

UDC 930(477)(092):321.64
DOI 10.24919/2519-058x.13.188683

Tamara SHARAVARA

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

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6370-6663>

ResearcherID: <http://www.researcherid.com/rid/Q-6621-2016>

ScopusAuthorID: <https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57200222339>

Serhii PRYKHODKO

PhD (Political Sciences), Associate Professor of the Department of Humanities and Social Studies at Poltava State Agrarian Academy, 1/3 Skovorody Street, Poltava, Ukraine, postal code 36000 (almazny@ukr.net)

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9755-6879-9179>

Тамара ШАРАВАРА

доктор історичних наук, професор, проректор з науково-педагогічної роботи і перспективного розвитку Полтавської державної аграрної академії, вул. Г. Сковороди, 1/3, Полтава, Україна, індекс 36000 (125125.tsh@gmail.com)

Сергій ПРИХОДЬКО

кандидат політичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри гуманітарних і соціальних дисциплін Полтавської державної аграрної академії, вул. Г. Сковороди, 1/3, Полтава, Україна, індекс 36000 (almazny@ukr.net).

Бібліографічний опис статті: Sharavara, T., & Prykhodko, S. (2019). Model of the totalitarian state in the view of OUN's activities (1920s – 1930s) and classical western concepts of totalitarianism: comparative aspect. *Skhidnoevropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 13, 136–146. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.13.188683

**MODEL OF THE TOTALITARIAN STATE IN THE VIEW OF THE OUN'S
ACTIVITIES (1920-ies – 1930-ies) AND CLASSICAL WESTERN CONCEPTS
OF TOTALITARISM: COMPARATIVE ASPECT**

Abstract. The purpose of the article is to identify the features of the totalitarian model of the state power organization created by the representatives of the Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists in the 1920-ies – 1930-ies, as well as to do a comparative analysis of the classical Western concepts of totalitarianism with the theoretical heritage of the Ukrainian nationalists. The methodology of the research is based on the principles of systematic, dialectic, authenticity, concrete-historical approach, logic. The general scientific (analysis, dialectical, synthesis, structural-functional, generalization) and special (content-analysis, comparative, system-historical) methods are used. The scientific novelty. The political conception of the Ukrainian nationalists of the 1920-ies – 1930-ies was first characterized in terms of defining the model of a totalitarian state. A comparative analysis of this model with classical theories of totalitarianism, formed by Western political scientists after World War II. The Conclusions.

Based on the analysis of the political concepts of the Ukrainian nationalists of the 1920-ies – 1930-ies, it has been found out that they completed the basic features of a totalitarian state. The creation of a model of a totalitarian state during this period is conditioned by objective prerequisites. The OUN's activities took place in the context of a discriminatory policy towards the Ukrainian population between Poland. That is why the ideas of hard resistance to the Polish authorities were popularized among the Ukrainians. It was in a totalitarian state that the Ukrainian nationalists saw a mechanism that would allow them to withstand external threats. In addition, in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe in the 1920-ies – 1930-ies, the ideas about a totalitarian organization of the state power were also very popular. The theories of totalitarianism by Western scholars emerged after World War II. It can be argued that there is an indirect influence of these concepts of the OUN figures on classical theories.

Key words: political regime, totalitarianism, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, integral nationalism, syndicalism.

МОДЕЛЬ ТОТАЛІТАРНОЇ ДЕРЖАВИ У ПОГЛЯДАХ ДІЯЧІВ ОУН (1920 – 1930-х рр.) ТА КЛАСИЧНІ ЗАХІДНІ КОНЦЕПЦІЇ ТОТАЛІТАРИЗМУ: ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ

Анотація. *Мета дослідження* – визначити особливості тоталітарної моделі організації державної влади, створеної представниками Організації українських націоналістів у 1920 – 1930-х рр., а також здійснити порівняльний аналіз класичних західних концепцій тоталітаризму з теоретичним надбанням українських націоналістів. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на принципах системності, діалектики, достовірності, конкретно-історичного підходу, логічності. Використано загальнонаукові (аналізу, діалектичний, синтезу, структурно-функціональний, узагальнення) та спеціальні (контент-аналіз, порівняльний, системно-історичний) методи. **Наукова новизна.** Вперше схарактеризовано політичну концепцію українських націоналістів 1920 – 1930-х рр. з точки зору визначення моделі тоталітарної держави. Здійснено порівняльний аналіз цієї моделі з класичними теоріями тоталітаризму, сформованими західними політологами вже після Другої світової війни. **Висновки.** На основі аналізу політичних концепцій українських націоналістів 1920 – 1930-х рр. з'ясовано, що в них у завершеній формі сформульовані основні ознаки тоталітарної держави. Створення моделі тоталітарної держави саме в цей період зумовлюється об'єктивними передумовами. Діяльність ОУН відбувалася в умовах проведення міжвоєнною Польщею дискримінаційної політики щодо українського населення. Тому серед українців популяризувалися ідеї жорсткого опору польській владі. Саме у тоталітарній державі українські націоналісти вбачали той механізм, який допоможе протистояти зовнішнім загрозам. Крім того, у країнах Центральної та Східної Європи у 1920 – 1930-х рр. також значну популярність мали ідеї щодо тоталітарної організації державної влади. Теорії тоталітаризму західних учених з'явилися вже після Другої світової війни. Можна стверджувати наявність опосередкованого впливу вказаних концепцій діячів ОУН на класичні теорії.

