

UDC 327(477:4)“1920/1930”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.20.240016

Ruslan DEMCHYSHAK

PhD (Political Science), Associate Professor of the Department of Political Science and International Relations, Lviv Polytechnic National University, Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences, 12 Stepan Bandera Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79000 (ruslan.dem74@gmail.com)

Researcher ID: R-1377-2017
ORCID: 0000-0002-9499-7889

Taras STARODUB

Postgraduate Student, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Lviv Polytechnic National University, Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences, 12 Stepan Bandera Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79000 (starodyb-taras@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0002-2792-1745

Руслан ДЕМЧИШАК

кандидат політичних наук, доцент кафедри політології та міжнародних відносин Інституту гуманітарних та соціальних наук Національного університету “Львівська політехніка”, вул. Степана Бандери, 12, м. Львів, Україна, індекс 79000 (ruslan.dem74@gmail.com)

Тарас СТАРОДУБ

аспірант кафедри політології та міжнародних відносин Інституту гуманітарних та соціальних наук Національного університету “Львівська політехніка”, вул. Степана Бандери, 12, м. Львів, Україна, індекс 79000 (starodyb-taras@ukr.net)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Demchyshak, R. & Starodub, T. (2021). Place of Ukraine in the Security System of the Region of Central and Eastern Europe in the Ukrainian Nationalism Theorists' Works (the 20–30s of the XXth century). *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 20, 104–115. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.20.240016

**PLACE OF UKRAINE IN THE SECURITY SYSTEM OF THE REGION
OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE IN THE UKRAINIAN NATIONALISM
THEORISTS' WORKS (the 20–30s of the XXth century)**

Abstract. *The purpose of the research is to study and analyze the Ukrainian nationalism theorists' views of the interwar period of the XXth century concerning the place and role of Ukraine in the security system of the macroregion of Central and Eastern Europe, primarily in the context of developing mechanisms to deter the Russian aggression and the effective realization of its geopolitical potential. The methodology of the research is based on the methods of historicism, comparative analytical and structural system analysis, the principle of problem is applied. The scientific novelty consists in the fact that for the first time there has been elucidated a comprehensive vision of foreign policy directions of Ukraine's development in*

the context of security problems of Central and Eastern Europe in the works of the Ukrainian nationalist thinkers of the interwar period of the XXth century. **The Conclusions.** In the 1920-ies and 1930-ies the Ukrainian nationalism theorists, determining Ukraine's place in the security system of the macroregion of Central and Eastern Europe, considered the following components: Ukraine – Russia, Ukraine – Poland, Ukraine's place in the confrontation with the Western-Eastern civilization, the security policy in the Baltic – the Black Sea region and foreign policy directions of the Black Sea region.

According to the nationalist thinkers, Ukraine should carry out active foreign policy activities in the direction from the Baltic to the Caucasus and the Balkans. Furthermore, Turkey was determined as the main strategic ally of Ukraine among the countries of the Black Sea area, and Bulgaria was also potentially the closest ally among the Eastern Balkan state. It should be mentioned that allied relations with the South Caucasus countries as independent states were vital and the relations with Belarus were considered as a protective shield from the north.

In addition, the Ukrainian thinkers are convinced that only a united Europe can withstand the Russian aggression and its potential geopolitical consequences. Consequently, in Ukrainian thinkers' works Ukraine is given a central place in the security system on the eastern borders of the European continent and a role in countering Russia's aggressive policy.

Key words: Central and Eastern Europe, geopolitics, nationalism, foreign policy strategy, the Ukrainian state.

МІСЦЕ УКРАЇНИ У СИСТЕМІ БЕЗПЕКИ РЕГІОНУ СЕРЕДНЬО-СХІДНОЇ ЄВРОПИ У ПРАЦЯХ ТЕОРЕТИКІВ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО НАЦІОНАЛІЗМУ (20–30-х рр. XX ст.)

Анотація. Мета дослідження – вивчення і аналіз поглядів теоретиків українського націоналізму міжвоєнного періоду XX ст. на місце та роль України у системі безпеки макрорегіону Середньо-Східної Європи, передусім у контексті вироблення механізмів стримування російської агресії та ефективної реалізації свого геополітичного потенціалу. **Методологія дослідження** спирається на методи історизму, порівняльно-аналітичний та структурно-системний аналіз, використовується принцип проблемності. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше подано комплексне бачення зовнішньополітичних напрямів розвитку України у контексті безпекових проблем Середньо-Східної Європи у працях українських мислителів націоналістичного спрямування міжвоєнного періоду XX ст. **Висновки.** Визначаючи місце України у системі безпеки макрорегіону Середньо-Східної Європи, теоретики українського націоналізму 20–30-х рр. XX ст. розглядали такі складові: Україна – Росія, Україна – Польща, місце України у протистоянні Західна – Східна цивілізації, безпекова політика у Балто-Чорноморського регіоні та зовнішньополітичні напрями реалізації її Чорноморської складової.

