

УДК 94 (477) "19"

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.32589/2412-9321.30.2025.332060>

I. B. DATSKIV

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Professor

of the Department of International Relations and Diplomacy of the Bohdan Hawrylyshyn
Educational and Research Institute of International Relations of the Western Ukrainian

National University (Ukraine, Ternopil)

e-mail: idatskiv@ukr.net

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8359-3937>

M. I. POLICH

Candidate of Historical Sciences, Senior Lecturer

of the Department of International Relations and Diplomacy of the Bohdan Hawrylyshyn
Educational and Research Institute of International Relations of the Western Ukrainian

National University (Ukraine, Ternopil)

e-mail: polych.maryana@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1285-2281>

**STATE-FORMING ACTIVITIES OF LONGIN TSEGELSKY
DURING THE YEARS OF NATIONAL LIBERATION
STRUGGLES (1918–1921)**

Abstract

The purpose of the article is to study the place and role of L. Tsegelskyi in the context of national liberation struggles of Ukrainians, analysis of the main directions of his socio-political activity and their interrelationships, as well as the formulation of broader conclusions regarding the political elite of that time and the ways it chose to implement the tasks of the national movement. The methodological basis of the research is based on the use of various general scientific and historical approaches. The basis of the work is the principles of objectivity and historicism. The biographical method, which involves the study of historical events through the prism of the lives and activities of individual figures, played an important role in the research. Scientific novelty consists in a new approach to posing a problem and its comprehensive disclosure, which includes a new understanding of facts and documents, their theoretical interpretation and the development of one's own explanatory model. The novelty of the research results lies in the inclusion of new archival materials, publications, documents, press sources, memoirs and scientific literature in scientific circulation. The results of the research show that Longyn Tsegelskyi was at the center of events that influenced the formation of the Ukrainian national idea during the liberation struggle. Relying on the serious research of Ukrainian historians, ethnographers and politicians, he substantiated the uniqueness and independence of the Ukrainian nation, refuting the claims of Russian and Polish chauvinists about the Ukrainian people as an unformed ethnic group, a part of other peoples. He greatly contributed to the development of national consciousness, which became a decisive factor for the nation's self-assertion.

Key words: Longyn Tsegelskyi, international activity, state secretariat, West Ukrainian People's Republic, Ukrainian statehood.

**ДЕРЖАВОТВОРЧА ДІЯЛЬНІСТЬ ЛОНГІНА
ЦЕГЕЛЬСЬКОГО У РОКИ НАЦІОНАЛЬНО-ВІЗВОЛЬНИХ
ЗМАГАНЬ (1918–1921 рр.)**

Анотація

Метою статті є вивчення місця і ролі Л. Цегельського в контексті національно-візвольних змагань українців, аналіз основних напрямків його громадсько-політичної діяльності та їх взаємозв'язків, а також формулювання більш широких висновків щодо політичної еліти того часу і шляхів, які вона обирала для реалізації завдань національного руху. Методологічна основа дослідження ґрунтується

на використанні різноманітних загальнонаукових і історичних підходів. Основою роботи є принципи об'єктивності й історизму. Біографічний метод, який передбачає дослідження історичних подій через призму життя та діяльності окремих діячів, відіграв важливу роль у дослідженні. **Наукова новизна** полягає в новому підході до постановки проблеми та її комплексному розкритті, що включає нове осмислення фактів і документів, їх теоретичну інтерпретацію та розробку власної пояснювальної моделі. Новизна результатів дослідження полягає в зачлененні нових архівних матеріалів, публікацій, документів, пресових джерел, мемуарів і наукової літератури до наукового обігу. **Результати дослідження** свідчать, що Лонгин Цегельський був в центрі подій, які вплинули на формування української національної ідеї в період визвольної боротьби. Спираючись на серйозні дослідження українських істориків, етнографів та політиків, він обґрунтував унікальність і самостійність української нації, спростувавши твердження російських і польських шовіністів про український народ як неоформлену етнічну групу, частину інших народів. Він значною мірою сприяв розвитку національної свідомості, яка стала вирішальним фактором для самоутвердження нації.

Ключові слова: Лонгин Цегельський, міжнародна діяльність, державний секретаріат, Західноукраїнська Народна Республіка, українська державність.

