

**UDC 327.33**

**BBK 66.4**

*Mykola Genyk*

**THE INFLUENCE OF POLISH-UKRAINIAN RECONCILIATION ON SECURITY  
EAST CENTRAL EUROPEAN REGION**

*Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation provided for solution of several problems: constructing of a new system of international relations in East Central Europe, resolution of borders issue, liberalization of policy concerning national minorities and overcoming of interethnic stereotypes. Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation made positive influence on geopolitical and democratic transformations in East Central Europe. Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation is an example of positive resolution of complicated interethnic conflict. International reconciliation processes make basis for forming of unified Europe and favour strengthening of security and stability.*

**Key words:** *Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation, Polish-Ukrainian relations, East Central Europe.*

Polish-Ukrainian conflict was one of the most large-scale conflicts in East Central Europe (ECE). In the period of World War II parallel to German-Soviet conflict lasted undeclared Polish-Ukrainian war (1942-1947). Changes of borders, displacement and deportation of population aggravated interethnic antagonisms. Totalitarian regime exploited Polish-Ukrainian antagonisms for forming of image of enemy and strengthening of its rule. Struggle for independence and democracy provided for need of reconciliation and coordination of liberal efforts. The importance of reconciliation was dictated by key role of both countries in Warsaw Treaty Organization and the USSR, situation on strategic sector between Russia and Europe.

Methodological basis of the research is positive peace theory of Johan Galtung, Bert V.F.Rölliing, Kenneth Boulding, Gunter Frank, Dieter Senghaas, Ekkehart Krippendorff. As opposed to negative peace that was taken as absence of war and organized violence positive peace is a state that is characterized by elimination of causes of inequality and injustice and creates optimal conditions for individual and collective self-realization of a person. The conception of positive peace implies liberty, sovereignty, equality, justice, economic cooperation and common international security. Thereby the content of Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation was the process of development of bilateral relations after World War II from negative to positive peace.

Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation provided for solution of several problems: constructing of a new system of international relations in ECE, resolution of borders issue, liberalization of policy concerning national minorities and overcoming of interethnic stereotypes [2, 33].

ECE in the 20<sup>th</sup> century was characterized by a number of facts that led to destabilization of macroregion, the division into the spheres of influence of great powers and transformation into the epicenter of world conflicts. Political thought of ECE nations proposed a new system of international relations in ECE based on the regional integration of small countries and the creation of the center of force between Russia and Germany. In political literature there exists an opinion that the liquidation of the Danubian monarchy of Habsburgs and the absence within its territory such supernational formation that would compensate its geopolitical functions, cause the disbalance of forces in ECE and its division

into the spheres of influence between the USSR and Germany. The beginning of World War II and the loss of independence of ECE countries made this problem urgent.

The processes of integration were concentrated in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Ukraine, etc. Poland was one of main countries of the region initiated many projects of regional integration. These conceptions were the continuation of federalist plans that were worked out by Polish political philosopher in the period of formation of Second Republic (Druga Rzeczpospolita). By the territorial principle the projects of regional integration can be classified into three types: those that covered the whole Intermarium (The Adriatic Sea – the Baltic Sea – the Black Sea) or its larger part, other narrower variants, and unity of two mentioned above models. According to the leading role of Poland and the competence of other subjects of federation projects can be divided into dominant and equitable.

The end of World War II and the beginning of integration of Western European countries on the basis of Schuman-Plan and impossibility of direct participation of ECE countries in these projects determined the appearance of projects of Central European integration. This point was observed as one of the means of struggle for democratization of the countries of socialist camp, liquidation of totalitarianism and Soviet enslavement and providing geopolitical stability of the region. After war emigration from ECE countries began to discuss actively the problem of federation. In a number of countries – Germany, Italy, Great Britain – Federal Clubs appeared the members of which were Hungarian, Lithuanian, Yugoslavian, Byelorussian, Latvian, Estonian, Polish and Ukrainian delegations.

