



Published in Nairobi, Kenya
by Royallite Global.

Volume 4, Issue 3, 2023

Article Information

Submitted: 3rd April 2023

Accepted: 28th July 2023

Published: 1st August 2023

Additional information is
available at the end of the
article

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

To read the paper online,
please scan this QR code



How to Cite:

Filippova, V., Huba, M., Pronina, O., Lohachov, D., & Mykolaiets, A. (2023). Historical insights into the evolution of local self-government and state administration. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.58256/rjah.v4i3.1250>

Historical insights into the evolution of local self-government and state administration

Viktoriia Filippova¹, Maryna Huba^{2*}, Oksana Pronina³, Dmytro Lohachov⁴, Anatolii Mykolaiets⁵

^{1,2,3,4}Kherson National Technical University, Ukraine

⁵Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Ukraine

*Corresponding author: gubamarina16@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6624-9074>

Abstract

This article aims to provide historical insights into the evolution of local self-government and state administration. The purpose of this study is to explore the development and transformations of these governance systems over time. The research methodology employed involves an extensive review of historical literature, archival records, and case studies to analyze the evolution of local self-government and state administration. The findings of this study reveal the gradual emergence and evolution of local self-government structures, highlighting the complex interplay between local communities and central authorities. The historical analysis demonstrates how these governance systems have adapted to social, political, and economic changes throughout history. The practical implications of this research lie in a deeper understanding of the historical context and dynamics that have shaped contemporary local self-government and state administration. This knowledge can inform policymakers and government officials in designing effective and responsive governance structures that align with the needs and aspirations of local communities. By shedding light on the historical development of local self-government and state administration, this article contributes to a broader understanding of the governance systems that underpin contemporary societies. It underscores the importance of historical insights in shaping future governance models and policies for a more inclusive and participatory approach to governance.

Keywords: historical evolution, local self-government, interplay, local communities, state administration



Introduction

Local self-government and state administration are crucial components of governance systems, playing pivotal roles in shaping the socio-political landscape of nations. Understanding the historical evolution of these systems provides valuable insights into how they have adapted and transformed over time. The concept of local self-government dates back centuries, with its origins rooted in the development of early civilizations. As human societies progressed, the need for organized governance at the local level became apparent (Van Dijck et al., 2018). At the same time, state administrations emerged to centralize power and establish authority over larger territories.

The *purpose* of the article is to explore the historical evolution of local self-government and state administration. Through a comprehensive examination of the changes and developments that have taken place, we can gain a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the complex interplay between local communities and central authorities. By analyzing these interactions, we can better comprehend how governance systems have been shaped throughout history. Via a comprehensive review of historical literature, archival records, and case studies, we will research the factors that influenced the evolution of local self-government and state administration. This examination will determine the social, political, and economic changes that have driven the transformation and adaptation of these systems. Based on the historical analysis, it is *hypothesized* that such changes influence the evolution of local self-government and state administration. Additionally, it is expected that the interplay between local communities and central authorities plays a crucial role in shaping the development and transformation of these governance systems over time.

Tasks of the Study:

1. Conduct a comprehensive literature review on the historical evolution of local self-government and state administration.
2. Analyze historical data and case studies to understand the factors and events that have shaped the development of these governance systems.
3. Investigate the interplay between local communities and central authorities to examine its influence on the evolution of local self-government and state administration.

By studying the historical trajectory of local self-government and state administration, we can gain a broader perspective on their current structures and functions. This understanding will have practical implications for policymakers, researchers, and individuals involved in the governance process, as it enables them to make informed decisions that align with the evolving needs and dynamics of society.

Literature Review

The evolution of local self-government and state administration has played a pivotal role in shaping societies throughout history. These institutions have undergone significant transformations (Semenets-Orlova et al., 2020), influenced by political, social, and economic factors. In this review, we will delve into a range of works that provide historical insights into the evolution of local self-government and state administration. By examining various perspectives, time periods, and regions, we aim to offer a holistic understanding of how these institutions have developed over time.

Throughout history, the progress of local self-government and state administration has had a

major influence on the advancement of societies. The theory and mechanism of local self-government focus on empowering local communities to make decisions and manage their own affairs, while state administration involves the centralization of power and the exercise of authority over larger territories. The theory of local self-government is anchored in principles such as subsidiarity and decentralization (Jachtenfuchs, & Krisch, 2016). It emphasizes the importance of allowing local communities to govern themselves and make decisions that directly impact their daily lives. Scholars like Alexis de Tocqueville, in his work “Democracy in America,” have highlighted the significance of citizen participation, community engagement, and grassroots democracy (De Tocqueville, 1956). He argues that local self-government enables better representation of diverse interests, fosters civic engagement, and strengthens democracy at the local level (De Tocqueville, 1956).

Regarding the mechanism of state administration, it encompasses the exercise of authority and the implementation of policies and laws by central government bodies. It focuses on maintaining law and order, providing public services, and ensuring efficient governance across larger territories. Scholars like Max Weber, in his work “Politics as a Vocation,” have explored the bureaucratic mechanisms and hierarchical structures within state administrations (Webber, 1921). The work emphasizes the importance of a professionalized civil service, efficient decision-making processes, and accountability measures to ensure effective state administration (Gerth, & Wright Mills, 1964).

The interaction between local self-government and state administration is a complex and dynamic process. It involves the interplay of power, decision-making, and resource allocation between local communities and central authorities. Various scholars have examined this interaction, shedding light on the tensions and synergies that arise.

Ostrom (1990), in her influential book “Governing the Commons,” pioneered the concept of “polycentric governance” and emphasized the importance of collaboration, trust-building, and shared decision-making between local communities and state administrations. She argued that effective governance requires a mix of self-organization at the local level and coordination with central authorities (Ostrom, 1990). Similarly, Robert Putnam’s work on social capital and civic engagement, as seen in “Bowling Alone” (Putman, 2000) and “Making Democracy Work” (Putman et al., 1992) has highlighted the role of strong social networks and civic associations in enabling effective interaction between local communities and state administrations. Putnam (2000) argues that a dense network of social connections facilitates cooperation, enhances communication, and strengthens the overall governance system.

The Origins of Local Self-Government

To comprehend the trajectory of local self-government, it is vital to explore its origins. E. A. Freeman’s influential work, “The History of the Norman Conquest of England,” delves into the influence of medieval feudalism and the role of local governance in England during the 11th century (Freeman, 1870; 1873). Freeman’s analysis highlights the importance of local institutions in maintaining order and administering justice.

Furthermore, F. W. Maitland’s “Domesday Book and Beyond” provides valuable insights into the development of local institutions in pre-Norman England, emphasizing the continuity and evolution of self-governing bodies from earlier periods (Maitland, 1987). These works shed light on the foundations of local self-government and its enduring presence in societal structures.

