

УДК 342.57

**R. Guban,**  
*Head of Department of Law, PhD, Associate Professor*  
*National Pedagogical Dragomanov University*

**A. Semendiai,**  
*Master Student of Faculty of Foreign Languages,*  
*National Pedagogical Dragomanov University*

## **ADMINISTRATIVE AND TERRITORIAL DIVISION OF UKRAINIAN LANDS AS A PART OF THE AUSTRO- HUNGARIAN EMPIRE**

*The article refers to the inclusion of Bukovyna into the the Austro-Hungarian Empire and especially its administrative and territorial structure in its composition. Attention is focused on the inclusion of the Ukrainian lands into the Austro-Hungarian Empire as the result of the dividing of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Administrative and territorial division of Transcarpathia is separately considered.*

**Keywords:** *Austria-Hungary, administrative and territorial division, Bukovyna, Transcarpathia, Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.*

In 1769 under the pretext of preventing the penetration of epidemic from the territory of Poland Austrian forces occupied the area of Spysh region at the order of Joseph II, the co-regent of Maria Theresia. Soon in 1770 Austria established a so-called cordon sanitaire on the northern slope of the Carpathians. Thus, the Viennese government annexed the territory of Spysh, Novotarschyna and Novosonchyzna. According to M. Kryshchanovych these events gave rise to the first division of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth [6, c. 51].

After the conclusion of the Treaty of Kucuk Kaynarca Austrian government started negotiations with P. Rumiantsev, the commander of Russian troops, who according to the treaty withdrew troops from Bukovyna in April 1774, allowing Austria to take control of these lands. As a hidden fee for withdrawal of Russian troops from Bukovyna he received from the Austrian government 6 thousands gold guilders and diamond-encrusted gold snuffbox [13, c. 46]. Austrian government explained officially to Russia the need for the annexation of Bukovyna by the choice of comfortable military and strategic position against the Turks. In its view, it was to serve the interests of Russia [5, c. 32]. 3 regiments of cavalry and 5 infantry battalions participated in the occupation of Bukovyna. From 16 to 19 of November 1774 border posts with imperial eagles were established within the borders [14, c. 36].

Having occupied Bukovyna, Austrian Ambassador F. von Tuhut said Turkey that the Austrian government was considering Bukovyna as a legitimate part of Polish territory (Galicia), gone to Austria and was determined to defend it at the demand to weapons defend [3, c. 5]. In March, 1775, Turkey agreed to give Austria the territory of Bukovyna, and in 7 of May, 1775 in Constantinople they signed the Convention on the transfer of Bukovyna; the document was sealed by signatures of Austrian Ambassador F. von Tuhut and grand vizir Izet Mehmet Pasha [14, c. 38]. In 2 of July, 1776 in the village Balamutivka it was signed the Convention on the borders, where the border between Moldova and Bukovyna was fixed [15, c. 12].

The attempts of Grigore Alexandru Ghica, the Prince of Moldavia to prevent the

transmission of Bukovyna by Turkey failed. He was killed by the reason of disobedience and threats towards Turkey in 1777. Austro-Turkish convention dated 7 of May, 1775 was ratified in 25 of February, 1777 after the final demarcation of the borders. Bukovyna swore allegiance to the Habsburgs [6, c. 60]. This event, in terms of I. Nastasiak, can be considered as the completion of the process of joining the edge as a part of Austria [13, c. 47].

In 1774–1786 military government that subordinated Nadvirniansk military council in Vienna was ruling Bukovyna. Originally this land was called generalate of Chernivtsi, then Galician border generalate and later as Bukovyna district. And only in May 1775 the new Austrian province obtained Bukovyna as the official name with the capital of Chernivtsi city [13, c. 75]. In 1783 Bukovyna was divided into Chernivtsi and Suchava counties, comprised of 133 settlements [15, c. 39].