Ключові слова: політичний режим, тоталітаризм, Організація українських націоналістів, інтегральний націоналізм, синдикалізм.

The Problem Statement. Beginning in the 1920-ies, the priority activity of the Ukrainian national movement representatives was to identify new ways of the state formation. This process took place against the background of developing optimal models of the state power organization that would meet the needs of the Ukrainian society. They were created under fundamentally new conditions, different from 1917 – 1921. The Ukrainian national liberation movement of that time, aimed at restoring statehood, was defeated. At the same time, undemocratic forms of governmental organization became popular and widespread in European countries, particularly those that regained their independence after World War I. Democracy, as a type of political practice and outlook, was in a certain decline during the period between the two World Wars (Kinder and Hilgeman, 2003; Bakirov and Sazonov, 2005). And this was

reflected in the views of some representatives of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, who showed a commitment to the undemocratic forms of the state.

The most common point of view was among the Ukrainian intelligentsia, who was the part of Poland. The Second Commonwealth generally pursued an assimilationist and discriminatory policy toward the Ukrainians. And this could not but affect their political preferences. Subsequently, a public opinion on Polish-Ukrainian relations took more and more radical forms. The focus was on a fierce confrontation with the Polish authorities. The expression of these tendencies was the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Armstrong, 1980; Cherkasov, Krinko, Shmigel, 2015). Its representatives, in addition to the current tasks, developed a theoretical model of the future Ukrainian state. They argued for the introduction of its totalitarian variety. This was due to the fact that such principles of power organization could strengthen the foundations of the future state under conditions of its formation and confrontation with external threats.

The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications. The issues of determining the optimal models of state power organization play an important role in the theoretical heritage of the Ukrainian political thought representatives of different ideological directions. Among them, a special place belongs to the figures of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN). They are one of the few, who rejected the democratic principles of building a Ukrainian state, proposing instead its totalitarian model. In particular, the corresponding developments are contained in the primary sources – the works of the OUN figures of V. Martynets, M. Stsiborskyi and Ya. Stetsko (Martynets, 1927; Stsiborskyi, 1935, 1939; Stetsko, 1987). The political aspects of the OUN program have also been analyzed in the studies of contemporary Ukrainian scholars V. Troshchynskyi, P. Hai-Nyzhnyk (Troshchynskyi, 1994; Hai-Nyzhnyk, 2018). They note the fact that the Ukrainian nationalists are committed to a totalitarian form of state.

A special mention should be made of the problem of Polish-Ukrainian relations, which, in the context of the discriminatory policy of official Poland against the Ukrainians, was rather acute. The characteristics of the socio-historical development of interwar Poland, on the territory of which the main activities of the OUN took place, noted in the publications of the Ukrainian researchers Ya. Tsetsyk, T. Hrynevych, M. Zelinskyi, and O. Sukhobokova (Tsetsyk, 2015; Hrynevych, 2017; Zelinskyi, 2018; Sukhobokova, 2018), Russian authors A. Cherkasov, E. Krinko, M. Shmigel, D. Ahremenko (Cherkasov, Krinko, Shmigel, 2015; Ahremenko, 2015), Polish journalist of the interwar period A. Bokhenskyi (Bokhenskyi, 2012). These publications are of a considerable interest because they identify a common historical background that has had a significant impact on the formation of totalitarian models of the state within the OUN.

In the modern works that analyze the various statesmanship models presented in Ukrainian political thought, including those of the nationalist camp, there is a need to compare these models with classical theories of political regimes.

The Purpose of the Article. To identify the features of the totalitarian model of state power organization created by the representatives of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists in the 1920-ies – 1930-ies, as well as to do a comparative analysis of classical Western concepts of totalitarianism with the theoretical heritage of the Ukrainian nationalists.