Україна, на думку мислителів-націоналістів, повинна здійснювати активну зовнішньополітичну діяльність у напрямі від Балтики по Кавказ і Балкани. Серед країн чорноморського простору головним стратегічним союзником України вважалася Туреччина, також потенційно найближчим союзником позиціонувалася східнобалканська держава – Болгарія. Важлива роль відводилася союзницьким відносинам з країнами Південного Кавказу як незалежними державами, а також відносинам з Білоруссю як захисним щитом з півночі.

Українські мислителі переконані, що лише об'єднана Європа здатна протистояти російській агресії та її потенційним геополітичним наслідкам. У своїх працях вони відводять Україні центральне місце у системі безпеки на східних кордонах Європейського континенту та роль противаги агресивній політиці Росії.

Ключові слова: Середньо-Східна Європа, геополітика, націоналізм, зовнішньополітична стратегія, Українська держава.

The Problem Statement. The Ukrainian state faced numerous geopolitical challenges at the beginning of the XXIst century, due to clear historical tradition. It should be mentioned that Ukraine is facing the problem of developing and implementing an effective geopolitical doctrine that would help maximize its geopolitical potential in the region of Central and

Eastern Europe, while creating reliable guarantees of protection from the constant military threat from Russia for more than a century. Taking into account the Ukrainian state economic and military potential, as well as its geopolitical position, Ukraine has a golden opportunity to become a leader in the macro-region of Central and Eastern Europe, in general, and the Baltic-Black Sea region, in particular.

As a result, there were diverse practitioners and theorists of the Ukrainian nationalist movement of the interwar period of the XXth century, who devoted their works to the above-mentioned issue: Dmytro Dontsov, Yuriy Lypa, Dmytro Andriyevskiy, Mykhailo Kolodzynskiy, Dmytro Myron, Zenon Pelenskiy and the others. Hence, the theorists' geopolitical visions remain relevant at the current stage of Ukraine's foreign policy strategy development.

The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications. Numerous researchers studied geopolitical views of the Ukrainian nationalism theorists of the 20–30-ies of the XXth century: O. Bahan (Bahan, 2016), V. V'yatrovych (V'yatrovych, 2004), R. Demchyshak (Demchyshak, 2014), O. Zaytsev (Zaytsev, 2012), H. Kas'yanov (Kas'yanov, 2004), M. Posivnych (Posivnych, 2018) and the others. However, the above-mentioned authors did not conduct a comprehensive study on the works of the Ukrainian nationalist thinkers of the interwar period of the XXth century concerning the issue of determining the foreign policy directions of Ukraine's development in the context of security problems of Central and Eastern Europe.

The purpose of the research is to study and analyze the Ukrainian nationalism theorists' views of the interwar period of the XXth century concerning the place and role of Ukraine in the security system of the macroregion of Central and Eastern Europe, primarily in the context of developing mechanisms to deter Russian aggression and the effective realization of its geopolitical potential.

In addition, the geographical and geopolitical position of the Ukrainian state in all historical periods was favorable for it to become one of the main factors of European security and stability. Due to the location on the shores of the Black Sea, combined with Ukraine's efforts to integrate culturally, politically and economically into the European Community, made the best contribution to this mission.

The Main Material Statement. Dmytro Andriyevskiy's views should be taken into consideration. This is because the researcher's views were interesting in terms of determining the impact of the world history events on the process of Ukraine's geopolitical positioning. In his geopolitical visions, the thinker highlighted the economic benefits of the location of Knyazyi Kyiv, put emphasis on the fact that Kyiv State was a trade center, where merchants from Europe and Asia had their offices. Owing to the advantageous geopolitical position on the way "from the Vikings to the Greeks", Kyiv political influence managed to extend as far as the Caucasus and the Balkans.

However, according to D. Andriyevskiy, two events took place that did not allow Kyiv to realize its geopolitical prospects and changed the Ukrainian state development course radically. The first event, which occurred, was the Byzantine Empire disappearance and the Ottoman Empire emergence in its place, as a result, Kyiv State became detached from the Black Sea, which came under the Turks' complete control. Hence, Kyiv lost its importance as a trade, political and cultural center between Europe and Asia, as well as the status of a maritime state.

The second important event that diminished the geopolitical importance of Ukraine as a maritime power was the discovery of America. Owing to the navigation's center relocation from the Mediterranean to the world's oceans, as well as the decline in the importance of

the eastern land routes from Europe to Asia, led to the complete isolation of the Black Sea. D. Andriyevskiy stated that after the above-mentioned event: “The main world political, cultural and trade ties stretched around Ukraine, leaving it as a province, which from the XVth to the XIXth century was forced to wage a constant struggle for its own existence and was repeatedly divided between its neighbours: Moscow, Poland and Turkey” (Andriyevskiy, 1928, p. 316).

It should be mentioned that at the same time, Dmytro Andriyevskiy was convinced firmly that Ukraine as a country with its historical tradition, cultural and economic ties, belonged to the Western civilization.