However, in 1786 Bukovyna was annexed to Galicia and became the 19th district of the Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria [13, c. 84]. and after the death of Emperor Joseph II, his successor, Emperor Leopold II unlinked Bukovyna from Galicia in 1790 [7, c. 53]. From 1790 to 1817 Bukovyna was a separate province with its capital in Chernivtsi under the control of the Galician governorship. However, in 1817 it was returned to Galicia again. Since August 1, 1794 Bukovyna was divided into four districts: Chernivtsi, Vyzhnytsia, Seret, Suchava and separate Dovhopilia neighborhood [13, c. 56]. In 5 of August, 1772 a secret convention between Austria, Prussia and Russia on the division of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was signed in St. Petersburg. Thus, on Galician and Bukovyna lands, occupied by Austria, they created a new administrative unit of the empire, called a crown land “the Kingdom of Galicia and Volodomyria” [12, c. 55].

In the newly territory the Austro-Hungarian Empire decided to streamline administrative divisions. In 3 of May, 1773 royal registry issued an order for his advisor Kochan seconded to Galicia for administrative and territorial reform. This document contained manual norms that ought to be guided during the reform. During its realization it had to be taken into account previous administrative divisions, the size of a territory, natural boundaries (the presence of rivers and mountains) and also the direction of rivers and roads that need to take place by the middle of the county and ensure the interests of trade, agriculture and unhampered movement of forces [13, c. 49].

Thus, in late 1773 the Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria divided into 6 areas (tsyrkul) and 59 districts. First, Lviv area included districts with centers in Rava, Gorodok, Zhovkva, Bibrtsi, Zolochiv, Brody, Zboriv, Terebovlia, Berezhany. District centers of the second Galician compass were Zhydachiv, Galych, Monastyrsk, Budzaniv, Dolyna, Tysmenytsya, Tlumach, Snyatyn, Chortkiv, Nadvirna, Utoropy, Delyatyn, Kosiv. The residence of third Belz area was located in Zamostia. Here centers were Ulaniv, Hurai, Zamost, Liubachiv, Hrubeshiv, Liashiv, Uhniv, Vytiv. The fourth, Sambir area, included district cities as Dubechko, Jaroslaw, Sanok, Lisko, Peremyshl, Biskovitse, Drohobych, Stryi and 2 titles non-specified in the documents. The fifth, Velytske area, comprised cities as Biala, Myslenitse, Velychka, Bohnia, Zyvets, Jordaniv, Dembno, Novyi Targ, Novyi Sonch. The residence of the sixth Plsnetsk area was situated in Zheshiv. The centers of districts were Baraniv, Dombrova, Zheshiv, Kolbushova, Pshevorska, Plzen, Lantsut, Bech, Dukla and Krosno [13, c. 49].

I. Nastasiak considers that in a view of the substantial financial resources and a lack of trained officials in 11 of October, 1774 the governor of Galicia gave a detailed plan for the

new administrative and territorial division of the land, according to which the amount and location of districts remained unchanged, but the number of districts decreased. After a completion the project was approved by the Galician court office in 14 of March, 1775. This time Lviv area (tsyrkul) consisted of only three districts: Zhovkva, Berezhany and Brody. Galician area (tsyrkul) with center Stanislav had four districts with centers in Galicia, Zalischyky, Tysmenytsia, Kolomyia. Belz area (tsyrkul) with a residence in Zamostia had three districts: Romashiv, Zamost, Sokal. Sambir area (tsyrkul) contained three districts with centers in Peremysl, Lisko, Drohobych. Velytskyy area (tsyrkul) with the residence in Krakiv had districts with centers in Zator, Viznich, Novyi Sonch. Plsnen area (tsyrkul) comprised districts with centers in Lezhaisk, Tarnow and Krosno [13, c. 52].

However, in 22 of March, 1782, Empress Maria Theresa issued a patent under which the division into districts were liquidated. Instead the division it was introduced only areas (tsyrkuli), which are also called districts. It was allocated 18 districts that were directly subordinated to a province: Bohnia, Vadovitse, Galicia, Duklya, Zheshiv, Belz, Zolochiv, Kolomya, Lviv, Peremysl, Sambir, Novyi Sonch, Stanislav, Stryi, Sanok, Tarniv, Tomashiv, Chortkiv [13, c. 53].

The main criterion which was taken into account while forming the mentioned districts was the number of people in a particular area. However, as I. Nastasiak says, from geographical and communicational points of view the new division had some drawbacks. So in early 1783 the Austrian authorities began to examine the question of alignment or curvature of the districts. In 25 of November according to the Imperial Patent the center of Tomashiv district was moved into Ternopil, the center of Zolochiv district was moved into Berezhany, the center of Belz district was changed to Zhovkva, the center of Galician one changed into Dolyna. In 1791 the center of Duklia district was transferred into Jasla [13, c. 54].