Ancient and Classical Perspectives

Ancient and classical civilizations also offer valuable insights into the evolution of local self-government and state administration. Aristotle's "Politics" provides a foundational understanding of governance, including the role of local communities in the Greek city-state (Barker, & Stalley, 1995). His work emphasizes the importance of civic engagement and the benefits of local self-government in fostering stability and collective decision-making (Annas, 1996).

Moreover, the works of Polybius, Livy, and Tacitus provide glimpses into the practices and structures of local self-government in the Roman Republic and Empire (Dench, 2018; Reid, 2014; Benner, 2013). These historians illuminate the intricate relationship between central authority and local autonomy, showcasing the inherent complexities of governing diverse regions within a broader administrative framework.

Medieval and Renaissance Europe

The medieval period witnessed the emergence of various forms of local self-government across Europe. Joseph R. Strayer's book, "On the Medieval Origins of the Modern State" (Strayer, 2005), delves into the transition from feudalism to centralized state power and the influence of local institutions on state administration. Strayer (2005) highlights the interplay between central authority and local assemblies, demonstrating how local governance shaped the development of more encompassing state structures.

Additionally, William Ullmann's "Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages" (Ullmann, 2010) explores the role of local assemblies, such as town councils, in different European regions. Ullmann (2010) contributes to our understanding of the functions and significance of these bodies in shaping governance, law enforcement, and public administration during the medieval and Renaissance periods.

Enlightenment and Modern Period

The Enlightenment era brought forth new ideas surrounding democracy and local self-government. Alexis de Tocqueville's renowned work, "Democracy in America" (De Tocqueville & Reeve, 1889) provides a comprehensive analysis of the influence of local institutions on American democracy during the early 19th century. De Tocqueville & Reeve (1889) emphasize the crucial role of local self-governance in fostering civic participation, promoting decentralized decision-making, and safeguarding individual liberties.

Similarly, the works of John Stuart Mill, such as "On Liberty" (Mill, 1974) discuss the role of local self-government in protecting individual freedoms and preventing the excessive concentration of power. Mill (1974) explores the importance of grassroots participation and the potential of local governance to mitigate the dangers of overbearing state control.

Comparative and Global Perspectives

To gain a comprehensive understanding, it is imperative to explore the evolution of local self-government and state administration outside of Europe. For instance, Perez-Garcia's research on Ming and Qing China (Perez-Garcia, 2021) sheds light on the development of local institutions and administrative structures in East Asia. Perez-Garcia (2021) highlights the unique characteristics of Chinese local governance and its influence on state administration throughout different dynasties.

Additionally, the research of Beard et al. (2008) offers insights into local governance in South Asia, with a particular focus on the Panchayati Raj system in India. Analyzing the historical evolution and challenges faced by such systems provides crucial insights into their effectiveness, local empowerment, and implications for state administration (Beard et al., 2008).

Thus, by examining the origins, ancient and classical perspectives, medieval and Renaissance Europe, Enlightenment and modern periods, as well as comparative and global perspectives, we have gained a nuanced understanding of these institutions' development. The review demonstrates the profound impact of factors such as feudalism, civic engagement, centralization of power, and democratic ideals on the evolution of local self-government and state administration. By studying historical insights and lessons, scholars can gain valuable insights to shape effective local governance systems in the present and future. Understanding the historical context not only helps us appreciate the significance of these institutions but also fosters an informed approach to contemporary governance challenges (Semenets-Orlova et al., 2019).

Methods

In the article, several case studies were conducted to examine the evolution of local self-government and state administration in different countries. The following case studies were conducted under the historical context of Ukraine, Ireland, Switzerland, Japan, and Kenya (see Table 1).

Table 1. Case Studies Providing Diverse Perspectives and Insights into the Historical Evolution of Local Self-Government and State Administration in Different Socio-Cultural and Political Contexts

Country	Period of Exploration
<i>Ukraine</i>	The case study in Ukraine focused on the historical development of local self-government and state administration during different periods, such as the Soviet era and the post-Soviet era (Pavlovysh, 2020). It analyzed the impact of political changes, decentralization reforms, and the role of local communities in shaping the governance systems.
<i>Ireland</i>	The case study in Ireland explored the historical evolution of local self-government and state administration, starting from its early origins to the present day (Ogbazghi, 2020). It examined the influence of historical events, such as the Irish War of Independence and the establishment of the Local Government Act, on the development of local governance structures.
<i>Switzerland</i>	The case study in Switzerland examined the unique system of local self-government and state administration in the country (Debela, 2020). It analyzed the historical roots of the Swiss federalism model and the interaction between the cantonal and local levels of governance.
<i>Japan</i>	The case study in Japan delved into the historical evolution of local self-government and state administration, focusing on the Meiji era and subsequent reforms (Nishikawa, 2008). It examined the role of the Emperor's Rescript and the modernization efforts in shaping the governance structures at the local level.
<i>Kenya</i>	The case study in Kenya explored the historical trajectory of local self-government and state administration in the country, examining the impact of colonial rule, independence movements, and post-independence reforms (Stamp, 1986). It analyzed the challenges and achievements in decentralization and citizen participation in the governance process.

These case studies illuminated the challenges, successes, and transformations of governance systems at

the local and state levels. Primary and secondary historical texts, including books, articles, and papers, were reviewed to gather information on significant events, key figures, and contextual background related to the evolution of local self-government and state administration.

Archival records and government documents were consulted to explore primary sources such as legal statutes, administrative regulations, and policy documents. These records provided information on the establishment and development of local self-government and state administration over time. In addition, scholarly analyses and interpretations of historical events and processes were examined to understand the broader historical context and factors that influenced the evolution of governance systems. Such analyses provided critical perspectives on the interplay between social, political, and economic forces and their impact on local self-government and state administration.

Results and Discussion

The evolution of local self-government and state administration in researched countries have been shaped by various important dates and events. Here are the indicated key milestones:

Ukraine

1. Medieval Kyivan Rus: A historical state in Eastern Europe from the 9th to the 13th centuries, operated under a complex system that reflected the political, social, and cultural dynamics of the time. In Kyivan Rus, local self-government functioned as a collective body that made decisions regarding local affairs, including land distribution, taxation, and dispute resolution. The village elders, known as “*starostas*,” played a prominent role in guiding and representing the interests of the community, while the larger cities had their own governance structures. At the same time, state administration in Kyivan Rus was centered around the Grand Prince of Kyiv, who held the highest authority in the realm. The Grand Prince appointed regional governors, known as “*posadniks*,” to oversee administrative tasks in various cities and territories. The *posadniks* were responsible for collecting taxes, maintaining order, and implementing the laws and decrees of the Grand Prince. The interplay between local self-government and state administration in Kyivan Rus was characterized by a delicate balance of power. While the local self-government enjoyed a certain level of autonomy in their local affairs, they were still subject to the overall governance and authority of the Grand Prince. The *posadniks* acted as intermediaries between the central authority and the local communities, ensuring compliance with the Grand Prince’s policies and maintaining order. It is important to note that the nature of local self-government and state administration in medieval Kyivan Rus was influenced not only by political structures but also by cultural and religious factors. The Orthodox Christianity practiced in Kyivan Rus played a significant role as the church had a strong influence on the governance at both the local and state levels.