Furthermore, one more renowned figure kept to the same point of view, Dmytro Dontsov put emphasis on the fact that Ukraine belonged historically to the Western European community on many grounds, in particular “given its geological and climatic conditions, and most importantly its river system, which is not a continuation of the Eastern Russian plain, but because of Lithuania and Poland and through their river system it is an extension of Central Europe. And although Ukraine was politically separated from Europe at the end of the XVIIIth century, culturally it always belonged to European civilization” (Dontsov, 1957, p. 84).

In Mykhailo Kolodzinskyi’s mind, Ukraine’s geopolitical future was seen in Eastern Europe. The purpose of the Ukrainian nation was defined as a cultural, trade and political center in this geopolitical space. According to Kolodzinskyi, “After all, since ancient times, the Ukrainian state must fulfill a strategic task – to establish geopolitical control over the Black and Caspian Seas, defending this area, as well as European culture from Russian military and ideological aggression” (Kolodzinskyi, 1957, p. 27).

In addition, Yuriy Lypa, in contrast to the traditional choice of vectors of Ukraine’s foreign policy development in the East-West coordinate system, defined the South as the main geopolitical axis of development for Ukraine. He believed that the “South-North” was Ukraine’s main geopolitical coordinate, determined by the established Ukrainian tradition. In his work, which was called “The Black Sea Doctrine”, Yuriy Lypa gave the Ukrainian state the primacy among the Black Sea countries, given its space, wealth and population. “The Black Sea area is a vital space for Ukraine, which is a vault around the Black Sea, which has a beam length of 800 – 900 km around its natural center, which is the Crimean Peninsula” (Lypa, 2007, p. 17).

Taking everything into consideration, the Ukrainian nationalist thinkers, each with his own specifics, attributed Ukraine to Western civilization in general, giving it the role of a leader in the region of Eastern Europe or the Black Sea.

Hence, the Ukrainian nationalist thinkers identified the main foreign policy threat – the Russian Empire in all its forms, which, in their opinion, will always menace Ukraine’s existence as a sovereign state, try to destroy its geopolitical potential and prevent European integration in their geopolitical works. At the same time, they identified the paramount causes and motives of Russia’s aggressive policy towards Ukraine and ways to overcome it.

Consequently, the Ukrainian thinker, Dmytro Dontsov noted that Russia’s policy left Ukraine no choice in foreign policy formation and made the Ukrainian state face a dilemma: “with them or against them?”. D. Dontsov stated confidently the following: “our main national strategic task should be the principle of complete independence from Moscow and imitation of Western culture, which saves Europe from Moscow’s invasion” (Dontsov, 1957, p. 89).

It should be mentioned that Russia always felt the cultural and political threat from Europe instinctively and tried to fight with Europe in various methods and forms. Therefore, as Dmytro Dontsov stated, Russia cannot allow Ukraine’s rapprochement with Europe, let alone the full integration of Kyiv into the European community, and will make every effort

to prevent and make such integration processes impossible. Moreover, Dmytro Dontsov made the following conclusion: “worldview civilizational confrontation between Russia and Europe is a struggle of two hostile civilizations, which will lead to a constant struggle between these two different worlds and cultures” (Dontsov, 1957, p. 80).

D. Dontsov’s thoughts were developed by D. Andriyevskiy. As a result, Dmytro Andriyevskiy in his geopolitical visions noted that Ukraine, independent of Moscow, politically, economically and culturally integrated into Europe, will be able to move Europe’s borders far to the East and North. It is obvious that such a geopolitical perspective was perceived by the Russian state leadership as a threat.

Moreover, D. Andriyevskiy also managed to spot the obvious fact that in the XVIIIth century Russia’s capture of large and extremely important from the geopolitical point of view of the Ukrainian space changed its foreign policy orientation, which until then was directed to the East and the North exclusively. D. Andriyevskiy concluded the following in this regard: “Since then, Russia began to promote its influence in the Caucasus, the Balkans and the Crimea. Russia tried to capture the Black Sea from the South, tried to spread its influence in the Persian Gulf, and even tried to reach the Suez” (Andriyevskiy, 1930, p. 223).

Hence, the above-mentioned information reflects Ukraine’s significance in Russia’s confrontation with the West, which is confirmed by modern international realities convincingly. Nowadays, military aggression by Russia and the Ukrainian territories’ annexation are seen in this context as an attempt to restore imperial control in Central and Eastern Europe, which gives Moscow enormous advantages in the geopolitical confrontation with Europe and the United States.

Mykhailo Kolodzynskiy in his works, carried on working on his predecessors’ thoughts, also drew attention to the fact that: “the way to Eastern Europe passes through Kyiv” (Kolodzynskiy, 1957, p. 40). Such realities motivate Russia to wage a constant and uncompromising struggle for the geopolitical control over Ukraine in order to ensure a dominant influence on the political situation in Eastern Europe. As a result, we should state again, in support of the thinker’s views, that current war between Russia and Ukraine is being waged for a geopolitical leadership in Eastern Europe not so much for the Crimea or Donbas.