In 13 of May, 1784 Emperor Joseph II issued a decree on the rise Galician cities, according to which there was a classification of them. The criteria for the division were municipal privileges and the right to hold fairs. The first class included only Lviv as the capital of the Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria and the residence of the provincial government, the second class had royal cities (those that had a special imperial privilege), municipal. According to the reform of 1811 settlements which had urban privilege received the status of city, and those who had the right to hold fairs obtain the status of town. However, as the A. Nastasiak mentioned, such kind of division had only customer registration value and did not generate any legal consequences [13, c. 134].

In 1809 Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria became part of the Duchy of Warsaw, which emerged with the support of Napoleon Bonaparte. However, this situation had not last long, and already in 1815 after a partial distinctions and displacement of district centers, which lasted several decades, Galicia was divided into the following divisions: Bohnia, Vadovitse, Galicia, Duklia, Zheshiv, Belz, Zolochiv, Kolomya, Lviv, Peremysl, Sambir, Novyi Sonch, Stanislav, Stryi, Sanok, Tarniv, Tomashiv, Chortkiv. This division has been lasted until the mid-nineteenth century. The area of the first seven districts was settled mostly Poles and officially called Western Galicia (with the center in Krakiv), in other districts Ukrainians mostly lived and it was called Eastern Galicia (with the center in Lviv) [13, c. 54].

In 1848 in Europe an active civil resistance movement that went down in history as the

“Springtime of Nations” began. All the population of Western Ukraine participated in this process. In 1848 Chief Rus Council nominated the emperor, parliament and government the demand for the division of Galicia according to ethnic lines into separate administrative and political units – western (Polish) and Eastern (Ukrainian) with the center in Lviv, making it the crown region and association with Ukrainian Transcarpathia [4, c. 131].

But the result of these claims was only the rename of an administrative and territorial unit. Since 1849 it has become as the “Kingdom of Galicia and Volodymyria of the Grand Duchy of Krakiv”. The territory was divided into districts ((tsyrkuli). Districts divided into counties (povity) [16, c. 229]. And if in the first time it was established 74 counties (povity), in the early XX century there were already 79 [11, c. 96].

However, the Austrian government reorganized also the administrative and territorial division of Hungary – it was established five military districts. One of the new administrative units became Uzhgorod district, which included comitates Ung, Bereg, Ugoch and Maramorosh. Ukrainian intellectuals perceived this step as the formation of “Rus district” – the prerequisites Ruthenian autonomy as a part of the Habsburg monarchy. However, in 28 of March, 1850 “Rus district” was eliminated. Ukrainians took it as a “Uzhhorod disaster”. The fact that up to that time training in schools was held in Ukrainian and in Uzhgorod there was a Ukrainian functioned gymnasium [1, c. 328].

Since 1850 Austria was divided into crown provinces headed by governors or boundary presidents, counties led by county elders, cities, led by the village mayors and villages led by [9, p. 33]. In 26 of March, 1861 Bukovyna gained boundary autonomy with the status of “the Duchy of Bukovyna”. This duchy was divided into counties, which at the end of the XIX century was 9: Chernivtsi, Hurahumor, Kypkolunh, Kitsman, Radivetsk, Seretsk, Storozhenets, Suchava, Vyzhnytsi [17, c. 23].

In 1867 the Austro-Hungarian Empire was formed and it was divided into 2 parts: Hungary with Transcarpathia, Transylvania and Croatia-Slovenia, which were combined under the name of Transleithania and Austria with Bukovyna, Galicia, Herts, Dolmatsia, Istria, Kraina, Moravia, Silesia, Triest and the Czech Republic (Cisleithania). Unfortunately, occupied by the Austro-Hungarian Empire Western Ukrainian land were not combined into one region. They were divided into separate administrative units with Polish, Romanian and Hungarian national lands.

Estimated by I. Iisna, the number of departments in Galicia during the second half of the nineteenth century has been ranged from 8 to 17. In the early XX century their number increased. And in 1908 Galician Viceroyalty was divided into 24 departments in 1910 25 and 37 in 1912 [9, c. 35]. As for the public authorities in rural areas, (due to P. Gural), “it has passed to landlords (dominii), thus strengthening the feudal system” [2, c. 331].