Thus, the roots of local self-government in Ukraine can be traced back to the medieval period when various territories within present-day Ukraine had their own governing bodies. Towns and cities established their own systems of governance, known as municipal republics or self-governing communities, with elected officials responsible for local administration (Kubicek, 2023).

2. The Cossack Hetmanate (1649-1764): The establishment of the Cossack Hetmanate in Ukraine during this period brought about a unique form of self-government (von Werdt, 2011). The Hetmanate was an autonomous territory within the Russian Empire, and it had a system of local councils known as

«Rada.» The Hetmanate's self-governance allowed for decisions on local matters to be made by elected representatives.

3. Russian Empire and Soviet Era: From the late 18th century until the early 20th century, Ukraine was under the control of the Russian Empire (Miller, 2003). Local self-government largely remained limited during this time, with power concentrated in the hands of imperial authorities. Following the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, Ukraine became part of the Soviet Union (Pipes, 1964), further centralizing power at the national level and diminishing local self-governance.

4. Independence of Ukraine (1991): The collapse of the Soviet Union led to Ukraine's independence. The country embarked on a path towards democratic reforms and the establishment of a decentralized governance system. The Declaration of Independence of Ukraine, adopted on August 24, 1991, emphasized the principles of local self-government and the importance of local decision-making (Rudakiewicz, 2022).

5. Adoption of the Constitution of Ukraine (1996): The Constitution of Ukraine, adopted on June 28, 1996, marked a significant milestone in the evolution of local self-government and state administration (Pikovska, 2021). It recognized local self-government as an essential element of democratic governance and established the legal framework for local councils, outlining their powers, responsibilities, and mechanisms for election.

6. Decentralization Reforms (2014-present): In recent years, Ukraine has been actively implementing decentralization reforms (Romanova & Umland, 2019). These reforms seek to devolve power from central authorities to local communities, aiming to strengthen local self-government, ensure effective service delivery, and address regional disparities. The decentralization process involves transferring more authority, resources, and decision-making powers to local councils.

7. Local Elections: Regular local elections have been a crucial aspect of the evolution of local self-government and state administration in Ukraine (Zhiltsov, 2021). These elections provide opportunities for citizens to directly participate in the democratic process by electing their local representatives. Local councils, as a result, gain legitimacy and authority to make decisions on local matters, reflecting the will of the people.

These key dates and events provide an overview of the evolution of local self-government and state administration in Ukraine. They highlight Ukraine's transition from a centralized system under Soviet rule to a decentralized governance structure that emphasizes local autonomy and citizen participation. It is worth noting that the process is ongoing, and further reforms and developments are expected in the future.

Ireland

1. Anglo-Norman Period (12th century): The Anglo-Norman invasion of Ireland in the 12th century brought about significant changes in governance (Campbell, 2013). The English crown introduced administrative structures, including shires (counties) and boroughs, which formed the basis of local

self-government in Ireland. These structures allowed for the establishment of local authorities and the delegation of certain powers to manage local affairs.

2. Plantations of Ireland (16th and 17th centuries): The Plantations of Ireland were a series of settlements undertaken by the English and Scottish Protestant settlers on confiscated lands from Irish Catholic landowners (Gillespie, 2006). These plantation schemes aimed to establish control over Ireland and promote Protestantism. As part of the plantation process, administrative divisions called “baronies” were created, and townships developed as centers of local governance. Additionally, “borough corporations” were established, granting local jurisdictions to certain towns.

3. Acts of Union (1800): The Acts of Union in 1800 led to the merger of the Kingdom of Great Britain and the Kingdom of Ireland, creating the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland (Whelan, 2001). With the union, Ireland’s local self-government became more integrated into the broader British governance system. The Irish representation in the British Parliament increased, and Irish Members of Parliament participated in decision-making processes concerning matters that affected Ireland.

4. Irish Home Rule Movement (1867-1921): The rise of the Irish Home Rule Movement, which aimed to secure self-government or autonomy for Ireland within the United Kingdom (O’Day, 1998). Led by figures such as Charles Stewart Parnell and later, John Redmond, the movement gained significant momentum. While attempts to pass Home Rule bills were initially unsuccessful, the momentum of the movement ultimately paved the way for greater self-government in Ireland.

5. Irish War of Independence (1919-1921): The Irish War of Independence marked a significant turning point in Ireland’s path towards independence from British rule. The conflict arose as a response to the British government’s refusal to grant full independence to Ireland. The war, fought between Irish republican forces and the British authorities, resulted in the signing of the Anglo-Irish Treaty in 1921. This treaty led to the establishment of the Irish Free State in 1922, which granted Ireland a measure of independence within the British Commonwealth. The Irish Free State had its own system of local self-government, with local authorities known as county councils and urban district councils (Hopkinson, 2002).

6. Irish Local Government Act (2001): In more recent times, the Irish Local Government Act of 2001 brought about significant reforms in local self-government (Halásková et al., 2014). The act replaced the previous system of county councils and urban district councils with a new structure that included county councils, city councils, and town councils. This reorganization aimed to provide greater autonomy and decision-making power to local authorities, allowing them to better serve their respective communities and address local needs.

Each period and reform has contributed to shaping the governance systems that exist in Ireland today, demonstrating the country’s journey towards greater autonomy and local decision-making power.

Switzerland

1. Swiss Confederation (1291): The roots of local self-government in Switzerland can be traced back

to the formation of the Swiss Confederation in 1291 (Church & Head, 2013). This event marked the beginning of a cooperative alliance among several cantons (states), including Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden. The Confederation was primarily focused on mutual defense and cooperation, with power vested in local assemblies and councils. This marked the foundation of Switzerland's commitment to local autonomy and self-governance.

2. Helvetic Republic (1798-1803): In the late 18th century, Switzerland underwent a period of significant political change influenced by the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. In 1798, the French army invaded Switzerland and established the Helvetic Republic (Aksim, 1972). The Helvetic Republic aimed to centralize power and introduced a more uniform system of governance across Switzerland. Under this centralized system, local self-government faced significant challenges as power was largely concentrated in the central government. The cantonal governments were abolished, and a more hierarchical administrative structure was put in place.

3. Restoration of Cantonal Autonomy (1814-1830): In the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars, there was a growing sentiment for the restoration of cantonal autonomy and local self-government in Switzerland. The Congress of Vienna in 1814 recognized Switzerland as an independent and neutral nation, and the Swiss Federal Constitution of 1815 restored some of the cantonal authorities. This period witnessed the reestablishment of various local institutions, such as municipal councils and local courts, which played a key role in local governance (Jarrett, 2013).

