

UDC 930.1(477)(092)“19”:321.01(477)
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.26.275214

Tamara SHARAVARA

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Vice-rector of Scientific and Pedagogical Work and Prospective Development at Poltava State Agrarian University, 1/3 Skovorody Street, Poltava, Ukraine, postal code 36000 (125125.tsh@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0002-6370-6663

Researcher ID: Q-6621-2016

Scopus Author ID: 57200222339

Serhii PRYKHODKO

PhD (Political Sciences), Associate Professor of the Department of Humanities and Social Studies at Poltava State Agrarian University, 1/3 Skovorody Street, Poltava, Ukraine, postal code 36000 (serhii.prykhodko@pdaa.edu.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0001-9755-6879-9179

Тамара ШАРАВАРА

докторка історичних наук, професорка, проректорка з науково-педагогічної роботи і перспективного розвитку Полтавського державного аграрного університету, вул. Г. Сковороди, 1/3, м. Полтава, Україна, індекс 36000 (125125.tsh@gmail.com)

Сергій ПРИХОДЬКО

кандидат політичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри гуманітарних і соціальних дисциплін Полтавського державного аграрного університету, вул. Г. Сковороди, 1/3, м. Полтава, Україна, індекс 36000 (serhii.prykhodko@pdaa.edu.ua)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Sharavara, T. & Prykhodko, S. (2023). Viacheslav Lypynskiy's Concept of Political Power. *Skhidnoieuropeiskiy istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 26, 66–75. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.26.275214

VIACHESLAV LYPYNSKYI'S CONCEPT OF POLITICAL POWER

Abstract. *The purpose of the research is to find out the meaningful essence and defining components of the political power concept developed by Viacheslav Lypynskiy, as well as its comparison with the characteristics of political power in modern political science. The methodology of the research is based on the principles of systematicity, dialectics, reliability, concrete historical approach, logic. General scientific (analysis, dialectical, synthesis, structural functional, generalization) and special (content analysis, comparative, systemhistorical) methods have been used. The scientific novelty consists in the analysis of Viacheslav Lypynskiy's political views, which has been carried out in the context of his development of the political power concept, the mechanisms of its implementation, and the legitimacy of power. A comparative analysis of this concept with the theory of political power presented in modern political science has been carried out. The Conclusion.* Based on the analysis of Viacheslav Lypynskiy's political views, it has been found out that the concept of political power is formulated in them. The scholar covered diverse aspects of its formation and functioning. The development of this concept could be explained by the scholar's reaction to the defeat of the National Liberation Movement

of 1917–1920. In his opinion, its reasons were related to the inability to create stable forms of the state. In fact, it can explain the main focus on the organization of the power issues. The specified concept contains sufficiently detailed characteristics of the political power, mechanisms of its implementation, principles of ensuring its legitimacy. The scholar also highlighted the issues of social composition of the authorities. He emphasized that they must include representatives of industrial and land owners class necessarily. Only they were able to ensure consistent progressive development of society, restraining possible manifestations of radicalism in state politics. The classical theory of the political power appeared in political science in the second half of the 20th century. Hence, V. Lypynskyi's developments should be considered as a component of it and an integral stage of its formation.

Key words: power, political power, state, legitimacy, power resources.