In addition, M. Kolodzynskiy made the conclusion: “since the eternal struggle for dominance in Eastern Europe is being waged in Ukraine, the Ukrainians are forced to be in a constant war with Russia, which is a spiritual threat to the whole world” (Kolodzynskiy, 1957, p. 40).

The Ukrainian thinker was convinced that in order to stop Moscow military aggression, Ukraine must give an adequate military response. The condition for this is the readiness to defend the independent Ukrainian state, the ability to create a combat ready naval and air force, the drastic need to strengthen its geopolitical position in Eastern Europe.

Another Ukrainian thinker, Dmytro Myron, shared the same point of view. D. Myron argued that the determining factor in the armed struggle against the Russian aggressor will be the high state of combat readiness and cohesion of the internal forces of the Ukrainian people themselves and their ability to fight the occupier. Consequently, international support will be a separate favorable factor that will provide new additional opportunities for the Ukrainian people successful struggle. At the same time, Dmytro Myron in his work “The Idea and Act of Ukraine” noted that the confrontation between Moscow and Kyiv was a landmark phenomenon not only for Ukraine itself, but also for all Eastern European countries, which were under constant pressure from Russian imperial policy. According to the thinker: “Ukraine’s victory in this confrontation will guarantee the restoration of the balance of power in this geopolitical region and help rebuild Eastern Europe effectively on the basis of the

national principle of equality of all independent states between the Baltic, the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea” (Myron, 2018, p. 303).

Dmytro Andriyevskiy, considered Moscow imperialism to be the most dangerous of all foreign policy threats to the Ukrainian state, which aimed at the complete destruction of Ukrainian nation’s historically, spiritually and physically, while developing his previous thoughts. Moreover, the thinker stated that in the Russian – Ukrainian War, the Ukrainians must realize what it means for them to be “to be or not to be”, while for Russia it is about its economic and geopolitical preferences in building a new Russian empire. Dmytro Andriyevskiy also claimed that “the Russian aggression can be stopped only by Kyiv’s victory over Moscow” (Roh, 2010, p. 82).

Yuriy Lypa in his geopolitical visions made conclusion that Russia’s and Ukraine’s geographical location determined to be complete opposite. According to the thinker, “If the land axis of Ukraine is the northeastern shore of the Black Sea, then such an axis for Russia is the upper Volga region. Another important difference between the two states is the direction of the rivers. If in Russia most of the rivers flow to the North, in Ukraine on the contrary, they flow to the South. Therefore, Ukraine is the South and Russia is the North” (Lypa, 2007, p. 277).

In Yuriy Lypa’s opinion, it is impossible to talk about the peaceful coexistence of these two irreconcilable centers of different civilizations – Kyiv and Moscow. Therefore, the only possible and acceptable way out for Ukraine in this geopolitical situation, according to the thinker is the following: “The destruction of Russia – as a center of supranational distribution of land over the Volga, Pechora and the White Sea” (Lypa, 2007). Only on condition of the absence of a geopolitical threat from the North, Ukraine will be able to realize its geopolitical potential and guarantee sustainable economic development in the Black Sea macro-region fully.

It should be noted that Yuriy Lypa was not talking about the Russian state destruction, but only about the empire’s liquidation. Consequently, several nation-states of the Finnish and Ural peoples must be formed at the territory of the modern Russian Federation. And Moscow state “will be able to exist at its historical geographical territories, which will delineate the national borders of the “Russians”, and there will appear a state formation much smaller in size than the Ukrainian state” (Lypa, 2007).

As a result, both Ukrainian thinkers: Dmytro Myron and Yuriy Lypa considered the fact of the Russian Empire’s complete collapse, as the main precondition for Ukraine’s successful geopolitical development in the region of Central and Eastern Europe and the full realization of its potential in it, but not a great alliance, agreement or federation with Russia.

Thus, all Ukrainian political thought of a nationalist orientation representatives were unanimous virtually in determining the main foreign policy threat to Ukraine. It was Russia’s position in all possible forms of its imperialist policy. Moscow imperialism was proclaimed the paramount hindrance not only to Ukraine’s European development path but also to the state formation process in general.

Hence, the Ukrainian nationalist thinkers considered Ukraine’s successful geopolitical development in its natural macro-regions of Central and Eastern Europe and the Baltic-Black Sea, which is in fact a continuation of the former.

Dmytro Dontsov considered the integration process into the European Community to be correct and natural for Ukraine. In addition to the fact that Ukraine historically belongs to European civilization, it also has an extremely important historical mission – to be a shield for Europe against Russia, which not only destroys the fundamental forces of the Ukrainian nation, but also destroys the basic principles of Western culture. D. Dontsov put emphasis

on that the protection of our independence was equivalent to the protection of European traditions and values. In fact, the victory of one of the two principles on the continent depends on Ukraine's foreign policy positioning in the macro-region of Central and Eastern Europe: European or Moscow. After all, Ukraine was always the first to accept the onslaught of Russia's political and cultural expansion to the West.