A few main models of regional integration had been actively discussed. The Ukrainian political thought preferred the conception of “Small Intermarium” that is rapprochement of Lithuania, Poland, Byelorussia and Ukraine paying attention to the conception of Intermarium that didn’t exhaust needs of Ukrainian external policy. The Ukrainian emigration actively popularized its conception in Prometheus League. However the sabotage of the Ukrainian vision of ECE federation can be observed after making comparative analysis of V.Soloviy, D.Andriyevsky and M.Livytsky projects.

V. Soloviy in his article “Do we really want federation?” published in the newspaper of Polish Christian and Social Movement proposed federation including Lithuania, Poland, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Slovakia, Czech, Romania, Hungary. He considered Poland to be the center of ECE integration and without its participation he considered impossible the amalgamation of the region.

In September 1948 a member of Ukrainian National Council and Leadership of Ukrainian Nationalists Organization (OUN-M) D.Andriyevsky submitted the memorial concerning ECE federation for consideration of USA State Department. In accordance with this project the region should have been divided into three blocks: Baltic and Black Sea including Baltic countries, Byelorussia, Poland, Ukraine and Cossackia; Danubian including Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and probably, Austria; Balkan – Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania and Greece.

M.Livytsky in his articles published in the weekly paper “Nedila” (“Sunday”) marked out three blocks on the space of ECE: Balkan-Central European, Scandinavian and “the block of nations oppressed by Moscow”. To the latter one he entered Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Ukraine with Crimea, Cossack Lands (Kuban, Don, Terek, Astrakhan, Ural and Orenburg), Georgia, Azerbaijan, mountainous nations of Caucasus, Kazakhstan, Turkestan, and Far East Land (Green Ukraine). M.Livytsky believed that Finland and Karelia could belong to Scandinavian Block, and Poland would have to choose between narrowed Intermarium and “the block of nations oppressed by Moscow” mentioned above [3, 1].

The Polish political thought actively watch existent conceptions of regional integration and advancing of its projects took place in permanent discussions. The Polish federation movement promoted this process. The Union of Polish federation was created in 1949 with

---

---

R.Piłsudski as its leader; in 1951 the same union was founded in Chicago with W.Wagner as its leader. In November 1952 it was renamed into "Polish union of cooperation of Central Eastern Europe". The activities of this societies consisted in conducting discussions as to regional federalization, meetings with the representatives of emigration of other nations and publishing an organ "Polish society for Central Eastern European Cooperation". Central European federalist club in Rome was published Polish bulletin "Intermarium". Following the idea of Intermarium, T.Orawski confirmed the main role of Ukraine in this society in the columns of this edition".

During the discussions of American Society of federalists a few main conceptions were put forward. A.Jeziorański in his speech "About Polish federalist conception" delivered in November 30, 1952 proposed to form four regional federations with their future union. To the first he included Poland, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Hungary and Croatia. The second one will consist of Finland, Estonia and Latvia, the third – Romania, Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece, and the fourth – Ukraine, Turkey, Caucasus, Don and Kuban. Czech participation in the societies was undesirable due to its Russian and German orientation.

A.Jeziorański and N.Jaremko's views on the Ukrainians perspectives can be explained by the struggle for Eastern Galicia and Lvov and a fear of losing the predominate role of Poland in the union of Central Eastern European countries with the Ukrainian participation. At this session B.Borysewicz criticized these statements of A.Jeziorański and called this project as the fiction in the relationships between Ukraine and Turkey.

In 1950s the idea of ECE federation was supported by the group of Parisian monthly "Kultura" ("Culture"). Its editor J.Giedroyc wrote that "Poland can return and hold independent existence only within the whole federalized Europe. The nations that owned not only independent states in 1939 but also Ukrainians and Byelorussians had the right for the participation in the future European federative union". On the way to union "Kultura" proposed to form international Central Eastern European team and to found Board of Free Europe in Strassbourg.

W.Bączkowski, J.Mieroszewski, J.Łobodowski and E.Raczyński proposed interesting views concerning the problem of ECE federalization in the columns of "Kultura". W.Bączkowski predicted federalist reconstruction after the pattern of J.Piłsudski plans. To its membership he planned to include Poland, Lithuania, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Romania and Baltic countries, Finland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria. L.Rebet sharply criticized W.Bączkowski's conception evaluating its conditions as "maximum use for Poland at the cost of and by means of Ukraine".