Introduction. The analysis of the history of the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people for national and state independence in the early twentieth century requires a new, more modern approach, and in some cases a revision of previously formed views. The activities of cultural and public figures, politicians, and scholars are an important component of this process, acting as a link between all research on this topic. In this regard, the significance of Longyn Mykhailovych Tsehelskyi (August 29, 1875 – December 13, 1950) as an outstanding figure of the Ukrainian revival requires a detailed and in-depth study. A comprehensive study of his socio-political activity will allow us to better understand the essence of the national liberation movement in Ukraine in the twentieth century and its individual directions.

The relevance of this article is enhanced by the insufficient development of the topic in the scientific literature and the lack of a thorough and comprehensive study that would focus on the socio-political, state-building and diplomatic activities of Longinus Tsegelski. In the current conditions of development of historical biography, where the importance of the individual in history is becoming increasingly prominent, the reproduction of L. Cegielski's biography in the context of the era and his state-building activities is of particular importance.

There are very few works devoted directly to L. Tsehelskyi and his activities in the development of international relations of the ZUNR. The historiography of the issue is poorly researched and small in scope, and there are practically no special scientific works devoted to this issue. The book of memoirs by L. Tsehelskyi himself is valuable (Tsehelskyi, 2003, p. 336). Quite interesting is the work of his son Yuriy-Mykhailo Tsehelski on the genealogy and essence of the Tsehelski family (Tsehelski, 1992, p. 787). The diplomatic activity of L. Tsehelski is reflected in some historical studies (Datskiv, Polich, 2015, p. 108–121), (Zdorovieha, 2009, p. 42–44) characterizes the state-building work during the Ukrainian Revolution – as a member of the Ukrainian National Council and the Ministries of Foreign Affairs in the governments of the ZUNR and the UNR.

The purpose of the study is to objectively investigate the state-building activities of L. Tsehelskyi during the national liberation struggle based on the analysis and processing of a set of sources, modern methodological approaches and achievements of historiography.

Research methods and methodology. Our research is based on the use of a number of general scientific and historical methods and approaches. The methods of analysis and synthesis were used to study the content and features of L. Tsegelskyi's political and social heritage. By applying the methods of induction and deduction, the priority of the idea of reviving Ukrainian statehood in the views of L. Tsehelskyi, which served as the basis for the comprehensive development of the Ukrainian nation, was proved. Also, in the process of writing the dissertation, the methods of document analysis, generalization, abstraction and concretization were applied.

Presentation of the main research material. Since throughout his life L. Tsehelskyi was actively involved in all stages of the formation of the Ukrainian state and was one of the

founders of the state-building principles, the ideological basis of the Ukrainian Revolution and its subsequent historical and sociological analysis, the study of his socio-political activity will be useful not only for historical science, but also for political science and sociology.

It should be noted that November 1, 1918, went down in history as a significant date for the population of the western Ukrainian lands. According to L. Tsegelski, it marked the beginning of desirable, and at the same time unexpected stage in the life of Eastern Galicia and the relatively small group of political figures who were directly preparing the seizure of power in Lviv and all the lands of this small region with a population of five million.

As L. Tsegelski emphasizes, during the decades of political struggle, strikes, riots, bloody elections, and demonstrations, he was firmly convinced of the successful proclamation and establishment of Ukrainian statehood: "The faith and trust of the educated masses in our organization and its leaders were great. I was well aware of the enthusiasm, patriotism, and readiness for initiation of our elders, who were sent to the field or scattered in barracks and outposts in cities. I was sure that on that night, the night of remembrance, the land would be ours" (Tsegelski, 2003, pp. 45–46).

The events of November 1, 1918, are often characterized in scientific literature and memoirs by the terms "the First of November upheaval" or the First of November coup. In relation to these events, L. Cegielski used the term "disruption" to describe the fighting of the Polish insurgents, and called November 1 the "first of November coup" or "act".

According to domestic historians, the terms "disruption" or "coup" are inappropriate for the events in question. Indeed, no coup took place in Lviv or other cities of Eastern Galicia, as Lviv historian Y. Dashkevych emphasizes: "Galicia was part of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy as a kingdom (that is why the residence of the Austrian emperor's governor was in Lviv). The monarchy lost the war with the Entente and in October 1918 was already in a stage of political collapse, and partly chaos" (Dashkevych, 2000, p. 357).

