

7. Манойло А. В. Конфлікт США з Іраном: прогнози і перспективи розвитку // Світ і політика //Новий світовий порядок або «демократія» по-американськи // Paranoiac // [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.paranoiac.ru/2011/05/novyj-mirovoj-poryadok-ili-demokratiya-po-amerikanski>.

Manojlo A. V. Konflikt SShA z Iranom: prognozy i perspektyvy rozvytku [The Conflict between the US and Iraq: Development Perspectives and Prognoses] // Svit i polityka. – 2012. – № 3. Novyj svitovyj porjadok abo «demokratija» po-amerykansjky // Paranoiac // [Electronic resource]. – Retrieved from: <http://www.paranoiac.ru/2011/05/novyj-mirovoj-poryadok-ili-demokratiya-po-amerikanski>.

Oleksandr Voronetskyi

Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University

Vynnytsia

Research Supervisor: I.G. Lebid, PhD in History, Senior Lecturer

Research Supervisor: V.I. Kalinichenko, PhD in Philology, Ass.Prof.

THE ROLE OF HISTORICAL TRADITION IN THE FORMATION OF UKRAINIAN DIPLOMACY (THE FIRST HALF OF THE 1990s)

Introduction. The Diplomatic relations of Ukraine are an integral part of its foreign policy interactions, as today they are intervened with all the aspects of the country's life and are achieving a qualitatively new level of their development. Nowadays, there is no doubt that the diplomacy has transformed considerably and has acquired new features. Native diplomats, historians and politologists have started to review and reconsider the importance of the issue of the Ukrainian revolution of 1917-1921.

The objective of this paper is to bring the light on how at the beginning of the twentieth century the Ukrainian people received the opportunity to gain their independence and create their own foreign policy. After the events of the revolution in Petrograd on March, 8 (February, 23) the Ukrainian national movement got the possibility to form its own institutions of self-government, which later transformed into the representative institutions of the whole Ukrainian nation [2: 1-5].

The absence of unity among the Ukrainian political circles slowed down the construction of the Ukrainian state. Autonomistic views dominated in the society, which blocked the realization of the idea of a self-sufficient state. From the very beginning the wrong aim which was chosen caused a number of mistakes: the absence of the national army, blurred borders, budget deficiency played a crucial role in the short-term existence of the UPR (the Ukrainian People's Republic) [4: 1-2].

The unfavourable foreign conditions had a negative influence: World War I, the Bolsheviks' and the White Guard's aggressive policy in the national matter, the rivalry with the newly founded Poland, the absence of the Central Powers' support.

Irrespective of the negative conditions the UCG (the Ukrainian Central Government) tried to develop its own foreign policy.

The young Ukrainian diplomacy gained the first fundamental achievement in the diplomatic field. The ratification of the Brest Treaty facilitated the deoccupation of Ukraine off the Bolsheviks' army and the acknowledgement of the UPR by the countries of the Quadruple Alliance as the subject of foreign relations [5: 66-67].

Conclusion. The short period of Ukrainian independence enabled the governing circles to gain experience in forming their own foreign policy direction, as well as diplomatic institutions. This historic occasion gave the opportunity to struggle for the Ukrainian unified independent state during the demolition of the USSR. The diplomacy of the modern Ukrainian state was founded on common human values, democratic rights and historic traditions which were formed during the Ukrainian revolution of 1917-1921 [5: 105].

Due to mutual acknowledgement, the intangibility of the state borders, the equality of all the subjects taking part in the international relations Ukraine was able to establish itself as a sovereign state. The citizens of modern Ukraine have realized that only the existence of the independent Ukrainian country and the well-developed network of diplomatic embassies will guarantee the protection of national interests and the welfare of the people.

References

1. Бойко О.Д. Історія України: [навчальний посібник] / О. Д. Бойко. – Київ: Видавничий центр «Академія», 2002. – 654с.

Boiko O.D. Istoriiia Ukrainy [The History of Ukraine]: Navchalnyi posibnyk / Boiko O.D. – Kyiv: Vydavnyuchy tsentr «Akademiiia» 2002. – 654 c. [in Ukrainian].

2. Грушевський М. С. «Вісти з Української Центральної Ради» / М.С. Грушевський, І.М. Стешенко. – Київ: Друкарня В. Бондаренко та П. Гніздовського. – 1917. – №1. – С. 1–20.