J.Mieroszewski believed that in the second half of 20<sup>th</sup> century in connection with development of armaments and communication full sovereignty of small countries is unachievable value and advanced the idea of "collective independence". He was an adherent of equal union of ECE countries and criticized Polish annexation conceptions where "federalism is only a new form of nationalistic imperialistic policy".

J.Mieroszewski as well as E.Raczyński criticized H.Ripka's conception as unreal and found it necessary to include Ukraine into projected federation and he proposed to use R.Schuman's idea about Western European integration beginning with the union of the most economically developed countries of the region that was Poland and Czechoslovakia. J.Mieroszewski drew economic motives into the regional integration of ECE. "Federalized Europe would be closed club for rich, highly-industrialized nations. If Eastern European countries gain independence long ago there would have been an abyss between economic systems of rich united West and scattering Eastern Europe. Eastern Europe must be united economically and politically at first to find relations with Western Europe as equal objects". In 1960s J.Mieroszewski as the variant federative idea proposed a conception of neutrality to

guarantee the USA, the USSR and the UNO a neutral status for Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

The Ukrainian political thought treated critically enough Polish conceptions of ECE federation stressing on their non-real intentions of Polish predominance in the region. Intermarium plans was “a block in which the most numerous nation was Poles which their dominant role and other small nations that were not connected historically with Poles neither geopolitical nor they did not play any economic, political or strategic part for Poland”.

In 1960-1980 the idea of ECE federation was ousted by other problems and lost its urgency. Some period of time it was supported in their columns by “Wiadomości Polskie”, “Listy do Polaków” and others. In particular J.Muchawiec stated that “the federation can’t be avoided” and he thought of the possibility of including Czech, Slovakia, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine and Byelorussia.

The attempts of restoring the idea of regional integration were revealed in the activity of Polish and Ukrainian group in FRG and Christian Service of nations’ liberation which f. prof. F.Blachnicki founded in Carlsberg in the beginning of 1980s. At the symposium “The unity of nations in the struggle for liberation” organized by them in November 11, 1982 J.Iranek-Osmecki stated that “the condition on which large supernational appeared in Eastern Europe was the formation political overnational structure between Germany and Russia”. The basis for union could become Polish-Ukrainian union that had to neutralize Poland and had “a positive influence on those nations that were afraid of Polish overpower or Polish cultural (even probably unconscious) imperialism”.

A new push was a discussion as to ECE federation that took place with beginning of Warsaw Treaty Organization decay and acquiring full independence of the countries of socialistic camp and increasing centrifugal tendencies within the USSR. Not seeing the perspective of joining the country to European Community the idea of regional integration in the beginning of 1990s was propagandized by the Polish magazines “Obóz”, “Nowa Koalicja”, “Międzymorze”, “ABC (Adriatyk-Bałtyk-Czarne morze)”. It was popularized in Poland by the oppositional party – the Confederation of Independent Poland (Konfederacja Polski Niepodległej).

The conception of Small Intermarium and Balto-Black Sea arc could be observed in the activity of Ukrainian democratic opposition – People Movement of Ukraine and Ukrainian Republican Party (URP). In July 29-30, 1994 initiated URP in Kyiv the international conference of political parties of Balto-Black Sea region was held. Poland was represented only by the leader of Confederation of Independent Poland L.Moczulski that showed its setting off the conception of regional integration and the way to the common European and Euro-Atlantic integration.