Dmytro Andriyevskiy expressed similar views, noting that Ukraine should become one of the main factors of security on the European continent. The thinker made the following conclusion, while developing his thoughts: "Only an independent Ukraine that is able to conduct independent foreign policy can stop Russia's geopolitical expansion to the European continent and push the boundaries of the latter's influence from the Carpathians beyond the Caucasus and the Caspian Sea" (Andriyevskiy, 1928, p. 381).

Furthermore, Andriyevskiy stated that the specifics of Ukraine's geopolitical position allow: 1) to guarantee the security of Western Europe in its confrontation with Russia; 2) to promote the establishment of mutually beneficial political and economic cooperation between these two different and irreconcilable world civilizations.

The geopolitical views of the Ukrainian thinkers in relation to Poland are somewhat different. This is primarily due to the peculiarities of the historical coexistence of Ukraine and Poland. It should be mentioned that in the 20–30s of the XXth century Western Ukraine was under the Polish occupation and subjected to all kinds of oppression by the Polish authorities, who tried in every way to suppress the Ukrainian nation independent movements.

Despite diverse unresolved issues between Ukraine and Poland that developed during the long historical coexistence, the Ukrainian thinker, D. Dontsov believed that they were local in nature and will not have a decisive impact on the general state of the Ukrainian-Polish relations. Dmytro Dontsov identified Poland as Ukraine's main strategic partner in Central and Eastern Europe.

Ukraine and Poland must work together to counter Russia's aggressive policy in Central and Eastern Europe, becoming a center for uniting other countries in countering geopolitical threats from Russia. It should be mentioned that Russia is not eager to see the existence of Kyiv and Warsaw as independent political centers in achieving its imperialist goals. According to Taras Starodub, Europe cannot be indifferent to the Russian-Ukrainian War, and the European community must use all means at its disposal, including all economic potential, in order to stop the Russian aggression, which once again poses a huge threat to European security, as this primarily applies to the Baltic States, Poland and the entire Baltic-Black Sea basin (Starodub, 2019, p. 52).

Only a united Europe can guarantee security and stability on the European continent and stop the Russian aggression. Taking into account the above-mentioned, D. Dontsov quoted Herzen rightly: "Russia can take over Europe to the Atlantic Ocean, just as it can be defeated up to the Urals. In the first case, Europe must be separated. In the second, Europe must be united firmly" (Dontsov, 1957, p. 99).

Dmytro Andriyevskiy, who considered Ukraine to be the second main geopolitical adversary, held a completely different opinion. The Ukrainian thinker stated that although Poland did not threaten our independence, it may hinder Ukraine's geopolitical potential development in Eastern Europe. Furthermore, D. Andriyevskiy noted that neither the Polish public nor the state's leadership treat the Ukrainian state's independence properly and did not realize its importance for the security and independent existence of Poland.

At the same time, Poland belongs to the European Community common with Ukraine, and this requires from Ukraine a completely different foreign policy approach. First of all, Ukraine

must convey to the European community the argument that any anti-Ukrainian policy conducted by Poland, weakens the Eastern Front and weakens Europe in the face of the Russian threat.

According to Dmytro Andriyevskiy, Ukraine, fighting the Russian aggression, must find a good opportunity to get rid of the political swing between Moscow and Warsaw and find reliable allies outside them. Due to the Ukrainian integration into the European community it could be implemented. As a result, the Ukrainian state will be able to take on the role of a unifying center in Eastern Europe, joining the political processes taking place on the continent. The Ukrainian thinker made the following conclusion: “The Ukrainian policy can and should vote for that consolidation, naturally promoting a radical reorganization of the state borders in the East. In this way, Ukraine will enter the system of European relations faster and easier and gain common ground with international political factors, than if it, while opposing state delimitation in the East, kept away from the whole of Europe” (Andriyevskiy, 1930, p. 226).

Mykhailo Kolodzynskiy also warns Kyiv concerning the readiness for a constant geopolitical struggle on two fronts at the same time: with Russia and Poland in his geopolitical visions. In addition, the Ukrainian thinker also considered these two countries to be Ukraine’s main competitors and opponents in the struggle for geopolitical supremacy in the Eastern Europe region.

It should be mentioned that M. Kolodzynskiy rejected any claims of Russia and Poland to the Ukrainian territories, as well as their desire to establish leadership positions in Eastern Europe. The thinker stated that such a historical right belonged to Ukraine exclusively. Moreover, M. Kolodzynskiy drew historical parallels and claims that Ukraine was the first to accept and deter the Tatars attack on the European continent, thus, saving Western civilization from imminent political and cultural destruction. And Moscow and Warsaw, at that time, were developing and strengthening their positions, and were carefully preparing for the attack on Ukraine (Kolodzynskiy, 1957, p. 39).

However, such Ukrainian thinkers’ views may seem somewhat outdated and irrelevant, but the events of recent years, including the so-called “war of the monuments” based on different interpretations of complex pages of the Ukrainian-Polish history, as well as some diplomatic statements by Poland and Hungary, provide the opposite ideas.

