations: interdepartmental volume of scientific works). – Volume 15. – Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy (Institute of history of Ukraine NAS Ukraine), 2006. – PP. 132-154.

6. Kozyreva M. E. Nemetskie natsionalniye rayony Yuga Ukrainy v 1920-1930-kh rr. : obshchie zakonomernosti i spetsificheskie osobennosti razvitiya (German national districts of the South of Ukraine in the 1920s and 1930s: main regularities and specific peculiarities of development): materialy X mezhdunar. nauch. konf. Mezhdunarodnoy assotsiatsii issledovateley istorii i kultury rossiyskikh nemtsev (materials of the 10th internat. sciet. konf. of the International association of researchers of history and culture of Russian Germans) [Key challenges of history of Russian Germans] (18-21 November 2003, Moscow). – Moscow : ZAO «MCHK-press» (ZAO “MSHK-press”), 2004. – PP. 418-425.

7. Chyrko B. Natsionalniye nemetskie rayony i selskiye sovery (National German districts and villa-ge councils) In *Materialy k Entsyklopedii “Nemtsy Rossii”* (Materials to the Encyclopedia “Germans of Russia”). – Moscow, 2002. – PP. 160-163. – (Seriya: Nemtsy Ukrainy. Pilotnyi sbornik; vyp. 7 (Chapter: Germans of Ukraine. The pilot volume: issue 7).

8. Kulynych I.M., Kryvets N.V. Narysy z istorii nimetskykh koloniy v Ukraini (Sketches from the history of German colonies in Ukraine); NAN Ukrainy; Instytut istorii Ukrainy (NAS Ukraine; Institute of history of Ukraine). – Kyiv, 1995. – 272 p.

9. Kulchytskyi S.V. Kryza kolgospnogo ladu (The crisis of the collective farm system) In *Ukraynskiy istorychnyi zhurnal* (Ukrainian scientific journal). – 2003. – № 5. – PP. 5-25.

10. Derzhavnyi arhiv Rossiyskoyi Federatsii (DARF) (State archive of the Russian Federation, DARF). Moscow. – F. P-6892. – Op. 1. – Case 50.

11. DARF. – F. P-6892. – Op. 1. – Case 1.

12. DARF. – F. P-6892. – Op. 1. – Case 47.

13. DARF. – F. P-6892. – Op. 1. – Case 48.

14. Orlyanskiy V.S. Evreyi Ukrainy v 20-30 roky XX storicchya: sotsialno-politychnyi aspekt (Jews of Ukraine in the 1920s and 1930s: socio-political aspect). – Zaporizhya, 2000. – 240 p.

15. Zaretska T. Polityka radyanskoyi vlady schodo stvorennia polskykh natsionalnykh rayoniv v USRR (Policy of the Soviet authorities in the sphere of creation of Polish national districts in the UkrSSR) In *Problemy istorii Ukrainy: fakty, sudzhennya, poshuky: mizhvidomchyi zb. nauk. prats.* (Challenges of history of Ukraine: facts, thought, investigations: interdepartmental volume of scientific works). – Volume. 16. – Part. 2 – Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy (Institute of history of Ukraine NAS Ukraine), 2007. – PP. 203-219.

16. Zaretska T. Polske naselennya USRR u 1920-ti roky: perekhid do radyanskogo sposobu zhyttya (Polish population of the UkrSSR in the 1920s: transition to the Soviet style of life) In *Problemy istorii Ukrainy: fakty, sudzhennya, poshuky: mizhvidomchyi zb. nauk. prats.* (Challenges of history of Ukraine: facts, thought, investigations: interdepartmental volume of scientific works). – Volume. 15. – Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy (Institute of history of Ukraine NAS Ukraine), 2006. – PP. 73-84.

17. Yakubova L. Sutsilna kolektyvizatsiya v selakh etnichnykh menshyn. 1930-1935 rr. (Complete collectivization in the villages of the ethnic minorities. 1930-1935) In *Problemy istorii Ukrainy: fakty, sudzhennya, poshuky: mizhvidomchyi zb. nauk. prats.* (Challenges of history of Ukraine: facts, thought, investigations: interdepartmental volume of scientific works). – Volume. 11. – Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy (Institute of history of Ukraine NAS Ukraine), 2003. – PP. 370-412.