4. Federal Constitution of 1848: The Federal Constitution of 1848 marked a significant milestone in the establishment of a federal state structure in Switzerland (Humair, 2006). It introduced a two-tier system of governance, with power distributed between the cantons and the federal government. The cantons were granted considerable autonomy, including the ability to decide on matters relating to local self-government. This constitution laid the foundation for the federal-state system that still exists in Switzerland today.

5. Development of Direct Democracy: Switzerland's commitment to local self-government is closely tied to its strong tradition of direct democracy (Altman, 2019). Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, various laws and reforms were introduced to encourage citizen participation in decision-making processes at both the local and national levels. The use of referendums and initiatives allowed Swiss citizens to directly influence legislation and policy decisions, reinforcing the principles of local autonomy and self-governance.

6. Modern Developments: Over the years, Switzerland has continued to refine and evolve its system of local self-government and state administration (Himsworth, 2019). Cantonal governments play a crucial role in overseeing local affairs, while municipalities (communes) have significant autonomy in areas such as education, infrastructure, and social services. There is a high degree of decentralization, with power shared between the federal, cantonal, and municipal levels.

The evolution of local self-government and state administration in Switzerland has been shaped by historical events, including the formation of the Swiss Confederation, the centralization efforts of

the Helvetic Republic, the restoration of cantonal autonomy, and the establishment of the federal state structure. Today, Switzerland's commitment to local autonomy and direct democracy continues to be key pillars of its governance system.

Japan

1. Asuka Period (592-710 AD): The Asuka Period marked the introduction of centralized state administration in Japan (Hualde, 2020). During this time, a system known as Ritsuryo was established, which aimed to create a centralized bureaucratic system based on Confucian principles. This system included the establishment of local administrative units called Kokubunji and Kokufu, which served as the foundations of local self-government. The Kokubunji were Buddhist temples that acted as administrative centers, while the Kokufu were regional administrative offices. These units were responsible for governing provinces and overseeing local administration.

2. Heian Period (794-1185 AD): The Heian Period saw the rise of the Fujiwara clan, who held significant political power (Sharmin, 2021). Local governance was largely controlled by powerful local families known as uji. These uji were responsible for maintaining law and order, resolving disputes, and collecting taxes in their respective territories. The Heian government also established provincial governors known as Kokushi to oversee regional administration. However, the power of these governors was often overshadowed by the influence of local uji.

3. Kamakura Period (1185-1333 AD): The Kamakura Period marked a shift in the structure of local governance in Japan (Perkins, 1998). During this time, the shogunate system was established, with the Kamakura shogunate holding significant power. The shogunate appointed military governors known as Shugo to manage local administration. These Shugo were responsible for maintaining law and order, collecting taxes, and overseeing defense. The Kamakura shogunate also established Kamon, which were local administrative units, to further decentralize governance.

4. Muromachi Period (1336-1573 AD): The Muromachi Period witnessed a further decentralization of power in Japan (Lau, 2022). The Ashikaga shogunate, which dominated this period, relied heavily on the support of regional daimyo (feudal lords) to maintain control. As a result, the daimyo gained significant autonomy in their territories, establishing their own administrative structures. Local governance was largely in the hands of these powerful daimyo, who held authority over their own domains.

5. Edo Period (1603-1868 AD): The Edo Period brought about stability and centralized governance under the Tokugawa shogunate (Mitchell & Yin, 2022). During this time, the shogunate implemented a rigid system known as the "bakuhan" system, which divided the country into domains. Each domain was governed by a daimyo, who had administrative control over their territory. The daimyo were responsible for maintaining law and order, collecting taxes, and managing local affairs. The Edo Period also saw the establishment of a hierarchical system of officials who assisted in governing domains.

6. Meiji Period (1868-1912 AD): The Meiji Period marked a significant transformation in the political and administrative structure of Japan (Paine, 2017). With the fall of the Tokugawa shogunate, the

Meiji government implemented a series of reforms to modernize the country. Local governance was restructured, and a unified system of local self-government was established. The new system included the creation of municipalities, known as “shi,” which were responsible for local administration. This period also saw the introduction of a parliamentary system and the adoption of Western administrative practices.

7. Post-World War II: Following Japan’s defeat in World War II, the country underwent further reforms in its administrative structure. The Local Autonomy Law of 1947 was enacted, which aimed to strengthen local self-government and decentralize power (Steiner, 1965). Under this law, local governments, such as cities, towns, and villages, were given more autonomy and authority in managing local affairs. Today, Japan’s local government system is characterized by a strong emphasis on local self-governance and active citizen participation.

8. The enactment of the Local Autonomy Law (1947): This law established a framework for local self-government in Japan. It defined the rights and responsibilities of local governments, including municipalities, and provided guidelines for their administration (Su, 2006).

9. Merger of municipalities (1955): In an effort to streamline administrative structures and enhance efficiency, a wave of mergers of municipalities took place in Japan (Thompson, 2008). Many small towns and villages were merged into larger cities and municipalities, leading to a reduction in the overall number of local governments.

10. Introduction of the Strong-Mayor System (1988): Prior to this date, most cities in Japan operated under the Council-Manager System, where a city manager held executive power. However, the Strong-Mayor System was introduced, giving elected mayors significant executive powers and decision-making authority (Kanai, 2013).

11. Decentralization reforms (1999): The Japanese government initiated broad decentralization reforms aimed at devolving power and responsibilities to local governments (Barrett, 2000). This included the transfer of certain administrative functions, such as education and welfare, from the central government to local authorities.

12. Introduction of the My Number system (2015): The My Number system was implemented, assigning a unique identification number to each individual residing in Japan (Shin et al., 2017). This system aimed to improve administrative efficiency by streamlining public services and facilitating better governance at the local level.

The transformation of governance structures throughout history has played a crucial role in shaping Japan’s administrative landscape and the relationship between central and local authorities.

Kenya

1. Pre-Independence Period:

- 1902: The establishment of the Native Councils Ordinance. This Ordinance introduced a form of

local self-government in Kenya by creating Native Councils at the grassroots level (Chweya, 2014). These councils allowed indigenous communities to have a say in local affairs and participate in decision-making processes.

- 1920: The introduction of the Native Authority Ordinance. This ordinance expanded on the Native Councils system and gave them increased powers, including the ability to levy taxes, make bylaws, and settle disputes within their communities (Shanguhya, 2016).

- 1963: Kenya gains independence. Kenya achieved independence from British colonial rule, leading to significant changes in the governance structure (Deflem, 1994). The transition to self-rule brought about the need for a new system of local self-government and state administration.

2. Post-Independence Period:

- 1963: Establishment of the Majimbo system. In the early years of independence, Kenya adopted a decentralized system of governance known as the Majimbo system. This system devolved powers and responsibilities to the regions and allowed for greater local self-government. However, the Majimbo system was later abolished in 1964, leading to a more centralized government structure.