Hence, in determining the place of Ukraine in the security system of the region of Central and Eastern Europe, the Ukrainian nationalism theorists gave an important place to the Ukrainian-Polish relations. Moreover, there was no unity in views concerning the above-mentioned issue. D. Dontsov considered Ukraine and Poland as allies in the joint security mission in Eastern Europe, and D. Andriyevskiy and M. Kolodzynskiy regarded the countries as competitors.

The Ukrainian nationalist thinkers paid special attention to Ukraine’s geopolitical positioning in the Baltic-Black Sea macroregion.

Yuriy Lypa presented his Black Sea doctrine as a basis for Ukraine’s foreign policy. The thinker considered the Black Sea space vital for Ukraine and assigns it the first place among the Black Sea countries.

Yuriy Lypa put emphasis on Ukraine’s indisputable right to own the Crimea, either as the heiress of the Bosphorus Empire or as the heiress of Kyiv great power. The Crimea was identified by Yuri Lypa as the main command center of the Black Sea vault.

Furthermore, Yuriy Lypa paid vital attention to mutually beneficial, good-neighborly relations between Ukraine and Belarus, which he considered the key to the Black Sea vault. Therefore, Belarus must always be in the forefront of geopolitical priorities of the Ukrainian foreign policy, so that it does not become a geopolitical tool in the hands of neighbours, especially Russia, hence, an open threat from the north. The thinker put emphasis on the

following: “The Belarusian lands are not an admission to the common border between the Baltic and Finno-Ural expansion centers. The swamps and forests of Belarus are the best as compared to the threat to Ukraine from the North (Lypa, 2007, p. 18).

According to Dmytro Myron, the author of “The Idea and Action of Ukraine”, Belarus can gain independence and economic development with the support of a strong Ukraine. Moreover, the renowned thinker truly believed that the geopolitical future of Belarus should be in close cooperation with Ukraine, not Russia, as Russia did not allow Belarus to develop fully its political, cultural and economic potential fully.

According to Dmytro Myron, Ukraine was given the role of a driving force and the main subject in the geopolitical space over the Baltic, the Caspian and the Black Seas. But in order for Ukraine to stop the Russian aggression in the Black Sea region, it needs to assert its geopolitical influence in the Caucasus, the Caspian Sea and Turkestan.

In addition, Dmytro Myron proclaimed the independent Caucasian states creation and removing them from Russia’s sphere of influence as the main priorities of the Ukrainian geopolitics in the Caucasus. Future subjects of international relations in the Caucasus were considered as potential allies of Ukraine. Consequently, Oleh Bahan considered the above-mentioned thesis to be super-relevant for the modern Ukrainian state, which suffered such a fatal blow from the south-east (occupation of the Crimea and Eastern Donbass by Moscow), namely, from the Caucasian direction (Bahan, 2016).

However, D. Myron believed that Ukraine should support the concept of an independent state of Turkestan and the Idel-Urals, while establishing ties with the Turkic peoples, who were under constant pressure from Moscow (Starodub, 2020, p. 193). It should be mentioned that in the geopolitical sense, their geographical location, which is a giant belt from Turkey to Tugva-Uyghur, serves as a deterrent for Russia to pursue its aggressive policy in the south.

Moreover, Zenon Pelenskyi decided to keep to the views of his predecessor, arguing that only if Russia’s expansion in the Caspian-Caucasus was blocked, its attack on the Ukrainian territory could be prevented. Z. Pelenskyi considered the strong contacts’ establishment with three Transcaucasian states: Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan to be the main task for the Ukrainian foreign policy in this geopolitical region. The renowned thinker also considered the vital idea, in particular, to establish foreign policy relations with the pre-Caucasian peoples: the Dontsy, the Kubans and the Volga Tatars, who should create the European Cossacks Federation (Muravskyi, 2006, p. 271).

Hence, the Ukrainian thinker Yuriy Lypa noted that Ukraine should support the idea fully and promote the Caucasus unification in all major aspects: geopolitical, economic and cultural, as this geopolitical space was perceived as part of the entire Black Sea macroregion. The countries of the Caucasus and Transcaucasia were considered by the thinker to be strategically important allies of Ukraine in the Black Sea area. Moreover, Yuriy Lypa stated the following: “The connecting link between Ukraine and the Caucasian peoples should be the Kuban, whose population is related to the population of southern Ukraine, and which from the end of the XVIIIth century became the center of the Ukrainian resettlement” (Lypa, 2007, p. 44).

According to Yuriy Lypa, Turkey should become Ukraine’s main partner in the Black Sea region. The two states will combine not only geographical proximity, but also common economic and political interests. In addition, Turkey and Ukraine will be united by security issues in the face of a common threat: Ukraine from the north and Turkey from the south and southwest. Therefore, the political alliance between Ukraine and Turkey is becoming a crucial link in security and cooperation in the Baltic-Black Sea region.