Some time the Ukrainian side tried to draw Polish society’s attention to the idea of Intermarium seeing in this conception the pragmatic means for drawing Ukraine into European processes. B.Osadchuk in the columns of “Kultura” announced that “Poland probably didn’t have to be a guide of experience in close union of the countries of the region”. When the controversial tendencies in ECE became obvious, and Scandinavian orientation in Baltic countries become prevalent and Russian one in Byelorussia, B.Osadchuk proposed to develop bilateral relations between Poland and Ukraine. Taking into account Polish refusal from “Kravchuk’s plan” as to creation of Security Zone in ECE stretching along Baltic, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Poland, Czech, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Moldova, Bulgaria and Austria with the possibility of using Ukrainian nuclear weapon for the region defense, B.Osadchuk said that the idea of creation around Warsaw-Kyiv “the center of gravitation of other weaker partners turned out to be alien as well as Piłsudski and Petlura’s plans” [4, 103].

The Polish side put aside the conceptions of regional integration that appeared in 1990s: L.Wałęsa’s “Europe-bis” project, “Kravchuk’s plan”, the expansion of Visegrad group at the

---

---

expense of Ukraine, etc. being sure that involving Poland in conflicting post Soviet space would mean the deceleration of its movement to European Community (EC) and NATO. This tendency can be shown on the hierarchy of polyvariant development of situation given by the Polish politologist P.Grudziński. At first three places there is “Central Europe in security system based on NATO and EC”, “Central Europe as a younger partner of Western coalition” and “Central Europe in Eurocentric system (without NATO)”. At the fifth place there is “Central Europe as an autonomous subsystem of regional security” and at the last tenth place – “Polish-Ukrainian coalition”.

Giving his view on the problem of regional integration of ECE in new geopolitical conditions, the editor of “Kultura” J.Giedroyc announced that “we are interested that in Eastern Europe we would have a number of countries which wouldn’t be not connected with any kind of Federation. We shall develop cooperation between them but there won’t be any organizational forms. If Poles are interested in it Ukrainians will not be well-disposed. But if the initiative is from Ukrainian’s side or any other country of ECE then we are sure to support this idea”.

The formation of the Višegrad Group consisting of Poland, Czech, Slovakia and Hungary become the practical realization of the regional integration conception in Central-East Europe. Ukraine is trying to form the GUAM (GUUAM) group including Georgia, Ukraine, (Uzbekistan), Azerbaijan and Moldova. In September 2005 in Georgia Ukrainian president V.Yushchenko proclaimed intention to create the block the democratic choice countries between Baltic, Black Sea and Caspian Sea.

Conceptions of regional integration of ECE are an example of political elite response to the geopolitical challenge of their societies. As to the prospects one can submit that they left unsolved and absorbed by the processes of common European integration.

The countries of the region are united round two integration centers and are invited to enter European Union (EU) in accordance with individual principle, a part of them are under the threat to leave beyond the borders of united Europe. At the same time the structural reforms introduced in EU have every reason to predict the so called camps of different speeds according to the criterion of their readiness for implementation of new rules. The conception of “the two-speed Europe” means to a certain extent the return to the idea Intermarium regional integration. The countries of ECE can find themselves in one camp that will mean the reproduction of the conception of regional cooperation at other historical stage.

Nationalities policy is an important constituent of the process of preservation of peace, guaranteeing of security and stability. Ethnic tolerance is one of main principles of modern nationalities policy. Tolerance problem is very important for East Central Europe (ECE). Late process of national sovereignization and mismatch of ethnic and state borders turned the region of ECE into the seat of interethnic conflicts.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century ECE became the region where drastic and extreme methods of nationalities policy were used – deportations, ethnic cleansings, displacement and repatriation of population. So long as in the period between two World Wars a third of Jews lived in a territory of ECE the region became the biggest place of Holocaust. Results of World War II caused considerable changes of borders and displacement of population. These factors influenced on forming of ethnic stereotypes, hatred and firm traditions of non-tolerance. The situation was complicated by policy of totalitarian regimes that sustained interethnic antagonisms for strengthening of their rule. That’s why interethnic reconciliation and tolerance became preconditions for political and social transformations.

Study of problems of ethnic tolerance and overcoming of stereotypes in ECE was started at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The problem of interethnic conflicts and stereotypes was investigated by B.Bakuła, A.S.Kowalczyk, R.Habielski, A.Friszke, K.Tarka, P.Eberhardt.

This study covers the process of forming of tolerance ideas in nationalities policy in emigrant circles of ECE.