- 2010: Implementation of the devolved system of government. The Constitution of Kenya, adopted in 2010, introduced a devolved system of government. This system established 47 counties as the main units of local self-government (Kanyinga, 2016). Each county has its own executive, legislature, and administrative structures, allowing for greater autonomy and decision-making power at the local level.

- 2013: First county elections. In 2013, Kenya held its first elections for county governors and representatives (Ochieng & Ireri, 2022). This marked a significant milestone in the implementation of the devolved system of government. The elections allowed for the election of local leaders who would be responsible for the administration of their respective counties, further enhancing local self-government in Kenya.

- 2017: Second general elections under the new Constitution. In 2017, Kenya held its second general elections under the new Constitution (Cheeseman et al., 2019). These elections allowed for the continuation of the devolved system of government and the strengthening of local self-government. The elections provided an opportunity for the electorate to exercise their democratic rights and choose their representatives at both the national and county levels.

These dates and events have played a pivotal role in shaping the evolution of local self-government and state administration in Kenya, allowing for greater participation and decentralization of power.

The evolution of local self-government and state administration in Ukraine, Ireland, Switzerland, Japan, and Kenya reflects a common tendency towards greater decentralization and devolution of powers. Thus, Ukraine, following its independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, embarked on a process of decentralization aimed at empowering local governments. The country has enacted several laws that grant greater autonomy and decision-making powers to local authorities, including the Law on Local Self-Government and the Law on Administrative and Territorial Structure. These reforms aim to foster local democracy, enhance service delivery, and address regional disparities.

In Ireland, the evolution of local self-government and state administration can be traced back to the establishment of county councils in 1899. These councils, along with the municipal corporations and town councils, played a significant role in local governance. Over the years, Ireland has seen a

gradual expansion of local powers, with greater emphasis on local decision-making and community engagement. The Local Government Reform Act in 2014 further strengthened local authorities and introduced measures such as directly elected mayors.

Switzerland is known for its highly decentralized political system, characterized by direct democracy and strong local autonomy. The country has a long tradition of local self-government, with a large number of communes enjoying a high degree of independence in decision-making. The principle of subsidiarity, which emphasizes that decisions should be made at the lowest possible level, is deeply ingrained in Swiss governance. This decentralized model has contributed to Switzerland's political stability and citizen participation in decision-making processes.

In Japan, the evolution of local self-government can be attributed to the post-World War II reforms aimed at democratizing the country's governance structure. The Local Autonomy Law of 1947 established a framework for local self-government and provided municipalities with the authority to manage local affairs. Subsequent reforms, such as the introduction of directly elected governors and the encouragement of citizen participation, have further empowered local authorities and enhanced local autonomy.

In Kenya, the evolution of local self-government and state administration has been driven by the need to address regional imbalances and promote inclusive governance. The country has undergone significant constitutional reforms, most notably with the promulgation of a new constitution in 2010. This constitution introduced a devolved system of government, with the establishment of 47 counties and the devolution of substantial powers and resources to the county governments. This move towards devolution aims to foster participatory democracy, enhance local service delivery, and promote equitable development across the country.

Thereby, in all these countries, there has been a gradual shift from centralized government structures towards regional or local self-government. This shift has been driven by the recognition of the importance of local participation and decision-making in governance, as well as the desire to address regional disparities and promote more effective and efficient administration.

The establishment of local self-government structures, such as municipal republics, shires, and boroughs, have provided opportunities for local communities to govern themselves and manage their own affairs. These structures have allowed for the delegation of powers and responsibilities to local authorities, enabling them to make decisions on issues that directly affect their communities. Additionally, the adoption of new legal frameworks, such as the Local Autonomy Law in Japan and the Local Government Act in Kenya, has provided a formal basis for the establishment and operation of local self-government systems.

Overall, the trend towards decentralization and devolution of powers in these countries reflects a greater emphasis on local autonomy, democratic governance, and the active involvement of citizens in decision-making processes at the local level.

The interplay between local communities and central authorities has played a significant role in shaping the evolution of local self-government and state administration in countries. The relationship between these two entities has undergone notable changes over time, influencing the development of governance structures and the distribution of powers.

Historically, Ukraine has experienced periods of both centralization and decentralization. During the Soviet era, central authorities exerted significant control over local governance, with local

governments acting as administrative bodies implementing central directives. However, with Ukraine gaining independence in 1991, there was a shift towards decentralization and greater autonomy for local communities. The influence of local communities on the evolution of local self-government and state administration in Ukraine can be observed through various mechanisms. One important aspect is the election of local officials, including mayors and local council members. These elections provide an opportunity for community members to voice their preferences and shape local governance. The ability to elect their representatives empowers local communities and allows for a more direct link between the people and their local government.

In recent years, there has been a growing recognition of the importance of local self-government in Ukraine. Efforts have been made to strengthen the role of local communities in decision-making processes and policy implementation. The process of decentralization, initiated in 2014, has aimed to transfer more powers and resources from the central government to local authorities. This has allowed local communities to have greater control over issues such as local development, infrastructure, education, healthcare, and environmental management. However, the interplay between local communities and central authorities is not without challenges. There can be tensions and conflicts between the two levels of government regarding the distribution of powers, resource allocation, and decision-making authority. Ensuring effective coordination and cooperation between local and central authorities is crucial to maintain a balance between local autonomy and the needs of the wider state.

Throughout Irish history, there has been a pattern of tension and negotiation between local communities and central authorities. During the Anglo-Norman period, the central authorities introduced administrative structures such as shires and boroughs, which established a system of local self-government. However, these structures were often heavily influenced by the central authority, limiting the autonomy of local communities.

In later periods, such as the Irish Wars of the 16th and 17th centuries, local communities played a significant role in resisting central authority and asserting their autonomy. The Gaelic clan system, for example, maintained a strong sense of local self-governance, which clashed with the attempts of central authorities to establish control.

The interplay between local communities and central authorities took a significant turn during the struggle for Irish independence in the early 20th century. The grassroots movements, such as Sinn Féin and the Irish Volunteers, mobilized local communities to assert their right to self-determination and challenge the authority of the British government. With the establishment of the Irish Free State in 1922, a new system of local self-government was introduced. The local government system was enshrined in the Constitution, granting substantial powers to local authorities. However, throughout the 20th century, there were debates and adjustments made to the balance of power between local communities and the central government. In recent years, there has been a push for further decentralization and strengthening of local self-government in Ireland. The Local Government Act of 2014 aimed to enhance the role and powers of local authorities, enabling them to make decisions on matters such as housing, planning, and local services. This reflects a recognition of the importance of local communities in decision-making processes and an attempt to empower them in shaping their own governance.