In Lviv on October 18–19, 1918, attended by members of the Austro-Hungarian parliament, the Galician and Bukovinian Sejm, several bishops, and three delegates from political parties. A written message of solidarity with the work and decisions of the Constitutional Assembly was received from Zakarpattia.

The author of the Declaration and Manifesto adopted by the Constitutional Assembly was Longin Tsegelski. According to him, the proclamation of Ukrainian statehood on October 19, 1918, was the first Ukrainian state legal act in Galicia, and November 1, 1918, was only the implementation of this act. During the days of preparation for the proclamation of Ukrainian statehood in eastern Galicia, L. Tsegelski's organizational skills and political maturity were most clearly expressed, as evidenced by the entries in his wife Olha's diary at the time (Tsegelski, 1992, pp. 371–374).

On the first day after the proclamation of the ZUNR, a new government, the State Secretariat, was formed in Eastern Galicia. K. Levytskyi was elected head (president) of the first government cabinet, L. Tsegelski was elected secretary of state for internal affairs, K. Levytskyi (temporarily) for financial affairs, V. Paneyko for foreign affairs, D. Vitovskyi for military affairs, S. Holubovych for justice, S. Baran for land affairs, Y. Lytvynovych for trade and industry, and Y. Baran, trade and industry – Y. Lytvynovych, railways – I. Myron, post and telegraph – O. Pisetskyi, education – S. Smal-Stotskyi, labor and public welfare – A. Chernetskyi, public health – I. Kurowets, religion – O. Barvinskyi, public works – I. Makukh. Most of the cabinet members were members of the National Democratic Party, others represented the Radical, Social Democratic, and Christian Socialist parties, and three were nonpartisan. On November 10, 1918, members of the new government took the oath of office (Makarchuk, 1997, p. 63).

The State Secretary of the Interior, who was appointed by L. Tsegelski, and the secretariat had broad powers. His duties, in addition to protecting public order, included the organization of the administrative apparatus in Lviv and on the ground. On the proposal of L. Cegielski, the UNR Rada approved R. Perfetsky, a lawyer and ambassador to the Sejm,

as assistant and deputy secretary of state. He was charged with ensuring the internal work of the Secretariat. L. Tsehelskyi himself was in charge of organizing local administrations. First of all, commissioners were elected or appointed to replace the former starostas in the counties, the formation of the people's militia and food departments began, and volunteers were enrolled in the Ukrainian army (Tyshchyk, 2004, p. 155–157).

At the same time, L. Tsehelskyi was working to improve the activities of the state apparatus. First, on November 15, 1918, at the suggestion of the Secretariat of the Interior, the law "On Supplementing the Ukrainian National Council with representatives of county and city organizations" was adopted (Makarchuk, 1997, p. 63). It established a quota according to which 70 ambassadors were to be selected. Secondly, on November 16, the UNR Rada approved one of the most important acts, the Law on the Provisional Administration of the Regions of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (Tyshchyk, 2004, p. 71), which, according to many researchers, was of constitutional importance. According to this law, Austrian legislation remained in force on the territory of the ZUNR. All administrative bodies on the territory of the ZUNR were subordinated to the State Secretariat. Other measures were also envisaged that concerned the work of the state apparatus, local self-government, courts, telegraph, post, railways, etc.

L. Tsegelski in his approaches to many aspects of state building is of great interest. The study of L. Tsegelski's activities confirms that he held moderate views in his work, was guided by law and professed tolerance in his attitude even towards his enemies. Of course, this was not always appreciated by radicalized figures. Judging by L. Tsehelskyi's memoirs, he repeatedly clashed with D. Vitovskyi, M. Lozynskyi, and some of his other colleagues over a number of issues (Tsehelskyi, 2003, pp. 42–43).

It should be emphasized that L. Tsehelskyi's activities at this time were not limited to participation in the organization of the proclamation and gaining power in the Western Ukrainian lands or work as State Secretary of the ZUNR with its wide range of functions and responsibilities. L. Tsehelskyi was destined to lay the foundations of Ukrainian diplomacy, to be a co-creator of the Act of Unification of Eastern and Western Ukraine, to work in the foreign ministries of the ZUNR and the UPR, and later to implement a number of international actions of the young state, to carry out the diplomatic mission of the ZUNR government in the United States (Makarchuk, 1997, p. 115).

