

the state maintained control over legal institutions to prevent excessive private influence.

The NEP led to a temporary economic recovery and legal modernization. The introduction of market-oriented laws contributed to increased production and trade. However, ideological tension between socialist principles and economic liberalization created an unstable legal environment.

Scholars continue to debate the effectiveness of the NEP's legal reforms. Some argue that the NEP provided a necessary economic boost, while others highlight its contradictions with socialist ideals. The temporary nature of these reforms raises questions about their long-term viability.

By the late 1920s, Soviet leadership, under Joseph Stalin, viewed the NEP as a threat to socialist economic planning. The policy was removed in favor of centralized control, leading to the collectivization of agriculture and the suppression of private enterprise. This change had deep legal consequences, as private property rights were cancelled, and state repressions strengthened.

The NEP was a hard, transformative period in the Ukrainian legal history. While it introduced elements of economic liberalization, it remained strictly supervised by socialist ideology. The eventual fall of the NEP marked a return to centralized governance, forming the trajectory of the Ukrainian law and state policy for decades to come.

References:

1. Суспільство і влада в радянській Україні років непу (1921-1928). Кол. монографія. Т. 1. Відп. ред. С. Кульчицький. — К.: Ін-т історії України НАНУ, 2015. — 656 с.
2. Лекції ІДПУ 2 <http://pli.nlu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Лекції-ІДПУ-2.docx>
3. Історія держави і права України : підручник / Ред. В. Г. Гончаренка. Харків, 2019.

THE CONCEPT AND STRUCTURE OF CRIMINAL LAW NORMS

OLEKSANDRA KURSOVA, student

ALLA I. RADU, Associate Professor, PhD in Philology, Language Adviser
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

Criminal law is a specific type of legal norm that regulates social relations related to the commission of crimes and responsibility for them. It performs the function of protecting society from criminal encroachments, determining which actions are criminal, as well as establishing punishment for their commission. Criminal law norms form the basis for the study of criminal law, that is why it is necessary to study this relevant phenomenon in detail.

In the field of criminal law, there is no unanimity in determining the content and essence of the definition of the notion “a criminal law norm”, which is directly related to the diversity of approaches to defining the primary concept of “a norm of law”.

For example, L.V. Dorosh defines a norm of criminal law as a generally binding rule of social behavior established by the state, it is expressed in criminal law and protected by a state body through monitoring its compliance and the application of punishment or other measures of a criminal law nature in the event of criminal offenses [1].

I. I. Mitrofanov offers the following definition: “a norm of criminal law is a generally binding rule regarding the non-commitment of a socially dangerous act, stipulated by the criminal law norm of the Special Part of the Criminal Code, and the commands organically related to it, the observance of which is ensured by the coercive potential of criminal law influence” [2]. A. A. Khomenko’s work expresses a somewhat different opinion, where the researcher notes that a criminal law norm is a special type of social rules of conduct of a general nature, which are established, recognized or sanctioned by a competent state body or in another manner prescribed by it, which have generally binding force, regulate social relations in the interests of citizens and society, they are expressed publicly in formally defined regulations, as a rule, in written form, and provide for the possibility of applying measures of state coercion, including liability to the state in case of violation of these norms in order to maintain and strictly enforce them [3].

The analysis of the definitions, mentioned above, indicates the presence of common features in the understanding of a criminal law norm, especially in regards to its mandatory nature, establishment by the state and focus on regulating social relations by prohibiting certain actions under the threat of punishment. At the same time, different authors focus on individual aspects of this concept, which indicates the multifaceted and complex phenomenon of a criminal law norm.

In the field of criminal law, where the main goal is to ensure the protection of public relations from criminal encroachments, the structure of a legal norm acquires its own specific features. For the effective functioning of criminal legislation, it is important to understand the internal structure of such norms, which ensures their logic, clarity and the possibility of proper application.

The three-element structure of a legal norm, consisting of a hypothesis, a disposition and a sanction, usually prevails in the works by the Ukrainian scholars. As for the area of criminal law, there is a certain dualism of opinions. In particular, the three-level structure of the norm is confirmed by the Constitutional Court of Ukraine in its Decision in the case on the constitutional submission of 46 people's deputies of Ukraine on the official interpretation of the provisions of Article 58 of the Constitution of Ukraine, Articles 6, 81 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine (hereinafter referred to as the Criminal Code of Ukraine) (case on the retroactive effect of the criminal law in time) dated April 19, 2000 No. 6-rp/2000. In particular, it states the following: “a criminal law norm consists of three elements: a hypothesis that determines the conditions under which a legal norm applies to a person’s prohibited behavior; a disposition that enshrines such a legal norm; a sanction that establishes a punishment for persons who have violated this legal norm”.