The development of local self-government and state administration in Switzerland has been significantly influenced by the interaction between local communities and central authorities. The Swiss political system is characterized by a unique federal structure that grants a considerable degree

of autonomy to local communities, while also maintaining a strong central authority. One of the key features of local self-government in Switzerland is the principle of subsidiarity. This principle emphasizes that decisions should be made at the most local level possible, allowing communities to have a direct say in their own affairs. This approach is reflected in the Swiss cantonal system, where each canton has its own constitution and significant legislative powers. Cantons often delegate certain responsibilities to municipalities, enabling a high level of local autonomy. At the same time, the Swiss central authorities, particularly the federal government, play a crucial role in coordinating and harmonizing policies across the various cantons. The federal government oversees matters of national importance, such as foreign affairs, defense, and monetary policy. It also ensures the adherence to fundamental rights and principles throughout the country.

The interplay between local communities and central authorities in Switzerland has fostered a unique balance between decentralization and unity. The decentralized nature of the Swiss political system allows local communities to address their specific needs and concerns, while the central authorities provide a framework for coordination and cooperation. This interplay has influenced the evolution of local self-government and state administration in several ways. Firstly, it has led to the development of a strong tradition of citizen participation and direct democracy. Swiss citizens have the right to initiate referendums and popular initiatives, allowing them to directly influence decision-making processes at both the local and national levels.

Secondly, the interplay has contributed to the stability and resilience of the Swiss political system. The decentralization of power has helped to mitigate conflicts and tensions between various regions and communities, as each locality has the opportunity to shape its own policies within the broader framework of Swiss governance.

Lastly, it has influenced the efficiency and effectiveness of state administration in Switzerland. Local communities have a better understanding of their own needs and can design and implement policies that are tailored to their specific contexts. Central authorities, on the other hand, ensure coordination and cooperation between different communities, promoting a unified approach to issues that transcend local boundaries.

The Swiss political system's unique federal structure, combined with the principle of subsidiarity, has allowed for a balanced distribution of powers and responsibilities. This interplay has fostered citizen participation, stability, and efficient governance, making Switzerland a notable example of successful decentralized governance.

Regarding Japan, it has witnessed a dynamic balance between the autonomy of local communities and the control exerted by central authorities, resulting in a unique system of governance. In Japan, the concept of local self-government, known as "chiho jichi," traces its roots back to ancient times. Local communities, or "mura," formed the backbone of social organization, each governed by a village headman or "shoya." These village headmen played a crucial role in maintaining order, resolving conflicts, and leading community decision-making processes. However, as Japan transitioned from a feudal system to a centralized state during the Meiji Restoration in the late 19th century, the influence of central authorities began to grow. The new government aimed to consolidate power, establish modern administrative structures, and promote national unity. As a result, local self-government underwent significant changes. The village headman system was replaced by elected officials, and the authority of local communities was gradually subordinated to the central government. The Meiji government

introduced prefectural systems, establishing prefectural governors as representatives of the central authority in local regions.

Nonetheless, the influence of local communities remained resilient. Through active participation in local elections and grassroots movements, communities exerted their influence on decision-making processes and advocated for their interests.

In more recent times, decentralization efforts in Japan have sought to empower local governments and strengthen local autonomy. The Local Autonomy Act of 1947 provided a legal framework for local self-government and aimed to strike a balance between central control and local community involvement. This act granted local governments significant responsibilities in areas such as education, public health, and social welfare. Furthermore, Japan's local governments have grown in stature and importance, with cities like Tokyo, Osaka, and Yokohama becoming major economic and political centers. These cities wield substantial power and engage in dynamic interactions with the central government to address local issues and pursue regional development.

While the central government holds significant decision-making power, the active engagement of local communities remains a vital force, ensuring that the diverse needs and aspirations of local regions are taken into account. This delicate balance contributes to Japan's distinctive governance system, characterized by both centralized control and participatory local governance.

The interplay between local communities and central authorities has significantly influenced the evolution of local self-government and state administration in Kenya. The historical context of Kenya's governance system provides valuable insights into this interplay.

Kenya has a diverse population with various ethnic communities, each with its unique cultural practices, socio-economic dynamics, and governance structures. Historically, these communities had their own localized forms of self-governance, where decisions were made collectively based on customary laws and traditions. However, with the arrival of colonial rule, the dynamics shifted, and a centralized administration was established. During the colonial era, the British imposed a hierarchical system of governance, consolidating power in the hands of central authorities. This top-down approach disregarded the traditional systems of local self-government and undermined the authority of local communities. The colonial administration aimed to control and exploit resources, which often resulted in marginalization and the loss of autonomy for local communities.

After gaining independence in 1963, Kenya embarked on a journey of nation-building, striving to strike a balance between centralized control and devolution of power to local communities. The country adopted a unitary system of government with a strong executive and centralized decision-making processes. However, recognizing the importance of local governance, Kenya introduced local authorities to ensure representation and participation at the grassroots level. Over time, Kenya's approach to governance has evolved, with the acknowledgement of the need for local self-government and decentralization. In 2010, the country implemented a new constitution that embraced devolution as a means to address historical imbalances and promote democratic governance. This constitutional reform provided for the establishment of 47 county governments, giving them substantial powers and resources to cater to the needs of their local communities.

The interplay between central authorities and local communities in Kenya's governance is an ongoing process that involves balancing the powers and responsibilities of different levels of government. While central authorities provide overarching policies and regulations, local communities play a vital

role in decision-making processes, resource allocation, and addressing the unique challenges faced at the local level.

The influence of local communities on state administration is seen through their ability to elect representatives who advocate for their interests at the county level. County governments have the mandate to provide essential services, such as healthcare, education, infrastructure, and agriculture. This has brought governance closer to the people and increased accountability within local governments. Furthermore, the interplay between local communities and central authorities has contributed to the empowerment of marginalized groups, promoting inclusivity and equal representation. It has allowed for the recognition and integration of customary laws and cultural practices into formal governance systems, fostering a sense of ownership and participation among local communities. However, challenges remain in achieving an optimal balance between central authority and local self-government. Issues such as resource distribution, capacity building, and ensuring effective coordination between different layers of government require continuous efforts and policy reforms.

From the colonial era to the present, Kenya's governance system has undergone changes to promote decentralization, devolution, and the integration of local communities into decision-making processes. By recognizing the importance of local governance, Kenya has taken significant strides toward a more inclusive and participatory democratic system.

As societies evolve and adapt, understanding the historical context of local self-government and state administration becomes increasingly relevant for shaping the future of governance systems (Bevir, 2007). This study provides beneficial insights into the development of governance structures, highlighting the interplay between local communities and central authorities in various countries. Analyzing historical trends offers a foundation for understanding the factors that have shaped the current state of local self-government, which can inform future reforms and decision-making processes. The article can serve as a reference point for designing more efficient and inclusive governance systems that balance local autonomy with centralized authority. Additionally, it lays the groundwork for comparative studies, enabling cross-cultural analysis of local self-government and state administration. This approach can uncover common challenges, best practices, and innovative solutions that can be shared and implemented in different contexts. Incorporating the article's insights into academic curricula and policy discussions can foster a deeper understanding of the importance of local self-government in democratic systems and stimulate further research and debates. Overall, the article contributes to ongoing discussions about the evolution of governance systems and offers valuable lessons for shaping the future of local self-government and state administration. Its future prospects are promising.