This difficult trip, which once again convinced the orderly Galicians of how terrible and destructive the "anarchic element of the revolutionary working people" was, ended with a meeting with the leadership of the UPR Directorate, which had just begun an uprising against the Hetmanate.

And although L. Tsehelski was very suspicious and distrustful of the Directorate, which of only socialists whose goal was to overthrow the Hetman and create a socialist republic, he had to negotiate with this government. Most right-wing politicians in Galicia, including L. Tsehelsky, were not at all satisfied with the socialist orientation of some of the UPR leaders and even their willingness to accept the Soviet platform, though, as they said, not Moscow's, but Ukraine's. Galicians brought up in a legitimate spirit were frightened by anarchy, destructive revolutionary despotism (Tsehelskyi, 2003, p. 336).

After intense negotiations, representatives of the UPR Directorate, represented by V. Vynnychenko, O. Andriyevsky, and others, agreed to the proposal of the Galician delegation to begin preparations for the unification of the two Ukrainian states and to assist Galician troops near Lviv. At the same time, L. Cegielski insisted on Galician autonomy (Lozynskyi, 1917, p. 67).

L. Tsehelski's active participation in the proclamation of the Unification was of great importance for the entire Ukrainian cause. He was part of a representative delegation of 65 people who traveled with appropriate security by a special train from Ternopil to Kyiv. The delegation was headed by the first vice president of the UNRada, Y. Bachynskyi,

and among its members, in addition to L. Tsehelskyi, were such well-known political figures of the time as D. Vitovskyi, S. Vityk, R. Perfetskyi, V. Stefanyk, I. Myron, and O. Burachynskyi (Datskiv, 2009, p. 429).

On January 22, 1919, the Act of Unification was officially proclaimed in a solemn atmosphere on St. Sophia Square in Kyiv. During the ceremony, L. Tsehelskyi was the first to speak, “read out the text of the Decree of the UNR Rada of January 3 and handed it over to the head of the Directorate of the UPR V. Vynnychenko” (Central State Archives of Ukraine, f. 1065, op. 1, p. 178, p. 2).

Longin Tsegelski played one of the most important roles in the successful implementation of the Unification Act, initiated by leading politicians from Galicia and Eastern Ukraine, especially in the context of political action. This was the most significant aspect of his activities in state-building, including in the diplomatic sphere.

After the proclamation of the Unification of Ukrainian lands, L. Tsehelskyi simultaneously became Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ukrainian People’s Republic in Kyiv, or, as they said at the time, “comrade of the Minister of Foreign Affairs” (the Minister was Volodymyr Chekhivskyi). The appointment to this position was, in fact, symbolic, since the unification of the governments of the UPR and ZUNR never took place. In addition, Kyiv was soon seized by the Bolsheviks. According to L. Tsehelskyi himself, he formally held this position from January 23 to February 3, 1919, when the Directory was forced to leave Kyiv (Tsehelskyi, 2003, p. 251).

At this time, L. Tsegelski had another difficult mission: the evacuation of the Galician delegation from besieged Kyiv. In addition, as deputy minister, he was charged with the responsibility of closing the Ministry of Foreign Affairs itself. But the hardest part was the feeling of losing Ukrainian statehood. “The fall of the Directory” L. Tsehelskyi would later write in his memoirs, “was the beginning of the end of the Ukrainian state. All the heroic struggle afterward, all the efforts of the Sich Riflemen, Petliura, the Galician Army. Army of the Ukrainian People’s Republic, etc. from the spring of 1919 until the battles near Zamost during Budynoy and Tukhachevsky’s offensive on Lviv-Warsaw (1920) are only unsuccessful attempts to regain what was lost as a result of the historical failure of the so-called Ukrainian democracy since November 1918” (Tsehelskyi, 2003, p. 279).

L. Tsehelsky managed to get a delegation of Galicians with their guards out of Kyiv and to Galicia without loss, as well as those Ukrainian families who did not want to stay in the occupied capital. This was the last official order of the government to the UPR Directorate (Zdorovieha, 2010, pp. 140–141).