However, Dmytro Myron made bold to state that there may be contradictions between Ukraine and Turkey in the struggle for the spheres of influence in the Caucasus and Transcaucasia, despite common economic and political interests.

Oleh Bahan, taking into consideration Yuriy Lypa's and Dmytro Myron's geopolitical visions, had clear understanding of the main strategy for the nation on the Black Sea: to solve the problems of relations with Turkey and begin together to "build a strong geopolitical bastion of common dominance in the Black Sea" (Bahan, 2016).

Another important geopolitical region for Ukraine in the creation of the Black Sea Union is the Balkans. Yuriy Lypa considered Bulgaria to be the central country of the region, at the same time very close and mentally related to Ukraine.

Zenon Pelenskyi also highlighted the importance of establishing close relations with Bulgaria in order to weaken Romania's influence and gain wider access to the Black Sea.

On the other hand, Yuriy Lypa noted that due to the Black Sea unification, it could be possible to initiate a new form of socio political system and contribute to new growth of European culture with the specifics inherent in the mentality of the Black Sea space. According to Yuriy Lypa, Ukraine should be the main initiator of these integration processes, given its geopolitical location and the huge Ukrainian vault, which is the four-seventh of the Black Sea space and wealth. The Ukrainian thinker made the following conclusion: "The Black Sea doctrine of the unity of the Black Sea states and the first place of Ukraine in the unity is the doctrine of development and offensive" (Lypa, 2007, p. 98).

Taking everything into consideration, we can state that the main foreign policy issues on the Black Sea component of the Baltic-Black Sea macroregion, theorists of the Ukrainian nationalism (Yu. Lypa, D. Myron, Z. Pelenskyi) considered: the Caucasian direction (or the Caspian-Caucasian direction), the Balkan relations with Turkey. The Black Sea area was considered as an important factor in the formation of the security system of the entire region of Central and Eastern Europe, an integral element of which was considered Ukraine.

The Conclusions. The Ukrainian nationalism theorists in the 1920s and 1930s, determining Ukraine's place in the security system of the macroregion of Central and Eastern Europe, considered the following components: Ukraine – Russia, Ukraine – Poland, Ukraine's place in the confrontation with the Western-Eastern civilization, the security policy in the Baltic-Black Sea region and foreign policy directions of its Black Sea component.

According to the nationalist thinkers, Ukraine should carry out active foreign policy activities in the direction from the Baltic to the Caucasus and the Balkans. Furthermore, Turkey was determined as the main strategic ally of Ukraine among the countries of the Black Sea area, and Bulgaria was also potentially the closest ally among the Eastern Balkan state. It should be mentioned that allied relations with the South Caucasus countries as independent states were vital and the relations with Belarus were considered as a protective shield from the north.

The Ukrainian-Polish relations were given the paramount role in determining Ukraine's place in the security system of the region of Central and Eastern Europe by the Ukrainian nationalism theorists. Moreover, there was no unity in views on this issue. D. Dontsov considered Ukraine and Poland as allies in the joint security mission in Eastern Europe, and D. Andriyevskyi and M. Kolodzinskyi – as competitors.

The Russian Empire in all its forms was unequivocally positioned as the main foreign policy threat. Hence, the emergence of a number of independent states in the ethnically non-Russian territories of Russia in accordance with their national and historical character will correspond to Ukraine's geopolitical interest.

In addition, the Ukrainian thinkers are convinced that only a united Europe can withstand the Russian aggression and its potential geopolitical consequences. Consequently, Ukraine is given a central place in the security system on the eastern borders of the European continent and a role in countering Russia's aggressive policy in Ukrainian thinkers' works. In the context of modern international politics, the question remains whether Ukraine will play this role in the guise of a country – the last EU member in the east (the concept of “outpost”) or a buffer country between the EU and Russia (the concept of “bridge”).

The Prospects for the Further Research. The foreign policy situation in which Ukraine finds itself requires the an effective and efficient geopolitical development strategy to deter the Russian aggression and preserve the integrity and independence of its territory. Taking into consideration, the international relations' modern system's active transformation and the world politics and the definition of Ukraine's geopolitical priorities, the prospect of further research into the geopolitical achievements of the Ukrainian nationalist thinkers seems quite relevant and is highly demanded.

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

Financing. The authors did not receive financial support for the research, authorship and publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andriyevskiy, D. (1928). Ukraina u svitoviy politytsi. [Ukraine in world politics]. *Rozbudova Natsii. Orhan Provodu Ukrayins'kykh Natsionalistiv*, 9, 313–319. [in Ukrainian]

Andriyevskiy, D. (1928). Ukraina u svitoviy politytsi. [Ukraine in world politics]. *Rozbudova Natsii. Orhan Provodu Ukrayins'kykh Natsionalistiv*, 10–11, 378–382. [in Ukrainian]

Andriyevskiy, D. (1930). Polityka natsionalizmu (Zovnishn'o-derzhavnytski zmahannya). [Politics of nationalism (Foreign state competitions)]. *Rozbudova Natsii. Orhan Provodu Ukrayins'kykh Natsionalistiv*, 9–10, 220–228. [in Ukrainian]