The Statement of the Basic Material. The ideas about the expediency of using undemocratic forms of the state power organization in Ukraine in the future were most strongly reflected in the concepts of the figures of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists in the 1920-ies – 1930-ies. In fact, they formed a complete model of a totalitarian state.

In our view, before analyzing the concepts of the Ukrainian nationalist camp theorists, it is appropriate to determine the historical context in which they were created. This will give a deeper insight into the essence of the Ukrainian nationalist movement in the early twentieth century and the model of the totalitarian state developed by its representatives. Historical prerequisites for the creation of a model of a totalitarian state within the Ukrainian nationalist movement were both the external and purely internal sources of origin. The researchers (Kinder, Hilgeman, 2003; Bakirov, Sazonov, 2005) state that at the beginning of the twentieth century in European countries, there were a situation of the democracy crisis and the spread of totalitarian political ideas. „Totalitarianism became a political reality in the twentieth century, when global projects on the final rationalization of social relations, developed in the framework of the European tradition, became an unprecedented enslavement of a person” (Bakirov, Sazonov, 2005, p. 380). The emergence of such projects at that time is associated with the peculiarities of the industrial period of a human development. The totalitarian model of the state “is a specific attempt to resolve the contradictions, which were exacerbated during the transition to the industrial stage, between complicated social organization and individual freedom” (Bakirov, Sazonov, 2005, pp. 380–381). The industrial period gave rise to another phenomenon – the mass person as a component of an atomized, that is, amorphous, unstructured society. It is a person, who does not have his own perspective on the environment and dissolves in the masses of the public. He is unable to articulate his own position and completely imitates his surroundings. “Mass is built on the priority of collective forms over interpersonal”, as a consequence, “the role of the state contributing to the spread of statistic ideas is enhanced” (Bakirov, Sazonov, 2005, p. 381).

Another factor in the popularization of totalitarian ideas in the early twentieth century, paradoxically, the introduction of democratic principles of a political life, in particular, universal suffrage. “The prerequisite for establishing a dictatorship is modern mass democracy. The sympathy of the masses is gained through opportunistic programs that bring together contradictory elements and through skillful propaganda, instills confidence in their own victory” (Kinder, Hilgeman, 2003, p. 417). “Elections on the basis of a proportional system under the conditions of an atomized society lead to the “formation of small political groups and hindering the formation of a clear parliamentary majority. Therefore, many peoples are ready to trust the Führer” (Kinder, Hilgeman, 2003, p. 417). The unpreparedness of the mass people to make their own responsible choices, full subordination to the mass interests often creates a politically dispersed structure of government bodies. Against this backdrop, supporters of undemocratic methods of government are gaining real power. These are the realities in the political life of most European countries after World War I. Its effects exacerbated the situation. “Many nations, even in Western democracies, are accustomed not only to strong executive power to solve problems, but also to learn from the war as a means of rapidly achieving political goals” (Kinder, Hilgeman, 2003, p. 417).

Consequently, in countries where there was no democratic practice, the demand for politicians, who guarantee the prompt resolution of complex problems bypassing established procedures has increased significantly. Such prerequisites explain the popularity of the totalitarian principles of state government and the democratic states crisis (Kinder, Hilgeman, 2003; Bakirov, Sazonov, 2005).

The internal prerequisites for the emergence of concepts of totalitarianism are related to the peculiarities of the processes that took place in the western part of Ukraine, subordinated to Poland in the early 1920-ies. In general, they are the western territories of Ukraine since

the nineteenth century that had a specific status. The Poles considered them their “eastern suburbs, which rightfully belonged to them. The Russian authorities (and the public) perceived these lands as the Western edge of the Russian Empire” (Ahremenko, 2015, p. 118). The difference between the consciousness of people, who lived in different parts of Ukraine, was noted by J. Armstrong, American researcher of the Ukrainian nationalism. The Ukrainians living in Austro-Hungary “never lost the understanding of their national differences” (Armstrong, 1980, p. 8), that is, they always maintained their identity and separation from the Poles. Instead, the Ukrainians within the Russian Empire were completely assimilated. “Most of the prominent people of the Ukrainian ethnic origin were russified in the field of culture and a national sentiment” (Armstrong, 1980, p. 9).