КОНЦЕПЦІЯ ПОЛІТИЧНОЇ ВЛАДИ В'ЯЧЕСЛАВА ЛИПІНСЬКОГО

Анотація. Мета дослідження: з'ясування змістової сутності та визначальних складових концепції політичної влади, розробленої В'ячеславом Липинським, а також її зіставлення з характеристиками політичної влади в сучасній політології. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на принципах системності, діалектики, достовірності, конкретно-історичного підходу, логічності. Використано загальнонаукові (аналізу, діалектичний, синтезу, структурно-функціональний, узагальнення) та спеціальні (контент-аналіз, порівняльний, системно-історичний) методи. **Наукова новизна.** Вперше здійснено аналіз політичних поглядів В'ячеслава Липинського у контексті розробки ним концепції політичної влади, механізмів її реалізації, легітимності влади. Здійснено порівняльний аналіз цієї концепції з теорією політичної влади, представленою в сучасній політології. **Висновки.** На основі аналізу політичних поглядів В'ячеслава Липинського виявлено, що в них сформульована концепція політичної влади. Вчений торкнувся багатьох аспектів її формування і функціонування. Створення цієї концепції пояснюється реакцією вченого на поразку національно-визвольного руху 1917–1920 рр. На його думку, її причини були пов'язані з неспроможністю створити стабільні форми держави. Власне цим і можна пояснити головну увагу на проблемах організації влади. Зазначена концепція містить достатньо докладні характеристики політичної влади, механізмів її реалізації, принципів забезпечення її легітимності. Вчений зробив також акцент на питаннях соціального складу органів влади. Він наголошував, що до них мають обов'язково належати представники верстви великих промислових і земельних власників. Лише вони здатні забезпечити послідовний прогресивний розвиток суспільства, стримуючи можливі прояви радикалізму у державній політиці. Класична теорія політичної влади з'явилася в політичній науці вже у другій половині ХХ ст. Тому розробки В. Липинського варто розглядати як її складову та невід'ємний етап становлення.

Ключові слова: влада, політична влада, держава, легітимність, ресурси влади.

The Problem Statement. After the defeat of the National Liberation Movement of 1917–1920 and attempts to restore the statehood, the Ukrainian public figures of various ideological orientations tried to determine its causes. The paramount cause among them was inability of political leaders at that time to create an effective form of the state power organization due to a low professional competence and lack of managerial experience. At the same time, the representatives of various directions of public opinion (from the left to the right-wing radicals) offered new models of the state. The principles of its construction are the most thoroughly laid out in the fundamental work of Viacheslav Lypynskyi, “The Letters to Brothers-Breadmakers”. In his political concept, the scholar focused on the issues of power, the formation and functioning mechanisms of power bodies. He interpreted power as a determining factor in the activity of a full-fledged state. Accordingly, quite high demands were placed on the personnel of the authorities. These should be really the best representatives of society by all criteria.

The historical research was one of the means of substantiating this concept. Thus, V. Lypynskyi, analysing the events of 1917–1920, compared them with the Liberation War

led by Bohdan Khmelnytskyi. In particular, he argued that at that time a decisive role in the generally successful state-building process was played by the transition of the Orthodox Ukrainian nobility to the side of the insurgent masses. The emphasis was on the personality of Yu. Nemyrych (Masnenko, 2018). In this way, the scholar put emphasis on the drastic need to involve large landowners as the descendants of the nobility in the process of the Ukrainian statehood forming.

The political concept of V. Lypynskyi, in addition to defining the practical ways of the Ukrainian state-building, is also of a theoretical significance. According to the authors, it can be considered a significant contribution to the development of the theory of political power, political elite. It contains provisions on the issues of the legitimacy of the authorities. In fact, this is actually its scientific significance. The study of the concepts of power by domestic scholars, in our opinion, is crucial for the implementation of their theoretical heritage objective structuring. It will contribute to a better systematization of the political theories of the Ukrainian specialists. On the other hand, the analysis of their views on the issue of political power will deepen theoretical knowledge regarding the specified issue.

The Analysis of the Recent Research. The state power organization issues occupy an important place in the theoretical heritage of the representatives of the Ukrainian political thought. In particular, their detailed development is presented in the work, written by Viacheslav Lypynskyi “The Letters to Brothers-Breadmakers” (Lypynskyi, 1995). In it there were outlined the basic principles of his concept of power. The analysis of its essence is contained in the researchers’ publications of V. Lypynskyi’s studies, the diaspora representatives: V. Isaiv and V. Rudko (Isaiv, 1984; Rudko, 1985). They considered the main components of the scholar’s concept in detail.

It is worth noting the publications, written by modern Ukrainian scholars, who study the heritage of V. Lypynskyi, for instance: P. Hai-Nyzhnyk, V. Masnenko, I. Perederii (Hai-Nyzhnyk, 2018; Masnenko, 2018; Perederii, 2011). They emphasized V. Lypynskyi’s analysis of a determining role of the state and the proper organization of the state power in the process of forming the Ukrainian nation.