On the contrary, there is another opinion according to which a norm consists of two elements, namely: a hypothesis and a disposition. For example,

Yu.V. Baulin notes that the hypothesis determines a legal fact that is the basis for the emergence of criminal-legal relations, in particular the signs of a crime that entail criminal liability. The disposition establishes the powers of the court regarding the application of criminal liability, restriction of the rights and freedoms of a person who has committed a crime, as well as possible exemption from liability or mitigation of punishment [4].

As a rule, supporters of a two-member structure proceed from the division of the norm into two types: regulatory and protective. Thus, regulatory norms contain a hypothesis and a disposition, and protective norms, respectively, a hypothesis and a sanction. Within the framework of this approach, taking into account the impossibility of reducing a norm to a separate article (or part of an article) of the law, we can conclude that every norm of law that requires protection from violations by state coercive measures must have a sanction.

A. V. Savchenko shares the opinion about the dual structure of a criminal law norm and adds that the norms of the General Part of the Criminal Code of Ukraine, as a rule, consist of a hypothesis and a disposition, and, in their turn, the norms of the Special Part of the Criminal Code of Ukraine consist of a disposition and a sanction (except for the norms-definitions (*explanatory*) and the norms on the conditions of exemption from criminal liability for some crimes (*encouraging*) [5].

In this work, I would like to dwell on the two-member structure of the norm. It seems reasonable to agree with P. L. Fris, who suggests paying attention to the fact that in criminal legislation, hypotheses are mostly included in the dispositions of legal norms, being simultaneously their components. He believes that the general hypothesis for each legal norm of the Special Part of the Criminal Code of Ukraine is the norm of Art. 2 of the Criminal Code, which establishes the general basis for criminal liability: "the basis for criminal liability is the commission by a person of a socially dangerous act, which contains the elements of a criminal offense provided for by the Code" [6].

Summing up, it should be noted that the structure of a criminal law norm is an important element of criminal law effective functioning. Regardless of the approach, the structure of a criminal law norm ensures its logic, consistency and clarity in regulating legal relations, allowing to effectively determine the ways of applying these norms, establishing rules of conduct and determining the consequences of their violation.

References:

1. Dorosh L.V. The concept of criminal law norm//“Issues of combating crime” Collection of scientific papers, Kharkiv , 2010, P. 65.
2. Mitrofanov I. I., Criminal law norms under the draft Criminal Code of Ukraine. – Available from: <https://visnyk-psp.kpi.ua/article/view/248139/245412>.
3. Khomenko A. A. Criminal law norm as a basic element of criminal law – Available from: <http://catalog.liha-pres.eu/index.php/liha-pres/catalog/view/250/6890/15423-1>.
4. Baulin Y.V. Exemption from criminal liability. Bulletin of the Criminal Law Association of Ukraine, 2016, No. 2(7). P. 287 – 289
5. Savchenko A. V. Modern Criminal Law of Ukraine: Course of Lectures, Kyiv, 2011.

THE GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE OF THE UKRAINIAN STATE: HIGHER AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES, ADMINISTRATIVE BODIES, AND THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM

TETIANA KUSII, student

BOHDAN I. GUTIV, Associate Professor, PhD in Law, Scientific Adviser

ALLA I. RADU, Associate Professor, PhD in Philology, Language Adviser

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

The importance of studying this topic is in the fact that examining the state and legal system during the time of Skoropadskyi helps us understand the characteristics of forming the Ukrainian statehood in the context of inner crisis and external pressure. It was a difficult period for Ukraine, and, I believe, we should know the history of the formation of our state. Analyzing this period reveals how legal institutions developed and how national and international circumstances influenced the creation of legal norms and state structures.

The **relevance** of this topic is that the Hetmanate under Skoropadskyi is one of the most controversial and under-researched periods in the Ukrainian history, especially in the context of its legal and state systems. Understanding how the state institutions functioned under Skoropadskyi is essential to identifying weaknesses in the development of the Ukrainian legal system and analyzing why the attempts to establish independence were short-lived.

The problems in studying this topic include insufficient research on specific legal acts and their impact on state development, as well as the contradictory assessments of Skoropadskyi's actions as those of a political figure. Since the legal framework of the Hetmanate differs from the legislation of other European countries, this issue requires a deeper analysis.

Skoropadskyi's rule began in 1918 after the fall of the Ukrainian Central Rada. The form of governance changed, and along with it, the law and civil life. His activity can be seen as both successful and not successful. He introduced land reforms, developed culture and education. One of the main criticisms of Skoropadskyi was his policy of rapprochement with Germany.

The state was authoritarian, with the Hetman as the head of the Ukrainian people. The Constitution of 1918 was introduced, proclaiming basic rights and freedoms, although in practice they were limited.

During Skoropadskyi's rule, the territory of the Ukrainian state was divided into provinces, just as it had been under the Russian Empire. They included Kyiv, Podillia, Chernihiv, Poltava, Katerynoslav, and others.

The Council of Ministers existed as the main executive body, but its powers were limited by the Hetman's will. The State Senate was the highest legislative authority. It had the function of overseeing the implementation of laws and decrees but also operated within the powers defined by the Hetman.