Bahan, O. (2016). Aktualnist' derzhavnytskykh natsionalistychnykh kontseptsiy u tvorchosti Dmytra Myrona. [The relevance of state nationalist concepts in the work of Dmitry Myron]. URL: <http://ukrnationalism.com/history/1899-aktualnist-derzhavnytskykh-natsionalistychnykh-kontseptsii-u-tvorchosti-dmytra-myrona.html>. [in Ukrainian]

Demchyshak, R. (2014) Zovnishnya polityka derzhavy v ukrayinskii politychniy dumtsi Zakhidnoii Ukrainy natsionalistychnoho spryamuvannya mizhvoyennoho periodu XX st. [Foreign policy of the state in the Ukrainian political thought of Western Ukraine of the nationalist orientation of the interwar period of the XX century]. *Ukrayinska natsionalna ideya: realii ta perspektyvy rozvytku*, 26, 15–20. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Unir_2014_26_5. [in Ukrainian]

Dontsov, D. (1957). *Pidstavy nashoi polityky*. [The basis of our policy]. N'yū-York: OCHSU, 210 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kas'yanov, H. (2004). Ideolohiya OUN: istoryko-retrospektyvnyi analiz. [Ideology of the OUN: historical and retrospective analysis]. URL: http://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Kasianov/Ideolohia_OUN. [in Ukrainian]

Kolodzinskiy, M. (1957). *Ukrayinska voyenna doktryna*. [Ukrainian military doctrine]. Toronto. [in Ukrainian]

Lypa, Yu. (2007). Heopolitychni oriyentry novoyi Ukrainy. [Geopolitical landmarks of the new Ukraine]. URL: http://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Lypa/Heopolitychni_oryentry_novoi_Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian]

Lypa, Yu. (2007). *Vseukrayinska trylohiya: U 2 t. T. 2.: Chornomorska doktryna; Chornomorskyi prostir (atlas); Rozpodil Rosii*. [All-Ukrainian trilogy: In 2 vols. Vol. 2.: Black Sea doctrine; Black Sea space (atlas); The division of Russia]. Kyiv: MAUP, 392 p. [in Ukrainian]

Muravskiy, V. (Comps.). (2006). *Pelenskyi Zenon. Mizhnarodna polityka Ukrainy. Konhres Ukrayinskykh Natsionalistiv 1929 r.: dokumenty i materialy*. [Pelenskyi Zenon. International politics

of Ukraine. Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists 1929: documents and materials]. Lviv, 420 p. [in Ukrainian]

Myron, D. (2018). *Ideya i chyn Ukrainy. [The idea and rank of Ukraine]*. Kyiv: Ukrainska vydavnycha sprava, 316 p. [in Ukrainian]

Posivnych, M. (2018). Formuvannya zovnishn'oyi polityky OUN (1929 – 1939). [Formation of OUN foreign policy (1929 – 1939)]. URL: <http://ukrnationalism.com/history/3096-formuvannia-zovnishnoi-polityky-oun-1929-1939.html>. [in Ukrainian]

Roh, V. (Comps.). (2010). *Andriyevskiy Dmytro. Rozbudova Natsiyi. Ukrayins'kyi natsionalizm: Antolohiya*. Vol. 1. Kyiv: FOP Stebelyak O. M., 384 p. [in Ukrainian]

Starodub, T. (2019). Zovnishn'opolitychni oriyentyry Ukrainy u heopolitychnykh viziyakh Dmytra Andriyevskoho (20–30-i roky XX st.). [Foreign policy guidelines of Ukraine in the geopolitical visions of Dmytro Andrievsky (20–30s of the XX century)]. *Naukovyi zhurnal "Humanitarni vizii"*, 5 (1), 50–56. doi: <https://doi.org/10.23939/shv2019.01.050>. [in English]

Starodub, T. (2020). Shlyakhy protydii rosiyskoyi ahresii v heopolitychnykh viziyakh Mykhayla Klodzinskoho ta Dmytra Myrona. [Ways to counteract Russian aggression in the geopolitical visions of Mykhaylo Kolodzinsky and Dmytro Myron]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriya filosofsko-politolohichni studiyi*, 28, 190–196. doi: <https://doi.org/10.30970/2307-1664.2020.28.2>. [in Ukrainian]

V'yatrovych, V. (2004). Osnovni pryntsyipy zovnishn'oyi polityky OUN. [Basic principles of OUN foreign policy]. *Ukrayins'kyi vyzvol'nyi rukh*, (3), 16–29. [in Ukrainian]

Zaytsev, O. (2012). *Ideolohiya i politychna stratehiya OUN do 1939 roku. [Ideology and political strategy of the OUN until 1939]*. URL: <http://er.ucu.edu.ua/handle/1/890>. [in Ukrainian]

The article was received October 14, 2020.

Article recommended for publishing 31/08/2021.