Viacheslav Lypynskyi’s concept of power was created under certain historical conditions, when the Ukrainian National Liberation Movement of 1917 – 1920 was defeated. It can be called a kind of reaction to those events. The main problems that accompanied the state-building processes at that time were analysed in the articles by V. Verstiuk, D. Reshetchenko, B. Yakymovych (Verstiuk, 2019; Reshetchenko, 2018; Yakymovych, 2019).

The Purpose of the Research. It is vital to state the actual absence of publications in the Ukrainian scientific publications concerning the contribution of the Ukrainian scholars to the world political science. Hence, the purpose of the article is to clarify the meaningful essence and defining components of the political power concept developed by Viacheslav Lypynskyi, as well as to compare it with the characteristics of the political power in modern political science.

The Results of the Research. Power is one of the key categories of political science and central issues of political practice. The entire political sphere to one degree or another concerns various aspects of its formation and functioning. It determines the main direction of the political subjects activity. The power issue was always in the focus of the political researchers of different historical periods. It was also the subject of study by the representatives of the Ukrainian political opinion. The principles of the organization of power are reflected in Viacheslav Lypynskyi’s political concept the most fully and comprehensively. First of all, it

is appropriate to determine the historical context in which it was created in order to provide a thorough definition of the essence of the above-mentioned concept. The above-mentioned approach seemed to us to be justified, since it was a certain consequence of previous historical events. After all, V. Lypynskiy focused on the problems of power, as he considered the inability to create stable power bodies by the activists of the Ukrainian People's Republic as the main reasons for Ukraine's loss of statehood. The following state of affairs was superimposed on the personal rejection of each other by the Ukrainian politicians of that time.

Modern Ukrainian historians also noted the fact that these problems influenced the political processes of 1917 – 1920 decisively. In particular, B. Yakymovych emphasized the basic lack of “a sense of one's own strength for independence”, the inability of the leadership of the UNR and ZUNR to “realize the unity, help each other at the most critical time” (Yakymovych, 2019, p. 192). In general, he characterized the policy of the Ukrainian leaders at that time as treasonous. “Incompetence, indifference, laziness, arrogance and even slowness, especially in decision making by the state or military officials, also become the traitors and treason for the state at the turning points of its history, precisely when it comes to its existence” (Yakymovych, 2019, p. 191). According to V. Verstiuk, in general, “the political leaders of both parts of Ukraine did not have a clear answer to the challenges created by the World War and the Revolution, and the most importantly, they did not develop a common ideal of future national statehood” (Verstiuk, 2019, p. 92). The continuation of heated discussions and mutual accusations was as a kind of apotheosis of these processes in emigration. They were carried out by the “antagonists in the National Liberation Contests of 1917 – 1921 – the government-in-exile of the Ukrainian People's Republic and the Hetmans the most actively” (Reshetchenko, 2018, p. 113).

Therefore, such historical prerequisites had influence on the essence of post-revolutionary political concepts directly, in which the main focus was on defining new ways of the state formation and, in particular, on the power organization issues.

First of all, it is necessary to specify the main categorical apparatus for the analysis of the power institution. V. Lypynskiy focused on the state power. It could be explained by the fact that during the period of the 20s and 30s of the 20th century the political power was considered as the state power exclusively. Other varieties of it did not exist at that time, at least at the level of theoretical elaboration. Therefore, the scholar considered the principles of the state power functioning. Modern Ukrainian researchers of his theoretical heritage highlighted this issue. According to I. Perederii, V. Lypynskiy put the creation of the Ukrainian nation in direct dependence on the process of the state formation. “Without the Ukrainian state, the Ukrainian nation cannot exist”. “Only after receiving their own state, the Ukrainians will turn from an ethnographic mass into a full-fledged conscious state political nation” (Perederii, 2012, p. 434). In the monograph “Ukraine of the 20th Century: Socio-political Models of the National State” edited by P. Hai-Nyzhnyk, it was also emphasized that the state for V. Lypynskiy was a determining factor in the process of nation-building. “The state is an indispensable condition for self-determination and creation of nation”. “State”, “civil society” and “nation” are closely interconnected and mutually determining in the progress of civilization” (Hai-Nyzhnyk, 2018, pp. 310–311). That is, in order for the Ukrainians to become a real nation, a full-fledged state is needed. The main reason for this should be a highly professional, competent administrative apparatus.