According to historians, the settlement of the Hungarians in Transcarpathia, whose territory inhabited by the Slavs has begun from the end of the IX century because of the transition of Ugri tribes through the Carpathians. The division of the province into administrative districts (zhupy or comitates) was made during the XIII and early XIV century. and, by the mention of R. Martsenyk, remained the same until the final collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire [10, c. 46].

In the mid-nineteenth century due to the defeat of the Hungarian revolution in 1849 an attempt to expand the rights of Rusyn counties of Hungary was made on the initiative of Dobriansky, A. Duhovnych and other activists. As part of the Koshytsk district (county, district) “Rus District” was allocated and included Maramoros, Ugochan, Bereg and Uzhansk

comitatus centered in Uzhgorod. However, at that time Transcarpathia was not presented as a single administrative and territorial entity. The Hungarian authorities have strongly sabotaged all activities in the district administration, and already made its liquidation in 20 of March, 1850. After 1867 Transcarpathia in Hungary was not a separate administrative unit. From 71 zhupy that comprised the territory of Hungary, Transcarpathia belonged to fourth: Uzhansk (center – Uzhgorod), Bereg (center – Coast) Ugochan (center – Sevlush, now called as Vinogradov), Maramorosh (center – Maramorosh – Syhit) [10, c. 46-48].

Uzhansk zhupa (area was 3230 square kilometers, population contained 162,089 people.) included: Velyky Berezhniaky, Perechyn, Uzhgorod, Serednie, Velyky Kapushan (now Slovakia) and Sobranetsk (Slovakia) districts. Bereg (area was 3786 square kilometers, population included 236,611 people.) had Nyzhniorechansk, Svaliava, Latorych, Mukachevo, Felvidek, Tysohat and Mezevkason districts. Ugochan (area was 3230 square kilometers, population comprised 162,089 people) – Velykosevlush, Korolivsky and Halman (Slovakia) areas. Maramorosh (area was 9716 square kilometers, population included 357,705 people.) had Dovzhan, Voliv, Khust, Tyachiv, Teresvian, Tysa, Syhet, Vishov, Izaveld and Shuha (now Romania) areas. It should be noted that in the early twentieth century. the proportion of ethnic Ukrainians in Transcarpathia increased. So, in 1900 Ukrainian accounted for 75.9% of the population, and 77.5% in 1914 [10, c. 48].

However, Ukrainian were also settled Spis, Sharisk and Zemplin comitatus (today these lands are of Ukrainian ethnic territories within Slovakia, the so-called Presov region) [10, c. 49]. According to Census 1910 Ruthenians in Spis counties accounted for 7.1% Sharisk – 22% Zemplin – 11.4% [8, c. 17].

Thus, we can say that on the Ukrainian lands that were part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire targeted designed for long periods policy in the sphere of territorial-administrative structure was not conducted. From 71 zhupy that comprised the territory of Hungary, Transcarpathia belonged to fourth: Uzhansk (center – Uzhgorod), Bereg (center – Coast) Ugochan (center – Sevlush – now Vinogradov), Maramorosh (center – Maramorosh – Syhit) [10, c. 46-48]. Uzhansk zhupa (area was 3230 square kilometers, population contained 162,089 people.) included: Velyky Berezhniaky, Perechyn, Uzhgorod, Serednie, Velyky Kapushan (now Slovakia) and Sobranetsk (Slovakia) districts. Bereg (area was 3786 square kilometers, population included 236,611 people.) had Nyzhniorechansk, Svaliava, Latorych, Mukachevo, Felvidek, Tysohat and Mezevkason districts. Ugochan (area was 3230 square kilometers, population comprised 162,089 people.) – Velykosevlush, Koroliv and Halman (Slovakia) areas. Maramorosh (area was 9716 square kilometers, population included 357,705 people.) had Dovzhan, Voliv, Khust, Tyachiv, Teresvian, Tysa, Syhet, Vishov, Izaveld and Shuha (now Romania) areas. It should be noted that in the early twentieth century. the proportion of ethnic Ukrainians in Transcarpathia increased. So, in 1900 Ukrainian accounted for 75.9% of the population, and 77.5% in 1914 [10, c. 48]. However, Ukrainian were also settled Spis, Sharisk and Zemplin comitatus (today these lands are of Ukrainian ethnic territories within Slovakia, the so-called Presov region) [10, c. 49]. According to Census 1910 Ruthenians in Spis counties accounted for 7.1% Sharisk – 22% Zemplin – 11.4% [8, c. 17].