It was in the Polish part of Ukraine in the 1920-ies that a favorable ground was formed for the further spread of a fundamentally new political ideology – integral nationalism. As J. Armstrong writes in his work “Ukrainian Nationalism”, “it is difficult to determine its exact nature”, because “its supporters reject systematic rational programs” (Armstrong, 1980, p. 20). However, the scientist made an attempt to point out its basic essential characteristics: “1) belief in the nation as the highest value to which all others must be subordinated, is, in essence, a totalitarian concept; 2) appeal to the mystical ideas of the cohesion of all individuals, who make up the nation; 3) subordination of a rational, analytical thought to “intuitively correct” emotions; 4) expression of “a national will” by the charismatic leader and elite of nationalist enthusiasts organized into a single party; 5) glorification of an active action, war and violence as an expression of the nation's highest biological vitality” (Armstrong, 1980, p. 20). In general, an integral nationalism, which has never enjoyed particular appeal in Western European countries, has instead become “a dominant force in the “discontented” countries of Central and Southern Europe during the period between the world wars. Its influence was also strongly felt in the ultranationalist parties of Poland, Hungary, Romania and Yugoslavia” (Armstrong, 1980, p. 20).

This ideology was adopted by the Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists. It is this ideology that should have ensured the main task of the organization – “to protect the interests of the entire Ukrainian population from discrimination, exploitation and repression by the Polish and Soviet governments. The main goal was to create an independent Ukrainian state, which was to include all Polish, Soviet, Romanian and Czechoslovak territories inhabited by the Ukrainians” (Cherkasov, Krinko, Shmigel, 2015, p. 102).

The OUN activities were most widespread in Poland, which, following independence, virtually immediately began to discriminate against minorities, the Ukrainians, in particular. In December 1920, as noted by T. Hrynevych, “The Constituent Seimas decided to grant veterans of the war for independence and the borders of Poland with land ownership. Only peasants, who served in the Polish army could get a plot of land, and therefore it did not extend to the Ukrainian peasantry” (Hrynevych, 2017, p. 111). At the same time, the Polish authorities “slowed the distribution of Polish landowners’ estates among the local peasantry and generally favored the allocation of land to the Polish colonists at the expense of the Ukrainian, Belarusian and Lithuanian peasants” (Hrynevych, 2017, p. 112).

The attitude of the Polish intelligentsia to the Ukrainian national movement, which can be traced on the example of the journalistic activity of the Polish public figure and the famous intellectual J. Bartoszewicz (1867 – 1938), is also indicative. According to M. Zelinskyi, Bartoszewicz lived for a long time in Ukraine until 1917 and, without a doubt, was acquainted with all the problems of the Ukrainians in the Russian Empire. After the restoration

of the state independence of Poland, J. Bartoszewicz, becoming a member of the Polish National Committee, significantly changed the tone of his publications. The peculiarities of his “works of that time on Ukrainian issues” became a departure from the practice of using the terms “Ukraine” and “Ukrainian”. Instead, the names “Rus” and “Rusyns” were used, proving only the ethnographic identity of this ethnic community. Finally, he concluded that “Ukraine has never had a strictly specific historical, geographical or administrative territory. ... Also, “Ukraine” and “the Ukrainians” were not political terms (Zelinskyi 2018, p. 91). He supported the view of the unhistory of the Ukrainian nation, and therefore “the Ukrainians are the least tempted to have their own independent state, which was artificially and erroneously created by the Ukrainian historians” (Zelinskyi, 2018, p. 92). That is, not only the Polish establishment, but also some representatives of the Polish intelligentsia considered the Ukrainians not as an independent nation, but only as a certain ethnographic group, who has no right to its statehood.

In contrast to democratic Czechoslovakia, where the Ukrainians enjoyed a certain commitment from the government of this country (Sukhobokova, 2018, p. 134), in the Second Commonwealth in terms of anti-Ukrainian policy, the opportunities for widespread socio-political activity of the Ukrainians were significantly limited. The internal policy of official Poland was aimed at assimilation and discrimination of the Ukrainians in all spheres of socio-political and economic life (Tsetsyk, 2015, p. 116). This led to a deepening of the Polish-Ukrainian controversy. “This activity of the Polish governments has opposed not only representatives of the Ukrainian political environment, the opposition to power, but also some of those Ukrainian politicians, who have stood in the position of the Polish-Ukrainian cooperation”. (Tsetsyk, 2015, p. 118). Under such circumstances, the political views of the Ukrainians acquired radical features. An increase in such positions among the Ukrainian population regarding the Second Commonwealth was noted by an eyewitness, Polish publicist Olexandr Bokhenskyi, who characterized the then-Polish-Ukrainian relations as “a state of excitement or hatred of the two million Ukrainian population in Poland” (Bokhenskyi, 2012, p. 173). Therefore, given that democratic ideas are in crisis, it is quite logical to explain the more popular view that political self-determination of the Ukrainians is possible only within the framework of the undemocratic model of the state.