The state power as the main type of political power has specific properties. According to the authors, in order to clarify V. Lypynskiy's concept, there was a need to compare it with the

interpretation of state power accepted in modern political science. Its leading characteristics include “the political organization of society with sovereign power, territory and the right to use coercion, the main function of which is management” (Levenets, 2011, p. 199). Hence, the state power has priority over other types of power and concerns the majority of social relations.

Viacheslav Lypynskyi defined the essence of the state power through its functional orientation. The authorities should create certain organizational forms of life activities of the society under government. But the scholar was not limited to the need to perform tasks related to public administration exclusively. He considered the authority in the field of education of the public masses to be an equally important task. That is, the creation and distribution among them of certain “cultural, moral and civilized” values, which become the national property gradually. “The lead in the transformation of any passive national unconscious collective into an organized, self-conscious nation, and the lead in the creation of ever new, organizational forms of public life of an already conscious nation is carried out everywhere and always by a certain active minority, which puts itself at the head of the nation and creates these dynamic – material and spiritual – public values, which are then taken over by the whole passive majority of the nation, uniting it all the time into one continuous, self-aware national organism” (Lypynskyi, 1995, pp. 185–186).

V. Lypynskyi focused on the mechanisms, means (resources), exercise of power. First of all, he noted the personal qualities of those in power. In particular, the scholar noted that they should possess a highly developed will to power and strive to implement it in society. “Each social group that wants to build and organize society must extract strength from itself. Only its own inner strength determines its influence on the whole society” (Lypynskyi, 1995, p. 70). The scholar considered certain human mental properties to be the main essential component of such inner strength, one of which is a natural tendency to dominate. He highlighted that every person strives for development, for the realization of his potential constantly. This desire is based on instincts, “illogical, spontaneous, irrational desires” (Lypynskyi, 1995, p. 362). That part of society in which they are more developed forms the basis of the ruling group formation. It differs from the rest of people in a stronger desire for leading positions in society. But this desire must be rationally realized and understood. It cannot be built only on the instincts. That is why, V. Lypynskyi put emphasis on the need to transform this “spontaneous desire” into a direct desire to achieve power. “The main sign of the movement, which distinguishes the leaders in a political public life, is a greater innate desire for power, greater imperialism (or a greater political temperament)” (Lypynskyi, 1995, p. 362).

It should be noted that the scholar considered the presence of such a conviction in his natural vocation to be insufficient to realize himself as a true subject of power. The “primitive desire for power” alone is “only the first impulse to the political action” (Lypynskyi, 1995, p. 363). It is vital that “the belief prevails in a person’s consciousness that his spontaneous desires, which drive him to action, are true, legal, and necessary. The movement increases to the extent that people, creating that movement, begin to believe that their creativity is not the result of only their personal subjective will, but is a manifestation of some higher than such subjective desires, an objective, legitimate and necessary truth” (Lypynskyi, 1995, p. 363). That is, in order to strengthen their aspirations, subjects of power must realize their direct connection with the objective historical processes. The scholar considered this combination of “spontaneous irrational desire for power” with belief in its legitimacy to be a kind of engine of historical development. But at the same time, he highlighted in every possible way that such “imperialism” and “mysticism” should not cross the limits of what is reasonable, sufficient, and

expedient. In order to prevent the arbitrariness on the part of the authorities, it is crucial to limit such inclinations constantly. In particular, religion, norms of public morality. On this occasion, V. Rudko, a researcher of the heritage of V. Lypynskiy, wrote that his “doctrine is voluntarist, but this voluntarism in his deep vision of the conditional value of such and similar worldview elements is balanced, bound by others (reason, religion, etc.)” (Rudko, 1985, p. 491).