Thus, we can say that on the Ukrainian lands that were part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire targeted designed for long periods policy in the sphere of territorial-administrative structure was not conducted.

**References:**

1. *Аркуша О. Г.* Українські землі в складі Австрійської (Австро-Угорської) імперії // Політична система для України: історичний досвід і виклики сучасності / О. Г. Аркуша, С. О. Біла, В. Ф. Верстюк та ін. ; гол. ред. В. М. Литвин. – К. : Ніка – Центр, 2008. – 988 с.
2. *Гураль П. Ф.* Територіальна громада в Україні: історико-правове дослідження / П. Ф. Гураль. – Львів : ЛЬВДУВС, “Край”, 2008. – 468 с.
3. *Жуковський А.* Історія Буковини / А. Жуковський. – Чернівці. – 1994. – Ч. 2. – 223 с.
4. *Кондратюк О.* Правовий статус Галичини у складі Австро-Угорщини (1867–1918 рр.) / О. Кондратюк // Вісник Львівського університету. Серія юридична. – 2004. – Випуск 40. – С. 130-135.
5. *Кордуба М.* Ілюстрована історія Буковини / М. Кордуба. – Чернівці, 1906. – 89 с.
6. *Криштанович М. Ф.* Державне управління правоохоронними органами в Галичині і Буковині (кінець XVIII – початок XX ст.): дис. ... канд. наук з держ. упр. : 25.00.01 / Криштанович Мирослав Франкович ; Львів. регіон. ін-т держ. упр. Нац. акад. держ. упр. при Президентові України. – Л., 2010. – 212 с.
7. *Круль В. П.* Краєзнавче дослідження географічних процесів заселення Галичини: дис. ... канд. географ. наук : 11.00.02 / Круль Володимир Петрович ; Чернівецький держ. ун-т ім. Ю. Федьковича. – Чернівці, 1996. – 258 с.
8. *Лемак В. В.* Закарпаття у державно-правовій системі Чехословацької республіки (1919–1939 рр.): автореф. дис. ... канд. юрид. наук : 12.00.01 / Лемак Василь Васильович ; Київський ун-т ім. Тараса Шевченка. – К., 1996. – 159 с.
9. *Лісна І. С.* Становлення національної державності в Галичині (1918–1923 рр.): дис. ... канд. юрид. наук : 12.00.01 / Лісна Іванна Стефанівна ; Львівський держ. ун-т ім. Івана Франка. – Л., 1998. – 178 с.
10. *Марценюк Р. О.* Національно-державне відродження українства на Закарпатті (1918–1939 рр.): дис. ... канд. іст. наук : 09.00.12 / Марценюк Руслана Орестівна ; Київський національний ун-т ім. Тараса Шевченка. – К., 2004. – 211 с.
11. *Моряк-Протопопова Х.* Правовий статус та повноваження Галицького намісництва (1849–1918 рр.) / Х. Моряк-Протопопова // Вісник Львівського університету. Серія юридична. – 2011. – Випуск 52. – С. 96-104.
12. *Нариси історії державної служби в Україні* / О. Г. Аркуша, Є. І. Бородін, С. В. Віднянський та ін. ; упр. Держ. Служби України, Ін-т історії НАН України. – К. : Ніка-Центр, 2008. – 536 с.
13. *Настасяк І. Ю.* Організація управління Галичиною і Буковиною в складі Австрії (1772–1848 рр.) : дис. ... канд. юрид. наук : 12.00.01 / Настасяк Ірина Юріївна ; Львівський національний ун-т ім. Івана Франка. – Л., 2005. – 200 с.
14. *Никифорак М. В.* Державний лад і право на Буковині в 1774–1918 рр. : дис. д-ра юрид. наук : 12.00.01 / Никифорак Михайло Васильович ; Чернівецький національний ун-т ім. Юрія Федьковича. – Чернівці, 2004. – 420 с.
15. *Сайко М. М.* Приєднання Буковини до Австрії і його вплив на соціально-економічний та політичний устрій краю (70–80-ті рр. XVIII–XIX століття) : автореф. дис. ... канд. іст. наук / М. М. Сайко. – Чернівці 1994. – 21 с.
16. *Тернопільська область. Адміністративно-територіальний устрій (станом на 1 червня 1997 року).* – Тернопіль : Ромс. – К. 1997. – 238 с.
17. *Шибя О. М.* Крайове самоврядування на Буковині (1861–1914 роки) : дис. ... канд. юрид. наук : 12.00.01 / Шибя Олександр Михайлович ; Київський ун-т ім. Тараса Шевченка. – К., 1995. – 180 с.