Now let us dwell on the developments of the Ukrainian nationalist camp representatives. The concept of the OUN ideologist Mykola Stsiborskyi, outlined in the work “Natiocracy”, became the most complete and complete form. The mechanism of functioning of state bodies was developed by him in the “Essay of the Draft Basic Laws (Constitution) of the Ukrainian State”. The optimal model of state organization, in his opinion, should be built on several levels. The basis of a local government should be the following administrative-territorial units: communities, counties and provinces. Authorities in the provinces should be responsible for the Councils and Governments, which are headed by regional heads and, within their competence, resolve local affairs. At the same time, they must be operated by the trade unions, which primarily express their industry interests. They form the Local Board of Governors. These bodies should provide “ample opportunities for amateur activity of the population in the forms of public self-government most favorable to the historical Ukrainian conditions” (Stsiborskyi, 1935, pp. 114–115). M. Stsiborskyi considered the combination of state and business bodies an effective means of exercising power at the local level. In the central government, syndicates should also play a leading role in the process of forming their bodies, as they nominate their representatives to the State Council, the legislative body. In turn, the

local syndicates form the All-Ukrainian Economic Council as a kind of second chamber of parliament. In promoting the idea of a bicameral parliament, M. Stsiborskyi argued for the need to represent territories and professional trade unions in it. This system of legislative body formation, in his opinion, best ensures fair representation in the public institutions of the broad sections of the people and “at the same time puts the State Council in direct contact with the people, transferring its formation to unions, social groups” (Stsiborskyi, 1935, p. 75). That is, the syndicates were given the role of centers not only economic but also political life of the country.

Yaroslav Stetsko, one of the leaders of the OUN, held similar views on the the state organization problems. With regard to local authorities, he advocated the granting of broad self-government rights to lands with representative bodies and their executive structures. The right to nominate their representatives should belong only to industrial unions, which at the same time are power institutions. They were assigned the exclusive right to nominate their elected representatives to the highest authorities of the entire state. “The power guarantee of the people is that all the productive groups (farmers, industrial workers and labor intelligentsia) protect their own interests through their elected representatives and with their help govern the state” (Stetsko, 1987, p. 191). Representatives of the “socially productive forces, professional corporation” form the “State Council of Labor” – the lower house of parliament. It should represent the interests of “labor and lands”. The “State Council of Labor” has internal structuring according to the professional and sectoral affiliation of its members. The Upper House is the “Grand Council of the State”. Ya. Stetsko noted that it is the embodiment of state experience. Membership in it is granted for special merit for life (Stetsko, 1987, p. 191).

The methods analysis of state power organization, offered by M. Stsiborskyi and Ya. Stetsko, give grounds to conclude that their authors were in the position of implementing the ideas of a corporate society and the corresponding forms of syndicate state. The principles of organization of state power formulated by them are in some way in line with the solidarity theory widespread in the first half of the twentieth century. One of its creators, the French jurist Leon Dyugi, proposed the syndicate state model as a certain antithesis of party democracy and the idea of class struggle (Dyugi, 1914, p. 53).

According to the authors, this approach was reflected in the views of the Ukrainian nationalists. Probably, for them, such a model was an intermediate option between liberal democracy and communist totalitarianism, therefore more optimal for practical application in the future Ukrainian state.

However, it should be noted that the practical implementation of these theoretical developments is quite problematic. Because in times of intense economic development it is difficult to keep people within sectoral associations. This can only be done by force. This was also indicated by a representative of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Movement I. Mazepa. In particular, he noted that “a corporate state can only be imposed by dictatorship” (Mazepa, 1949, p. 81).

Another important component of the functioning of a totalitarian state is the existence of a separate organization, often a party, which performs the functions of the real highest authority and stands over the entire system of state power. It is totalitarian in both its professed ideology and structural structure. The OUN activists proposed the Order’s concept in this regard. In particular, Ya. Stetsko saw in it “the embodiment of idealism and heroism” (Stetsko, 1987, p. 18) of the entire nation. The Order must be unified into a single monolith around certain ideological values. The main one among them is, of course, the idea of the

nation. Public leaders “compete for its implementation. This competition fills their whole consciousness. And it unites them into one social group. The idea unites them. And that is the essence of the Nationalist Order” (Stetsko, 1987, p. 18). It is easy to understand that as one of the leaders of the Ukrainian nationalist movement, Ya. Stetsko saw in this Order the Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists. He regarded his main functions as “the political control of the masses, the public and the administrative apparatus, the mastery of the political leadership of the masses with the intention of turning into a tremendous force of internal consolidation of the nation and the guarantee of the nation” (Stetsko, 1987, p. 257). Even when working in government bodies, members of the organization must first and foremost adhere to their party guidelines.