Therefore, the scholar supported the point of view that the power, determined only by a highly developed, unlimited “will to rule” cannot ensure the normal development of the society. It will turn into the usual arbitrariness and dictatorship of the ruling power. Under such circumstances social order can only be maintained by means of violent methods. Hence, in the process of exercising power, the will of power must be justified and regulated by rational factors.

In addition to the above-mentioned personal qualities, V. Lypynskiy emphasized the importance of external resources, which the subjects of power must possess in order to perform their functions successfully. It is obvious that his vision of this issue is significantly different from the visions of later scholars. But no one covered this issue previously. Hence, we can state the fact that it was the Ukrainian scholar, who for the first time considered the issue of power resources and their importance in politics.

In modern political science, power resources are defined as “a set of means used by the subject of politics to achieve their political goals, strengthen and expand political power” (Levenets, 2011, p. 636). They are classified depending on the spheres of public life: economic, legal, social, power, cultural and informational, etc. V. Lypynskiy argued that the effectiveness of the ruling group’s activities could be ensured not only by a strong will to power, while analyzing the issue of power resources. The effectiveness of its implementation increases in the presence of certain external factors to a large extent. According to V. Isaiv, another researcher of Viacheslav Lypynskiy noted in this regard, “the scholar distinguishes the concept of “internal power” in the ruling minority very clearly from what we can call the concept of “external power”. The external power is a purely material force, i.e. control over the means of coercion” (Isaiv, 1984, p. 85).

Hence, the scholar considered the government’s resources as a set of certain primarily material means that would confirm the “will” of the ruling stratum to rule. “In order to be able to fulfill an organizational role in the nation properly, it must have material power greater than any other group in the nation” (Lypynskiy, 1995, p. 136). The scholar considered this factor extremely important for the exercise of power. He considered the concept of the material power as a combination of two components. First of all, these are “means of war and defense of one’s nation, i.e. the state apparatus and the army” (Lypynskiy, 1995, p. 189). This tool is fully consistent with modern understanding of this type of power resource as coercion, which can be used by the state power to maintain the social order. Second of all, the performance of management functions requires the availability of certain means of production among the subjects of government. In particular, they must “own agricultural means” (Lypynskiy, 1995, p. 189). These means include “technical means of war and peace” that are essential for the organization of the “economic life and material defense of the nation” (Lypynskiy, 1995, p. 189), i.e. those that support a proper level of vital activity of a subordinate society. Possession and disposal of the main means of production were a vital prerequisite for the successful exercise of power for V. Lypynskiy.

According to the scholar, the social basis of the Ukrainian government, “the unifying and organizing basis in the matter of nation-building and state-building in Ukraine is only the “class of the Ukrainian breadmaker” (Kornovenko & Pasichna, 2021, p. 113). In addition to

the fact that the “class of the Ukrainian breadmaker” has the necessary means of production. It is the state ideology bearer. “Khliborobska (breadmaking) ideology is ideology whose ideologies contribute to a broader understanding of the essence of nations, it is a universalist ideology” (Kornovenko & Pasichna, 2021, p. 118).

Justifying the significant role of the productive classes in the state-building process, the scholar explained in detail why it was important for the subjects of power to own and dispose of property. Those who personally produce bread and goods, who own the means of production (land and factories), who have the material power to rule and to be responsible for the rule, and who, in addition, “with their people and their material wealth” are to exercise power functions directly: lands and factories” will bear responsibility “for their power, for their rule” (Lypynskiy, 1995, pp. 153–154). V. Lypynskiy argued the need for the owners to form the basis of the state leadership with it. Only for them, personal economic interests will be fully aligned with the need for a stable functioning of the state. Hence, exercising its power, the ruling group will strive for the gradual improvement of the existing social and political system, and will restrain radical changes in it.