Due to his knowledge of foreign languages and experience in diplomacy, Longin Tsehelskyi led negotiations with all foreign representatives. One of the most important was the mission from the Peace Conference, headed by French General Jozef Barthelemy. However, these negotiations were unsuccessful, as the National Council refused to accept the terms of the armistice proposed by General Barthelemy. L. Tsegelski, who considered it necessary to accept conditions that could ensure sovereignty at least in part of the territory and lead to recognition by the Entente powers, strongly disagreed with the policy of the ZUNR government and resigned on February 13, 1919.

In July 1919, on behalf of the head of the government of the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic, Yevhen Petrushevych, L. Tsyhelsky left on a diplomatic mission to the United States of America. From 1920 to 1921 he represented the government of the ZUNR in Washington. In 1923, in connection with the decision of the Council of Ambassadors to annex Eastern Galicia to Poland, L. Cegielski’s diplomatic mission ended. However, he never returned to his homeland, Ukraine. There was no place for him in Galicia, which belonged to Poland, or in Soviet Ukraine. He obviously knew this. Tsegelski saw his life only in a sovereign Ukrainian state, so there was nowhere to return to. Thus, the prominent Ukrainian politician and diplomat remained in America (Zdorovieha, 2009, p. 44).

Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research. Thus, it should be noted that Longin Tsegelsky was at the center of events that became decisive for the formation of the Ukrainian national idea during the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people. Drawing on in-depth research by Ukrainian historians, ethnographers, and politicians, including M. Hrushevsky, he substantiated the uniqueness and independence of the Ukrainian nation, convincingly refuting the statements of Russian and Polish chauvinists about the Ukrainian people as an unformed ethnic mass, part of other nations. He made a significant contribution to the development of national consciousness, which became a key factor for the nation's self-affirmation. It was from this perspective that he defended Ukraine's national rights to its native language, culture, and education. Through his public speeches and printed materials, he prepared Galician society for the liberation struggle. He also predicted the political future of the Ukrainian state, in the construction of which he actively participated as one of the most important figures of the ZUNR, initiator and participant in the Unification of Western and Eastern Ukraine.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Use of Artificial Intelligence

No artificial intelligence tools or materials were used in the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Datskiv, I. & Polych, M. (2015). Lohnyn Tsehelskyi v istorii ukrainskoi dyplomatii (do 140-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia). *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 3, 108. [in Ukrainian]

Datskiv, I. B. (2009). *Ukrainska dyplomatiia (1917 – 1923 rr.) u konteksti svitovoi istorii: Monohrafia*. KROK. [in Ukrainian]

Dashkevych, Ya. (2000). Zakhidno-Ukrainska Narodna Respublika : poztyvnyi i nehatyvnyi dosvid. Ukraina: kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist, 6 [in Ukrainian]

Zdoroveha, M. (2009). Lohnyn Tsehelskyi bilia vytokiv ukrainskoi dyplomatii. *Vseukrainskyi naukovyi zhurnal "Mandrivets"*, 2, 42–44. [in Ukrainian]

Zdoroveha, M. V. (2010). *Suspilno-politychni pohliady Lohnyna Tsehelskoho*. Dys. ... kand. polit. nauk : 23.00.01. Lviv. nats. un-t im. I. Franka. [in Ukrainian]

Lozynskyi, M. (1970). *Halychyna v rr. 1918–1920*. Chervona Kalyna. [in Ukrainian]

Makarchuk, S. (1997). *Ukrainska Respublika Halychan: narysy pro ZUNR*. Svit. [in Ukrainian]

Tyshchyk, B. Y. (2004). *Zakhidnoukrainska Narodna Respublika (1918–1923)*. Istoryia derzhavy i prava. Triada plius. [in Ukrainian]

Tsehelskyi, L. (2003). *Vid lehend do pravdy. Spomyny pro podii v Ukraini zviazani z Pershym lystopadom 1918 r.* Svit. [in Ukrainian]

Tsehelskyi, Yu.-M. (1992). *Zaha rodu Tsehelskykh i rozpovid pro Kaminku Strumylovu*. Ellicott City : Smoloskyp. [in Ukrainian]

Tsentrальнi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchykh orhaniv vladys i upravlinnia. F. 1065, op. 1, spr. 178. [in Ukrainian]