Another OUN theorist, Volodymyr Martynets, was responsible for the formation and activities of this type of organization, which would fulfill the functions of state leadership. The vision of this problem was outlined in the work “Notes on the forthcoming conference of the Ukrainian nationalists” in 1927. It should be noted that the above mentioned M. Stsiborskyi and Ya. Stetsko created their concepts based on the fact that such a structure exists – the OUN. In turn, V. Martynets has only theoretically developed a model of such an organization. Addressing this issue, V. Martynets noted that it cannot belong to representatives of parties or other groups of this type. The defeat of the Ukrainian national movement of 1917 – 1921 proved the inability of parties to exercise state rule. Through their disputes and quarrels, they bring disorientation and disorganization into society, generate apathy and despair in it, and ultimately make it incapable of resisting external aggression, thereby discrediting the state idea. Therefore, the task has now moved into the creation of such a representative organization, but on a substantially different basis. A non-partisan political organization had to take its place.

Its main functional orientation should not be limited to the exercise of power as a mere regulation of social relations. The role of the nationalist organization is that it provides for “the coordination and directing of national energy into a strong channel of creative life” (Martynets, 1927, p. 13). V. Martynets revealed the essence of the process of exercising its powers as follows: “The nationalist organization, being the source of state idealism, should set as its main task: the planned expansion of state ideology and systematic activity in all areas of Ukrainian social life, the need to foster power, armed struggle for statehood and prepare the nation for those constructive tasks” (Martynets, 1927, p. 14). The authority of this organization as a governing power in the state is not limited to legislative regulatory activity. It must spread and embrace its ideology throughout society, eliminate the influence of all others.

Thus, in the OUN programming documents, a nationalist organization with a rigid structure and a universal ideology was promoted as a leading political force. As noted, the term “order” was even used to characterize it (Stetsko, 1987, p. 18). This approach was quite understandable, since the nationalists had a negative attitude towards the party institute, considering them to be splitting the people. Instead, a rigid monolithic organization is needed in the conditions of unfavorable external environment. But if we compare the views of the OUN officials of the functional purpose of the governing organization with the provisions of modern totalitarianism theories, then one can state the fact that they are completely similar. Therefore, the ideas of forming a leading political force of the Order type are in fact completely consistent with the appointment of ruling parties in a totalitarian state with a one-party system.

The third important component of a totalitarian state is an ideology that is universal and binding in nature. The view of the OUN functionaries was based on their outlook. “The only ideology that educates citizens of the Ukrainian State is the ideology of Ukrainian Nationalism”

(Stsiborskyi, 1939, p. 12). The activity of any other parties, organizations that profess, as stated in the draft Constitution of M. Stsiborskyi, other ideologies is forbidden. With such an ideology, there are a number of limitations. Amateur activity and citizens' initiative are allowed only in the economic sphere, but under strict state control. There is also a censorship of all publishing, media and education.

Therefore, the theoretical developments of the Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists on the principles of the organization of power contain key features of a totalitarian state. By the way, in Article 1 of the Sketch of the Project, M. Stsiborskyi stated, "Ukraine is a sovereign, authoritarian, totalitarian professional-state state" (Stsiborskyi, 1939, p. 1). It should be noted that the term "authoritarianism" was used by M. Stsiborskyi once without explaining his interpretations.

The totalitarian nature of these models of state-building has also been noted by modern researchers. According to V. Troshchynskyi, "it organically flowed from its (nationalism. – auth.) irrational-voluntarist and totalitarian ideology and aimed at establishing a "national dictatorship" in the Ukrainian state" (Troshchynskyi, 1994, p. 220).

In order to clarify the essence of the model of totalitarian state proposed by the Ukrainian nationalists, it is advisable to determine the content of classical theories of totalitarianism developed by Western political scientists for the purpose of their further comparison. In a holistic form, the classical theories of totalitarianism emerged after World War II as a kind of analysis of the practical forms of its implementation in Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. The most prominent authors are R. Aron, H. Arendt, Z. Brzezinski and C. Friedrich.