The scholar justified this point of view by means of his own historical research. A fairly massive transition of the Ukrainian Orthodox nobility to the side of the rebel Cossacks during Khmelnychyna was a significant moment to him. In particular, he provided the example of Yuriy Nemyrych, a statesman of the 19th century. His transition to the side of Bohdan Khmelnytskyi became a reflection of a crucial trend during the Liberation War, when the Ukrainian nobility became an active participant on the side of the rebel Cossacks. Such participation gave the Cossack movement an organized form and directed it towards the implementation of a clear political programme – the formation of a new state. “For Lypynskiy, it was an extremely important landmark event, as it was evidence of the end of the difficult and long-term maturation of the Ukrainian Cossacks, which turned from a nationless military robber caste that rebelled against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth into a state-national class” “The figure of Yuriy Nemyrych was of a special interest to V. Lypynskiy only because of the fact that he, having entered the service of the Ukrainian state” (Masnenko, 2018, p. 60), retained his status and consciousness of belonging to the nobility.

V. Lypynskiy considered recognition of the right to rule by the subordinate society as another important and decisive factor in a proper performance of their functions by the authorities. The ruling group “must have a legal basis in the understanding of the entire nation, must correspond to the concepts of legality and public morality that the entire nation lives by at this historical moment” in order to implement it (Lypynskiy, 1995, pp. 136–137). The scholar called it “a moral authority”. Using the terminology of modern political science, it can be noted that this feature corresponds to the “legitimacy” category. It is connected not only with the purely legal side of legality, i.e. a formal compliance with legal norms of the authorities themselves and their practical actions. The essence of legitimacy as a practical phenomenon and a theoretical category is the recognition by society of the existing political institutions as the most acceptable, regardless of the attitude towards specific representatives of the government. This is “the ability of the system to create and maintain the belief that these political institutions are optimal for society” (Lipset, 1960, p. 77). Bodies and officials of state power acquire this position if subordinates recognize the legality and expediency of their existence as such, as well as the directions of their activity in general.

Achieving legitimacy is quite a difficult problem for any government. At different historical stages of their functioning, power institutions in all countries solved tasks in

different ways. In addition, there is no single, unified approach to ways of ensuring it. Since legitimacy is built on society's reception of power as legitimate, it is appropriate to note different aspects of such recognition depending on what content is attached to the concept of legitimacy. "Socio-cultural is related to the established principles of social life, which are based on historical, national, cultural, religious, moral, legal, psychological, worldview determinants of society's existence. In the moral and ethical sense, legitimacy acts as the correspondence of political activity, its goals and means to people's moral ideas about the ideal order, leading social values. In the legal dimension, legitimacy is compliance with law, justice, the principles of which are recorded in the legal acts of the state, or compliance with public receptions of justice" (Vysotskyi, 2004, pp. 24–25). The political component consists in "recognition by society or its overwhelming majority of the power, rights and powers of a certain person, body, organization, their behaviour, policy and practical activities" (Levenets, 2011, p. 394). The society's reception of its power as legitimate occurs in the context of the mentioned approaches. At the same time, it should be taken into account that in different societies the grounds for perceiving the authorities as corresponding to their interests are significantly different.

V. Lypynskiy considered his concept of moral authority precisely from the point of view of such an approach, i.e. he characterized legitimacy precisely from the point of view of the above-mentioned multidimensional understanding. Authority, in his opinion, primarily consists in the observance by subjects of power of the morality existing norms and in subordinating their actions to "some one, accepted by all and binding on all – both strong and weak – law" (Lypynskiy, 1995, p. 186). Another manifestation of the essence of "moral authority" depends on "the degree of acceptance by the passive masses of those forms of public organization that, in accordance with their moral characteristics, are reproduced by the active national aristocracy" (Lypynskiy, 1995, pp. 130–131). Hence, V. Lypynskiy considered it not only as the legitimization of power in the eyes of subordinates, but also as the subordination of power itself to existing social and legal norms. By the way, it educates a subordinate society in an appropriate spirit. According to the authors, there is every reason to note the development of V. Lypynskiy regarding the "moral authority" of the government as a certain contribution to the theory of legitimacy.