Conclusion

In this article, we explore the relationship between local communities and central authorities and how it has influenced the governance systems of different countries. By analyzing historical trends, we gain valuable insights into the development of local self-government and state administration. Understanding this dynamic is crucial to political science, comparative politics, and governance studies. By examining the evolution of governance systems, researchers can better understand the factors that have shaped power distribution and decision-making processes within societies. This knowledge can inform future studies and provide a foundation for further research on local self-government and state administration. For policymakers and practitioners involved in governance and public administration, this article offers

significant implications. By studying the historical evolution of local self-government, policymakers can make informed decisions regarding the devolution of powers, decentralization initiatives, and the promotion of participatory decision-making processes.

Lessons learned from historical experiences can guide policymakers towards effective governance models that foster community engagement, improve service delivery, and promote local autonomy. General, this article emphasizes the importance of historical insights in understanding the evolution of local self-government and state administration. By studying the interplay between local communities and central authorities, we can gain a deeper understanding of governance systems, inform future research, and guide practical decision-making in the pursuit of effective and inclusive governance.

Biographies

Viktoriia Filippova: DSc in Public Administration, Professor, Department of Public Administration and Local Self-Government, Kherson National Technical University.

Maryna Huba: PhD in Economics, Associate Professor, Department of Public Administration and Local Self-Government, Kherson National Technical University.

Oksana Pronina: PhD in Public Administration, Associate Professor at the Department of Public Administration and Local Self-Government, Kherson National Technical University.

Dmytro Lohachov: Postgraduate Student, Department of Public Administration and Local Self-Government, Kherson National Technical University.

Anatolii Mykolaiets: PhD in Public Administration, Associate Professor, Professor at the Department of Public Administration, International Regional Academy of Personnel Management.

Authorship and Level of Contribution

Viktoriia Filippova contributed to the research process by conducting literature reviews and collecting relevant historical information on the interplay between local communities and central authorities. She provided valuable insights during the analysis phase and contributed to the writing and editing of the manuscript.

Maryna Huba conducted extensive research on the historical evolution of local self-government and state administration in different countries. She analyzed the data, identified notable trends, and contributed to the overall conceptualization of the article. Additionally, she played a key role in structuring and drafting the manuscript.

Oksana Pronina conducted in-depth research on the historical development of local self-government and state administration. She contributed to the identification of key historical events and their influence on governance structures. Moreover, she played an active role in editing the manuscript and ensuring its coherence.

Dmytro Lohachov played a significant role in researching and compiling data on local governance systems in various countries. He was instrumental in analyzing historical events and their impact on the evolution of local self-government and state administration. He also contributed to the interpretation of findings and the writing process.

Anatolii Mykolaiets contributed to the conceptualization and design of the research project. He provided expertise in the political science field and guided the analysis of historical data. He also contributed to the writing and revising of the manuscript, ensuring its academic rigor and relevance.

Collectively, the authors collaborated throughout the research process, bringing their individual expertise to examine the interplay between local communities and central authorities in the evolution of local self-government and state administration.

References

- Aksim, R. E. (1972). *Reluctant patriots: the swiss revolution of 1798 to 1803*. Doctoral dissertation, Carleton University.
- Altman, D. (2019). *Citizenship and contemporary direct democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Annas, J. (1996). Aristotle's "Politics": A Symposium: Aristotle on Human Nature and Political Virtue. *The Review of Metaphysics*, 731-753.
- Barker, E., & Stalley, R. F. (1995). *Aristotle: Politics*. Published online by Cambridge University Press on 27 October 2009.
- Barrett, B. F. (2000). Decentralization in Japan: negotiating the transfer of authority. *Japanese Studies*, 20(1), 33-48.
- Beard, V. A., Mirafab, F., & Silver, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Planning and decentralization: Contested spaces for public action in the global south*. Routledge.
- Benner, E. (2013). *Machiavelli's Prince: A new reading*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Bevir, M. (Ed.). (2007). *Encyclopedia of governance* (Vol. 1). Sage.
- Campbell, K. L. (2013). *Ireland's History: Prehistory to the Present*. A&C Black.
- Cheeseman, N., Kanyinga, K., Lynch, G., Ruteere, M., & Willis, J. (2019). Kenya's 2017 elections: winner-takes-all politics as usual? *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 13(2), 215-234.
- Church, C. H., & Head, R. C. (2013). *A concise history of Switzerland*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chweya, L. (2014). *Democracy and organization of local governance in Kenya* (pp. 203-236). Nairobi: University of Nairobi Press.
- De Tocqueville, A. (1956). *Democracy in America [1835]*. https://xroads.virginia.edu/~Hyper/DETOC/toc_indx.html
- De Tocqueville, A., & Reeve, H. (1889). *Democracy in America* (Vol. 2, pp. 83-84). New York.
- Debelo, K. W. (2020). Local governance in Switzerland: Adequate municipal autonomy cum intergovernmental cooperation? *Cogent Social Sciences*, 6(1), 1763889. DOI: 10.1080/23311886.2020.1763889
- Deflem, M. (1994). Law enforcement in British colonial Africa: A comparative analysis of imperial policing in Nyasaland, the Gold Coast and Kenya. *Police Stud.: Int'l Rev. Police Dev.*, 17, 45.
- Dench, E. (2018). *Empire and political cultures in the Roman world*. Cambridge University Press.
- Freeman, E. A. (1870). *The History of the Norman Conquest of England: The preliminary history to the election of Eadward the Confessor*. 1870 (Vol. 1). Clarendon Press.
- Freeman, E. A. (1873). *The history of the Norman conquest of England: its causes and its results* (Vol. 2). Clarendon Press for Macmillan and Company, New York.
- Gerth, H.H. & Wright Mills, C. (Ed.) (1964). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (translated), pp. 77128, New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Gillespie, R. (2006). *Seventeenth-Century Ireland (New Gill History of Ireland 3): Making Ireland Modern—The Quest for a Settlement* (Vol. 3). Gill & Macmillan Ltd.
- Halásková, M., & Halásková, R. (2014). Impacts of Decentralization on the local government Expenditures and public Services in the EU Countries. *Lex Localis-Journal of Local Self-Government*, 12(3), 623-642.
- Himsworth, C. (2019). *European Charter of Local Self-Government: A Treaty for Local Democracy*. Edinburgh University Press.