**Губань Р., Семендяй А.** *Адміністративно-територіальний устрій українських земель у складі Австро-Угорської імперії.*

В статті йдеться про входження Буковини до складу Австро-Угорської імперії та особливості її адміністративно-територіального устрою у її складі. Акцентовується увага на входженні українських земель до складу Австро-Угорської імперії в результаті поділів Речі Посполитої. Окремо розглядається адміністративно-територіальний устрій Закарпаття.

**Ключові слова:** Австро-Угорщина, адміністративно-територіальний устрій, Буковина, Закарпаття, Річ Посполита.

**Губань Р., Семендяй А. Административно-территориальное устройство украинских земель в составе Австро-Венгерской империи.**

*В статье говорится о вхождении Буковины в состав Австро-Венгерской империи и особенности ее административно-территориального устройства в ее составе. Акцентируется внимание на вхождении украинских земель в состав Австро-Венгерской империи в результате разделов Речи Посполитой. Отдельно рассматривается административно-территориальное устройство Закарпатья.*

**Ключевые слова:** Австро-Венгрия, административно-территориальное устройство, Буковина, Закарпатье, Речь Посполитая.

УДК 342.36:329.12

**Огірко Р. С.**  
кандидат юридичних наук, доцент,  
завідувач кафедри теорії та історії держави і права  
Національного педагогічного університету  
імені М. П. Драгоманова

## ІДЕЯ “ЛІБЕРАЛЬНОЇ ІМПЕРІЇ” І КРИЗА ЛІБЕРАЛЬНОЇ ДЕРЖАВИ: БЕЗПЕКОВИЙ КОНТЕКСТ

*Розглянуто витoki, зміст та потенційну можливість ідеї “ліберальної імперії” поєднати реалізацію природних прав людини і нації з імперським домінуванням як гарантією безпеки Євроатлантичної цивілізації і міжнародного правопорядку та попередження поглиблення кризи ліберальної державності.*

**Ключові слова:** ліберальна імперія, імперія, ЄС, природні права людини і нації, ліберальна державність, міжнародний правопорядок і безпека.

Метою статті є дослідження проблеми попередження руйнування міжнародного правопорядку і безпеки в умовах глобалізації і кризи сучасної ліберальної держави. На нашу думку, головною загрозою міжнародній безпеці від міжнародного тероризму, який концентрується навколо новоявленого імперського утворення ІДІЛ (“Всесвітній халіфат”), а також останньої найбільшої “старої імперії” – Російської федерації, які своєю метою мають знищення Євроатлантичної цивілізації. У зв’язку з цим у європейському науковому і політичному дискурсі (Р. Купер, Н. Фергюсон та ін.) обговорюється як спосіб гарантування міжнародної безпеки ідея “ліберальної імперії”. Остання аж ніяк не є очевидним оксюмороном, оскільки це поняття задає очевидний креативний імпульс, поєднуючи в собі дві протилежності – ліберально-демократичний державний устрій та імперський принцип; має історичний прецедент (Британська імперія, яка переросла в Співдружність), а також тому що автори як нинішню модель для своєї ідеї, пропонують ЄС (а не, наприклад, США). Але при цьому не враховується, що чинна політико-правова природа ЄС не відповідає меті, принципам і державно-правовому механізму ідеї “ліберальної імперії”. Це є наслідок кризового характеру сучасної Європейської державності ліберально-демократичної орієнтації, яка, вистоявши і перемігши у Другій світовій війні тоталітарну фашистську