The scholar compared the activities of the Ukrainian government during the periods after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi and in 1917 – 1920, and identified certain analogies in them. In particular, the loss of statehood, in his opinion, was directly caused by the delegitimization of power and the loss of authority among the people. Political ambitions and engagement of candidates for the mace" (Stepanchuk, Fedurko, 2021, p. 222) were combined with the desire to secure external support". Ultimately, this led to a prolonged political crisis.

Another principle of legitimacy, according to the scholar, was its historical validity. Under the conditions of the actual crisis of power in Ukraine during the years of 1917 – 1920, when no model of statehood could take hold, it is necessary to turn to its historical form of government. On this basis, V. Lypynskiy noted the following: "the restoration of the state should be carried out taking into account the traditions and history of the Cossack era", and "the Hetmanship is the only natural form of organization of state power in Ukraine" (Grycenko & Shcheglov, 2020, p. 122). At the same time, the power of the Hetman is necessarily lifelong, as a guarantee of the state stability. The scholar emphasized that only Hetman power will ensure "our Ukrainian legitimacy in those forms in which it is possible with our weak state national tradition and will enable us to revive this weak national state

tradition of ours, strengthen and ourselves, having disciplined and organized, the foundations for laying the structure of the Ukrainian State” (Lypynskiy, 1995, pp. 44–45). Only the Hetman’s power will be accepted by society as legitimate and expedient due to its conformity to traditions. That is why, V. Lypynskiy saw in the Hetmanate of Pavlo Skoropadskiy the most adequate form of state under the current conditions for him. Created, albeit for a short time, “the state machine of the Hetmanate tried to preserve balanced systems, traditions, and concepts” (Ihnatusha & Frolov, 2021, p. 107). The scholar considered its main feature to be the rejection of constant experiments with the principles of power organization and desire to stabilize it. And in this way, the real legitimacy of the government is ensured.

The Conclusion. Thus, the issue of political power was one of the central ones in Viacheslav Lypynskiy’s research. His concept of power was a certain result of the scholar’s historical research. He analysed the events of 1917 – 1920 in detail in order to identify the reasons for the failure of attempts to restore statehood. Mainly, he saw them in the fact that during this period it was not possible to establish stable forms of organization of state power, to form full-fledged authorities and ultimately to develop and implement clear state policy measures that would meet the needs and challenges of the time. V. Lypynskiy explained this situation by the fact that the stratum of large land and industrial owners, who could ensure stability and clear determination of state policy, were actually removed from the leadership of the National Liberation Movement and from any political activity in general. Instead, the left-wing radical slogans were thrown into society, which caused disorientation and discord in it. The scholar confirmed this position by analogy with the Liberation War of the 17th century led by Bohdan Khmelnytskyi. V. Lypynskiy argued that at that time the main prerequisite for success in the state-building process was full participation of the Ukrainian Orthodox nobility in it. It was its representatives, who ensured the direction of the spontaneous Cossack movement into organized political activity, which made it possible to create an effective state, quite progressive for that time.

The theoretical component of the mentioned concept contains sufficiently detailed characteristics of the functional essence, mechanisms, means and methods of exercising power. Considerable focus is on issues of power legitimacy, ways of its real implementation. Under the conditions of an actual crisis of power, it is very important to ensure a positive reception of the government by society. And this can be done only by implementing a clear, stable state policy in accordance with the interests and needs of society.

In general, Viacheslav Lypynskiy’s concept of power should be considered as a certain contribution to the development of the theory of political power, which was created already in the second half of the 20th century. The categorical apparatus and criteria of government efficiency developed by him can be used for further research.

Acknowledgement. We express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for publishing.