So, they proposed their concepts of a totalitarian state after the OUN did. Thus, Z. Brzezinski and C. Friedrich identified in the work "Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy" the following features of the totalitarian regime: "1. An ideology that embraces official doctrine that encompasses all the vital aspects of human life has been developed. 2. A single mass party, usually headed by one person, a "dictator"; a party that either stands over or is completely intertwined with a bureaucratic state organization. 3. The system of terrorist police control. 4. Technologically determined and almost comprehensive control of the party over all mass media. 5. Centralized control and management of the entire economy through bureaucratic coordination; this control is usually extended to most other public organizations and groups" (Friedrich, Brzezinski, 1956).

The French political scientist R. Aron in the work "Democracy and totalitarianism" noted the following characteristic features of totalitarianism: "1. A regime that gives a single party a monopoly right to political activity. 2. This party is armed with an ideology, which gives it the status of a single authority, and subsequently – the official state truth. 3. In order to disseminate official truth, the state gives itself the exclusive right to influence and to the means of persuasion. The state and its representatives control all media. 4. The sphere of economy is fully subordinated to the state" (Aron, 1993).

Thus, the defining features of totalitarianism, formulated in these classical theories of Western political scientists, are: the only ruling party that actually performs the functions of state power; a universal ideology that encompasses all spheres of social life through its regulatory influence; total control of public life by the state through coercive coercion.

If we compare the characteristics of the totalitarian model of the state, defined in the writings of the OUN figures and in the theories of Western scholars, they actually coincide. It should be borne in mind that Ukrainian concepts appeared earlier than Western ones. Therefore, it is possible to give priority to this to Ukrainian theorists. Of course, there is no direct influence to speak of. But it is quite appropriate to state the presence of indirect communi-

cation. That is, the figures of the Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists also made their contribution to the development of the totalitarianism theory. However, it should be noted separately that their developments were part of the OUN's purely political worldview. Western scholars, analyzing the practical examples of the Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, have generally taken a negative view of the totalitarian practice of exercising state power.

The Conclusions. Thus, the models of state power organization, formulated by figures of the Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists, contain all the features of totalitarianism, which, only after World War II, were enshrined in the classical theories of Western political scientists. The creation of totalitarian models of organization of state power in the 1920-ies – 1930-ies had its own internal logic. The OUN acted in the context of Poland's official policy of discrimination and assimilation against the Ukrainian population. That is why the ideas of hard resistance to the Polish authorities became more and more popular among the Ukrainians. It is in this environment that the OUN's proposals on the organization of state power, based on the totalitarian principles of its functioning, appeared. The idea of applying these principles was justified by the need to create a solid foundation for the future state, in the face of its external threats. The OUN theorists have stood in the position of putting into practice the ideas of a corporate society and the corresponding forms of syndicate state. The principles of state power organization formulated by them are in some way in line with the widespread solidarity theory in the first half of the twentieth century. It should be emphasized that M. Stsiborskyi and Ya. Stetsko developed their concepts based on the existence of such a structure as the OUN, and V. Martynets only theoretically developed a model of such an organization.

Acknowledgments. We express a sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for printing.

Funding. The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahremenko, D. A. (2015). Vnutrennie i vneshnie prichinyi vozniknoveniya ukrainskogo natsionalizma v Rossii v XIX v. [Internal and external causes of Ukrainian nationalism in Russia in the 19th century]. *Rusin, 1*, 116–131. doi: 10.17223/18572685/39/8 [in Russian]

Arendt, H. (1996). *Istoki totalitarizma [The origins of totalitarianism]*. Moskva: TsentrKom, 672 p. URL: https://www.e-reading.club/chapter.php/1017156/53/Arendt_-_Istoki_totalitarizma.html [in Russian]

Armstrong, J. A. (1980). *Ukrainian Nationalism*. Littleton: Ukrainian Academic Press, 361 p. [in English]

Aron, R. (1993). *Demokratiya i totalitarizm [Democracy and totalitarianism]*. Moskva: Tekst, 303 p. URL: https://www.e-reading.club/chapter.php/89783/19/Aron_-_Demokratiya_i_totalitarizm.html [in Russian]

Bakirov, V. S., & Sazonov, N. I. (2005). *Sravnitel'naya politika. Osnovnyie politicheskie sistemyi sovremennogo mira [Comparative policy. The main political systems of the modern world]*. Harkiv, 592 p. [in Russian]

Bokhenskyi, A. (2012) Politychna problema Chervenskoï zemli [The Political Problem of Cherven Land]. *My ne ye ukrainofilamy. Polska politychna dumka pro Ukrainu i ukrainsiv. Antolohiia tekstiv*, Kyiv, 173–215. [in Ukrainian]