Since totalitarian regimes in ECE were established freedom of political thought existed in emigration only. Worldwide tendencies to international integration, decolonization, democratization and struggle against race discrimination were preconditions for reconciliation between ECE nations and forming of atmosphere of tolerance.

The main aim of ECE emigrant circles' was return of independence and democracy to their states. Because of multinational character of the majority of states of this region solution of problems of interethnic relations took an important place in conceptions of liberation struggle.

The problem of achieving of reconciliation between nations and tolerance forming took priority place in publications of emigration magazines: "Kultura", «КОНТИНЕНТ», «Сучасність», "Intermarium", "Svedectvi", "Irodalmi Ujsag" and others. The most active figures that addressed the problem should be mentioned: J.Giedroyc, J.Mieroszewski, J.Łobodowski, K.A.Jeleński, M.Pankowski, K.Zielonogórski, T.Katelbach, J.Mackiewicz, J.Majewski, B.Osadchuk, B.Levyckiy, V.Maksimov, V.Bukovskiy, N.Gorbanevskaya, V.Nekrasov [1, 66-67].

Reappraising past history political emigrants arrived at a conclusion that confrontation and conflicts had led to loss of independence by ECE states. Interethnic antagonisms and stereotypes were exploited by totalitarian regime for forming of image of enemy and strengthening of its rule. Fomentation of resentmentality and xenophobia is used by totalitarian regime for struggle against aspiration for economic and social reforms and more sovereignty. Publicists condemned manifestation of nationalism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism by government or society.

They also criticized totalitarian methods of nationalities policy, condemned assimilation policy carried out by communists: elimination of material traces of "strange" culture, exclusion of evidence of nationalities' contribution to civilization and cultural heritage from history and literature textbooks, discrimination of their cultural, economic and religious rights.

The publicists worked out positive programme of resolution of ethnic problem. They argued that interethnic reconciliation would enable coordination of liberation struggle, attainment of independence, overcoming of totalitarianism, ensure security and stability. Resolution of the problem of borders, liberalization of national minorities policy, breaking of stereotypes and interethnic reconciliation were considered to be constituent elements of forming of tolerance.

The principle of tolerance and liberalization of nationalities policy formed the basis of ideology of the majority of oppositional movements in ECE. Political conceptions of ECE emigrant circles made great influence on democratic development in the region during post-communist period.

First attempts to achieve Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation after World War II were made by oppositional movements and cabinets-in-exile. After suppression of opposition only emigrational circles occupied themselves with seeking for reconciliation. In general there was a consensus on thesis about priority of Ukraine's and Poland's independence for guaranteeing of ECE security and prevention of threats from Russia and Germany. But negotiations between Polish and Ukrainian cabinets-in-exile in 1947-1948 had collapsed because of disagreement over borders issue. The initiative of reconciliation passed to public organizations. Its difference from German-French reconciliation consisted in application of the method of people's diplomacy. Institutional basis for reconciliation became Polish-Ukrainian associations, mass media and other public organizations. Borders question was the most complicated problem. We may divide projects of its resolution into 4 types:

- 
- Legitimist – that is return to borders before 1939
  - Federalist – creation of federation of ECE or federation of Poland and Ukraine only when the problem's acuteness will be reduced by force of transformation of interstate borders to administrative bounds
  - Prolongation – putting off the problem until the appearance of independent Poland and Ukraine
  - Inviolability of borders – consent to borders formed as a result of World War II

It should be emphasized on the role of Paris monthly "Kultura" and its editor J.Giedroyc. J.Miorszewski in his publications substantiated priority importance of changes in the territory of Poland's Eastern neighbours – Ukraine, Lithuania and Belarus for transformations in the whole socialist camp. The author convinced of necessity of agreements on inviolability of post-war borders for the purpose of achievement of mutual understanding and common struggle for independence. Main achievements of this stage were overcoming of ethnic stereotypes, criticism of totalitarian methods of policy concerning national minorities, conviction in decisive role of Ukraine's and Poland's independence for security of all nations of ECE.