Funding. The authors did not receive any financial support for the research, authorship and / or publication of this article

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Grycenko, I. & Shcheglov, A. (2020). Statute of the Ukrainian National Cossack Movement (UNAKOR) (1935) as a historical source. *Skhidnoevropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 14, 117–129. Doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.14.197184 [in English]

Hai-Nyzhnyk, P. (2018). Stanovlennia teorii ukrainskoho natsional-konservatyizmu i hetmanskoho monarkhizmu u XX st.: Vilna Ukraina, UIK-SVU, UDKhP, UNH, USKhD, SHD (hetmanskyi rukh) [Formation of the theory of Ukrainian national conservatism and hetman monarchism in the

20th century: Free Ukraine, UIK-SVU, UDHP, UNG, USHD, SGD (hetman movement)]. *Red. P. Hai-Nyzhnyk, Ukraina XX st.: suspilno-politychni modeli natsionalnoi derzhavy (derzhavnytska ideolohiia ta prohramni zasady providnykh ukrainskykh politychnykh partii i hromadsko-politychnykh ob'iednan* (pp. 223–358). Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]

Ihnatusha, O. & Frolov, M. (2021). Reaction of Social and Political Forces of Zaporizhzhia to the Beginning of the Hetmanate Era (April – May of 1918). [Formation of the theory of Ukrainian national conservatism and hetman monarchism in the 20th century: Free Ukraine, UIK-SVU, UDHP, UNG, USHD, SGD (hetman movement)]. *Skhidnoevropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 21, 97–109. Doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.21.246899 [in English]

Isaiv, V. (1984). Politychna sotsiolohiia V'iacheslava Lypynskoho. [Political sociology of Vyacheslav Lypynsky]. *Suchasnist – Modernity*, 6, 81–95. [in Ukrainian]

Kornovenko, S. & Pasichna, Yu. (2021). Intellectual Bases of Ukrainian Agrarianism of the Revolutionary Epoch: Vyacheslav Lypynsky. *Skhidnoevropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 19, 107–121. Doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.19.234292 [in English]

Levenets, Yu. (Ed.). (2011). *Politychna entsyklopediia* [Political encyclopedia]. Kyiv: Parlamentske vydavnytstvo. [in Ukrainian]

Lipset, S. M. (1960). *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*. Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday. URL: <https://archive.org/details/politicalmansoci00inlips>. [in English]

Lypynskiy, V. (1995). *Lysty do brativ-khliborobiv* [Letters to the bread-making brothers]. Kyiv, Filadelfiia: Instytut skhidnoevropeyskykh doslidzhen NAN Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian]

Masnenko, V. (2018). Yuriy Nemyrych as an ideal representative of the szlachta layer in Vyacheslav Lypynsky's vision. *Skhidnoevropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 7, 54–64. Doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131216. [in English]

Perederii, I. H. (2012). *V'iacheslav Lypynskiy: etnichnyi poliak, politychnyi ukrainets: monohrafiia* [Vyacheslav Lypynskiy: ethnic Pole, political Ukrainian: monograph]. Poltava: Vydavnytstvo PoltNTU. [in Ukrainian]

Reshetchenko, D. (2018). Derzhavnyi tsentr Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliky v ekzylu: peredumovy reorhanizatsii (1945 – 1948 rr.) [The State Center of the Ukrainian People's Republic in Exile: Prerequisites for Reorganization (1945 – 1948)]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 3, 111–123. [in Ukrainian]

Rudko, V. (1985). Dontsov i Lypynskiy [Dontsov and Lypynsky]. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, IV (3–4), 477–494. [in Ukrainian]

Stepanchuk, Yu. & Fedurko, O. (2021). The Concept “Ruin”: Modern Historiographical Discourse. *Skhidnoevropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 20, 216–226. Doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.20.240044 [in English]

Verstiuk, V. (2019). Sobornist v ukrainskii suspilno-politychnii dumtsi ta realnii politytsi (do 100-richchia proholoshennia Akta zluky) [Congregationalism in Ukrainian socio-political thought and real politics (to the 100th anniversary of the proclamation of the Act of Unification)]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 1, 67–93. [in Ukrainian]

Vysotskyi, O. (2004). Sutnist lehitymatsii polityky. [The essence of political legitimation]. *Politychnyi menedzhment – Political Management*, 4, 24–34. [in Ukrainian]

Yakymovych, B. (2019). Prychyny porazky ZUNR: vtornhennia, bezdiialnist chy zrada? [The reasons for the defeat of ZUNR: invasion, inaction or betrayal?]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 1, 180–193. [in Ukrainian]

The article was received August 01, 2022.

Article recommended for publishing 22/02/2023.