Cherkasov, A. A., Krinko, E. F., & Shmigel, M. (2015). Ukrainskiy natsionalizm v godyi vtoroy mirovoy voyny: priroda i proyavleniya [Ukrainian nationalism during the Second World War: nature and manifestations], *Rusin, 2*, 98–117. doi: 10.17223/18572685/40/7 [in Russian]

Dyugi, L. (1914). *Obschestvo, lichnost i gosudarstvo: Sotsialisticheskoe pravo, individualnoe pravo i preobrazovanie gosudarstva* [Society, personality and state: Social law, individual law and state transformation]. Sankt-Peterburg, 77 p. [in Russian]

Friedrich, C., & Brzezinski, Zb. (1956) *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 346 p. URL: https://is.muni.cz/el/1421/jaro2012/HIB0405/Friedrich_-_Brzezinski.pdf [in English]

Hai-Nyzhnyk, P. (2018). Kontsepsiia i model Ukrainskoi derzhavy u prohramovykh zasadakh OUN (r): vid teorii revoliutsiinoi natsiokratii do praktyky "paralelnoi" derzhavnosti (1941 r.) [The concept and model of the Ukrainian state in the programmatic foundations of the OUN (p): from the theory of revolutionary nationalocracy to the practice of "parallel" statehood (1941)]. *Ukraina XX st.: suspilno-politychni modeli natsionalnoi derzhavy (derzhavnytska ideolohiia ta prohramni zasady providnykh ukrainskykh politychnykh partii i hromadsko-politychnykh obiednan.* (pp. 446–539). Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]

Hrynevych, T. (2017). Natsional-demokratychnyi rukh ta natsionalne pytannia u II Rechi Pospolytii [The National Democratic Movement and the National Question in the Second Commonwealth]. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk*, 5, 107–116. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.5.116970 [in Ukrainian]

Kinder, G., Hilgeman, V. (2003). *Vsemirnaya istoriya* [The World History]. Moscow, 638 p. [in Russian]

Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, I. (1973). *Mizh istoriieiu i politykoiu* [Between history and politics]. Munich, 441 p. [in Ukrainian]

Martynets, V. (1927). *Zamitky do maibutnoi konferentsii ukrainskykh natsionalistiv* [Notes on the forthcoming conference of Ukrainian nationalists]. Prague, 20 p. [in Ukrainian]

Mazepa, I. (1949). *Pidstavy nashoho vidrozhennia. T. 2: Problema vidrozhenoii Ukrainy* [Grounds for our rebirth. Vol. 2: The problem of reborn Ukraine]. Prometei, 163 p. [in Ukrainian]

Stetsko, Ya. (1987). *Ukrainska vyzvolna kontsepsiia* [Ukrainian liberation concept]. Munich, 1, 528 p. [in Ukrainian]

Stsiborskyi, M. (1939). *Narys proiektu osnovnykh zakoniv (Konstytutsii) Ukrainskoi derzhavy* [Essay on the Draft Basic Laws (Constitution) of the Ukrainian State], 16 p. [in Ukrainian]

Stsiborskyi, M. (1935). *Natsiokratiia* [Nationocracy]. Paris, 121 p. [in Ukrainian]

Sukhobokova, O. (2018). Prazka hrupa UPSR ta stvorennia Sotsialistychnoi lihy novoho Skhodu [Prague Group of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and creation of the Socialist League of the New East]. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk*, 6, 133–139. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.6.123766 [in Ukrainian]

Troshchynskyi, V. P. (1994). *Mizhvoienna ukrainska emihratsiia v Yevropi yak istorychne i sotsialno-politychne yavyshe* [Interwar Ukrainian emigration in Europe as a historical and socio-political phenomenon]. Kyiv, 260 p. [in Ukrainian]

Tsetsyk, Ya. (2015). Polsko-ukrainski vzaiemovydnosyny na Volyni naperedodni Druhoi svitovoi viiny: prychny konfrontatsii [Polish-Ukrainian relations in Volyn before the Second World War: causes of confrontation]. *Storinky istorii*, 31, 116–125. [in Ukrainian]

Zelinskyi, M. (2018). Ukraina i ukraintsi v politychnii dumtsi Yoakhima Bartoshevycha (1867 – 1938) [Ukraine and the Ukrainians in the Political Thought of Joachim Bartoshevych (1867 – 1938)]. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk*, 6, 86–94. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.6.124679 [in Ukrainian]

The article was received on April 24, 2019.

Article recommended for publishing 06/11/2019.