Approving of inviolability of European post-war borders and creating conditions for liberal evolution of soviet regime, signing of Final Act of Council for Security and Cooperation in Europe started move of the initiative of reconciliation to oppositional movements. The idea of necessity of cooperation of nations of the region for liberation and democratic changes was proclaimed in appeals of the I Congress of Polish "Solidarność". After introduction of military situation the problem of elaboration of policy concerning Poland's Eastern Neighbours took priority place in Polish opposition's ideology. J.Giedroyc's and J.Miorszewski's ideas formed the basis of Polish opposition's political programs. Publications of oppositional magazines "Nowa Koalicja", "Międzymorze", "ABC", "Obóz", "Dialogi. Biuletyn Polsko-Ukraiński", "Spotkania" and others made a great influence on persuasion of Polish society in necessity of reconciliation. B.Skaradziński's work "Byelorussians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians: our Enemies or Brotrers?" that analyzed relations of Poles with neighboring peoples and called for reconciliation was reissued 7 times. Polish Independency Reconciliation, Confederation of Independent Poland, Liberal-Democratic Party "Niepodległość" and others propogated Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation. On G.Kostrzewa-Zorbas's initiative Polish opposition made a motion to Ukrainian, Byelorussian and Lithuanian opposition to sign the agreement for inviolability of borders and common struggle for independence. In 1980-s oppositional movements reached mutual understanding concerning inviolability of borders and tolerant nationalities policy.

Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation made positive influence on geopolitical and democratic transformations in ECE. In the period of USSR's disintegration Poland realizing the doctrine of "two levels" had established parallel relations with Kyiv, Vilnius and Minsk. Poland was the first to recognize Ukraine's independence. In post-bipolar period the rapprochement at level of state leadership and proclaiming of declarations about reconciliation took place. Pope Joannes Paul II gave moral support for Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation. Poland's and Ukraine's views coincide concerning main problems of global and regional security, enlargement of EU and NATO to east. Both states cooperate actively in political, military, economic, energy and education fields.

Social stage is one of the most important for forming of positive peace. Move to the stage of public reconciliation provides for peace education, state support for cooperation in different fields. Processes of Europeanization, forming of atmosphere of inadmissibility of solution of interstate problems by force in Europe are precondition for reconciliation between societies. Reconciliation between societies is being realized by methods of supporting and

encouragement of common projects of education for youth, coordination of educational programs, publications in mass media, holding of conferences and so on.

Leaving of Ukraine out of the range of Eurointegration processes endangers Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation. Barrier on the way to bilateral rapprochement could influence on formation of new stereotypes and conflictogenic problems.

Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation was of great importance due to several factors:

Poland and Ukraine were the most numerous (after Russians) peoples of socialist camp and the USSR;

Poland and Ukraine were the most influential countries respectively in Warsaw Treaty Organization, Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the USSR.

Poland and Ukraine are situated on strategic sector of confrontation of the USSR and the USA.

Achievement of Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation afforded both nations an opportunity to avoid inspiration of interethnic confrontation and gaining of their independence;

Poland's independence meant abolition of Brezhnev's doctrine and attaining of full independence by other ECE states.

Ukraine's independence facilitated disintegration of the USSR and its evolution to confederative union CIS and abolition of imperial status of Russia.

Downfall of the USSR and socialist camp meant transformation of international system from bipolar unipolar or post-bipolar.

Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation may be an example for relations among other nations of the region: Polish-Russian, Serbian-Albanian and so on.

Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation is divided into 4 main stages: emigrational, oppositional, intergovernmental and intersocial. Its difference from German-French reconciliation consisted in application of the method of people's diplomacy. Institutional basis for reconciliation became Polish-Ukrainian associations, mass media and other public organizations. In 1980-s oppositional movements reached mutual understanding concerning inviolability of borders and tolerant nationalities policy.

In post-bipolar period the rapprochement at level of state leadership and proclaiming of declarations about reconciliation took place. Move to the stage of public reconciliation provides for peace education, state support for cooperation in different fields.

Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation is an example of positive resolution of complicated interethnic conflict. International reconciliation processes (French-German, German-Polish and Polish-Ukrainian) make basis for forming of unified Europe and favour strengthening of security and stability.

1. Deklaracja w sprawie ukraińskiej // Kultura.- 1977.- № 5 (356).- S. 66-67.
2. Kamiński A.Z., Kozakiewicz J. Polish-Ukrainian Relations 1992-1996. Report / Antoni Z. Kamiński, Jerzy Kozakiewicz.- Warsaw: Center for International Relations at the Institute of Public Affairs, 1997.- 55 p.
3. Livyckyj M. Problemy ukrajinskoji zakordonnoji polityky // Nedila.- Schwainfurt; Aschafenburg 28.IX.1947, nr. 92.- S. 1.
4. Osadczuk B. Ukraina sam na sam // Kultura.- 1993.- № 12.- S. 102-109.

*Польсько-українське примирення передбачало вирішення кількох проблем: конструювання нової системи міжнародних відносин в Центрально-Східній Європі, розв'язання проблеми кордонів, лібералізації політики щодо національних меншин та подолання міжнаціональних стереотипів. Польсько-українське примирення справило позитивний вплив на геополітичні і демократичні трансформації Центрально-Східної Європи. Польсько-українське примирення є прикладом позитивного вирішення складного міжнаціонального конфлікту.*

---

---

*Процеси міжнаціонального примирення лежать в основі формування єдиної Європи та сприяють зміцненню безпеки і стабільності.*

**Ключові слова:** польсько-українське примирення, польсько-українські відносини, Центрально-Східна Європа.

*Польско-украинское примирение предполагало решение нескольких проблем: конструирование новой системы международных отношений в Центрально-Восточной Европе, решение проблемы границ, либерализации политики в отношении национальных меньшинств и преодоление межнациональных стереотипов. Польско-украинское примирение произвело положительное влияние на геополитические и демократические трансформации Центрально-Восточной Европы. Польско-украинское примирение является примером положительного решения сложного межнационального конфликта. Процессы межнационального примирения лежат в основе формирования единой Европы и способствуют укреплению безопасности и стабильности.*

**Ключевые слова:** польско-украинское примирение, польско-украинские отношения, Центрально-Восточная Европа.

**UDC 321.728/354**

**ВВК 66.2(4 Укр)**

*Taras Lavruk*

## **DOMINANT VECTORS IN THE GEOPOLITICAL DOCTRINE OF MODERN RUSSIA: ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIENCE OF THE MID-2000S.**

*The main line of the foreign policy of Russia in the mid-2000s combined reality and pleasure principles that have been antagonistic in this case. Selected geopolitical strategy predetermined its own unpredictability and depreciation. Conceptually allowed signs were completely incompatible in practice.*

**Keywords:** foreign-policy strategy, geopolitical priorities, geopolitics of Russia, geostrategic players, geopolitical axis.

To be and to look are complementary tasks, and since they are also multi-vector goals, the efforts to implement each of these principles are often unequal and happen to be mutually contradictory. Art "to look" has been investigated comprehensively but not thoroughly enough. The ability to comply with the stated strategy in domestic and especially foreign policy had also seen attempts to implement with greater or lesser success by politicians at different levels and in different times. Certainly, the higher crisis degree of geopolitical system, the more subtle diplomat must act, in other words, these concepts are directly proportional.

Jean Baudrillard focused on "simulation of actual reality", Guy Debord investigated a "performance society", and Paul Virilio analyzed "substitution of the actual reality by virtual reality". Despite of each of these researchers own conclusions, their findings have some common ground. It is the position that the visibility of the power, its everyday technologies and incarnations leads to a paradoxical result: "The more the power shows itself the more it is hidden, elusive and has hidden itself better" [8, p.14], the art "to look" is highly polished.

The might of symbolic power which is based on the symbolic capital, reveals itself in the nature of structuring social reality on the basis of consensus on a particular vision of the world, and legitimation of the appropriate cognitive order. Task to force everybody to see and believe the "right" things, to hear certain words, in this case is absolutely necessary to