- Hopkinson, M. (2002). *The Irish war of independence*. McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.
- Hualde, J. (2020). *Queen Suiko (推古), the beginning of the Asuka (飛鳥) period*. Doctoral dissertation.
- Humair, C. (2006). Economic Complementarity and Political Solidarity: Concerning the Sources of the First Treaty of 1850 Between Switzerland and the United States. *Swiss American Historical Society Review*, 42(3), 2.
- Jarrett, M. (2013). *The Congress of Vienna and its legacy: war and great power diplomacy after Napoleon*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Kanai, T. (2013). *Changing Local Government and Local Politics in Japan. Panorama: Insights into Asian and European Affairs*. A series of occasional papers published by the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung's "Regional Programme Political Dialogue Asia/Singapore", 85.
- Kanyinga, K. (2016). Devolution and the new politics of development in Kenya. *African Studies Review*, 59(3), 155-167.
- Kubicek, P. (2023). *The history of Ukraine*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Lau, W. (2022). Warrior State Formation Processes of Japan. In *On the Process of Civilisation in Japan: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations* (pp. 313-341). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Maitland, F. W. (1987). *Domesday book and beyond: three essays in the early history of England*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mill, J. S. (1974). *On liberty (1859)*. <https://www.stephenhicks.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/milljs-on-liberty-1-and-2.pdf>
- Miller, A. (2003). *The Ukrainian Question: Russian Empire and Nationalism in the 19th Century*. Central European University Press.
- Mitchell, A. M., & Yin, W. (2022). Political centralization, career incentives, and local economic growth in Edo Japan. *Explorations in Economic History*, 85, 101446.
- Nishikawa, Y. (2008, January). Public Administration between Western Model and Eastern Tradition: A Historical and Comparative Sketch. In *The Public Sector in Transition* (pp. 39-56). Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG.
- Ochieng, J., & Ireri, K. (2022). "The New Sheriffs in Town"! Newspapers Visibility of Kenya's First County Governors. *African Journalism Studies*, 43(1), 34-52.
- O'Day, A. (1998). *Irish home rule, 1867-1921*. Manchester University Press.
- Ogbazghi, P.B. (2020). *Origin and Development of Local Government in Ireland*. In: Farazmand, A. (Eds.) *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3945-1
- Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action. *Political Economy of Institutions and Decisions* (p. 280). Cambridge university press. ISBN 0521405998, 9780521405997
- Paine, S. C. M. (2017). *The Japanese Empire: Grand Strategy from the Meiji Restoration to the Pacific War*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pavlovych, T. O. (2020). Decentralization reform in Ukraine and the post-soviet countries: comparative analysis. *BBK*, 83, 244.
- Perez-Garcia, M. (2021). The Mandate of Heaven, the Rule of the Emperor: Self-Sufficiency of the Middle Kingdom. In: *Global History with Chinese Characteristics*. Palgrave Studies in Comparative

- Global History. Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-7865-6_3
- Perkins, G. W. (1998). *The clear mirror: a chronicle of the Japanese court during the Kamakura period (1185-1333)*. Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Pikovska, T. V. (2021). History of development of urban territorial communities: legal aspect. In *Colloquium-journal*, 8(95), część 3, 46-53.
- Pipes, R. (1964). *The formation of the Soviet Union: Communism and nationalism, 1917–1923* (Vol. 13). Harvard University Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. A Touchstone book, Business book summary (p. 541). Simon and Schuster. ISBN 0743203046, 9780743203043
- Putnam, R. D., Leonardi, R., & Nanetti, R. Y. (1992). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy* (p. 256). Princeton University Press. ISBN 0691037388, 9780691037387
- Reid, J. S. (2014). *The municipalities of the Roman Empire*. Cambridge University Press.
- Romanova, V., & Umland, A. (2019). *Ukraine's Decentralization Reforms Since 2014: Initial Achievements and Future Challenges*. The Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House, London, 26. <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/handle/123456789/20126>
- Rudakiewicz, N. (2022). Long and arduous way to decentralization: past, present and future of the reforms of local self-government in Ukraine. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 1-19.
- Semenets-Orlova, I., Halytska, N., Klochko, A., Skakalska, I., & Kosyuk, N. (2019). *Information exchange and communication infrastructure in the public sector*. Paper presented at the CEUR Workshop Proceedings, 2588.
- Semenets-Orlova, I., Klochko, A., Tolubyak, V., Sebalo, L., & Rudina, M. (2020). Functional and role-playing positions in modern management teams: An educational institution case study. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 18(3), 129-140. doi:10.21511/ppm.18(3).2020.11
- Shanguhya, M. S. (2016). Integrating African Traditions in Environmental Control in Western Kenya: Contradictions and Failure in Colonial Policy, 1920-1963. *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 49(1), 23-52.
- Sharmin, D. (2021). *The Heian Period: Last Division of Classical Japanese History*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Dhaka.
- Shin, S., Seto, Y., Sasaki, M., & Sakamoto, K. (2017). Analysis of specific personal information protection assessment in the social security and tax number system of local governments in Japan. In *Computer Information Systems and Industrial Management: 16th IFIP TC8 International Conference, CISIM 2017, Bialystok, Poland, June 16-18, 2017, Proceedings 16* (pp. 685-696). Springer International Publishing.
- Stamp, P. (1986). Local government in Kenya: Ideology and political practice, 1895-1974. *African Studies Review*, 29(4), 17-42.
- Steiner, K. (1965). *Local government in Japan*. Stanford University Press.
- Strayer, J. R. (2005). *On the medieval origins of the modern state* (Vol. 76). Princeton University Press.
- Su, C. P. (2006). The Guarantee of Local Self-Government in the Japanese Constitution: The Theory and Practice. *NTU L. Rev.*, 1, 57.
- Thompson, C. S. (2008). Chapter Nineteen. Population decline, municipal amalgamation, and the politics of folk performance preservation in Northeast Japan. In *The demographic challenge: A handbook about Japan* (pp. 361-386). Brill.

- Ullmann, W. (2010). *Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages (Routledge Revivals)*. Routledge.
- Van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & De Waal, M. (2018). *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. Oxford University Press.
- von Werdt, C. (2011). "Cossacks into State-Builders"—Constructing Historical "Cossack-Statehood" in Ukraine. *Introduction: Paths of Ambiguous Transformation after 20 Years* 9, 383.
- Webber, M. (1921). "*Politik als Beruf*". *Gesammelte Politische Schriften* (Muenchen, 1921), pp. 396-450. Originally a speech at Munich University, 1918, published in 1919 by Duncker & Humblodt, Munich.
- Whelan, K. (2001). The other within: Ireland, Britain and the Act of Union. *Acts of Union: The Causes, Contexts and Consequences of the Act of Union*, 13-33.
- Zhiltsov, S. S. (2021). Local elections results in Ukraine: the authorities reframing. *Post-Soviet Issues*, 7(4), 508-515.