Hrushevskiyi. M.S. «Visty z Ukrainskoi Tsentralnoi Rady» [News from Central Rada of Ukraine] / M.S. Hrushevskiyi, I.M. Steshenko // Drukarnia V. Bondarenko ta P. Hnizdovskoho. – 1917. – №1. – P. 1–20 [in Ukrainian].

3. Грушевський М. С. «Вісти з Української Центральної Ради» / М.С. Грушевський, І.М. Стешенко. – Київ: Друкарня В. Бондаренко та П. Гніздовського.. – 1917. – №3. – С. 1–11.

Hrushevskiyi. M.S. «Visty z Ukrainskoi Tsentralnoi Rady» [News from Central Rada of Ukraine] / M.S. Hrushevskiyi, I.M. Steshenko. // Drukarnia V. Bondarenko ta P. Hnizdovskoho – 1917. – №3. – P. 1–11 [in Ukrainian].

4. Масвський І. «Боротьба» / Українська партія Соціалістів-Революціонерів. – Київ, 1917. – №1. – С. 1-8.

Maievskiyi. I. «Borotba» [Struggle] // Ukrainaska partiia Sotsialistiv-Revoliutsoneriv, Kyiv, 1917. – №1. – P. 1-8 [in Ukrainian].

5. Чекаленко Л. Д. Зовнішня політика України (від давніх часів до наших днів): підруч. для студ. вищ. навч. закл. / Чекаленко Л. Д., Федуняк С. Г.; за заг. ред. Л. Д. Чекаленко. – Київ : ДП«Вид. дім «Персонал», 2010. — 464с.

Chekalenko L.D. Zovnishnia polityka Ukrainy (vid davnih chasiv do nashyh dniv) Foreign Ukrainian policy (from the ancient times to nowadays) pidrych. dlia styd. vyshch. navch. zakl. / L.D. Chekalenko, S. H. Feduniak; za zah. red. L.D. Chekalenko. — K.: DP«Vyd. dim «Personal», 2010. — 464 p. [in Ukrainian].

Hlib Voloskyi

*Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University
Vinnytsia*

Research Supervisor: Y.T. Temirov, Ph.D in History, Ass.Prof.

Language Supervisor: V.I. Kalinichenko, Ph.D in Linguistics, Ass. Prof.

PIPELINE POLITICS IN EUROPE: SECURITY PERSPECTIVE

Introduction. “Yesterday there were tanks, today there is oil”. The words of A. Krushelnycky, former Head of Poland’s Security Service, are interesting from the following two perspectives. On the one hand, they show us what energy has become in the modern world. The modern world is an energy addict and from day to day, energy demand is rising more and more. Therefore, those, who have an energy dose, have power over an energy addict. That means energy is not only about the economy anymore. It has shifted into the political dimension and transformed into the tool of influence. Energy has become a weapon and if the Soviet Union used tanks to get control over Eastern Europe in the last century then Russia uses gas for the same goal today. Yesterday there were tanks, today there is gas.

On the other hand, energy has become a subject of securitization. Due to its significance, energy security developed into the issue of national security. As a result, we can see an introduction of new military defense doctrine, based upon the control of energy resources through the usage of military and non-military means. Such example we can find in 2003 when the US suddenly decided to free Iraqi people from Saddam Hussein [1]. Yesterday there were tanks, today there is oil.

Objective of the paper. So, the above-mentioned facts prove energy to have become a *topical* and extremely important security issue. That is why it is *crucial* to study how energy can impact foreign policy and what energy means in the security dimension which appears to be *the objective* of this paper. For this sake, we use the example of pipeline politics in Europe because it allows us to show energy as a security issue from several perspectives. As it has been already mentioned, Russia uses gas for the same goal, as used tanks in Soviet times. In additional, it is a good example of control over energy resources through non-military means. This long pipeline epopee gives us many lessons of how to use energy to implement foreign policy.

These lessons began in 2005 with the company called “Gazprom”. In 2005, Russia bought 50% of “Gazprom”. That company became the main tool of Russian policy in Europe and Central Asia. The proofs of this fact can be observed the same year when Russia tried to buy “Beltransgaz”, the company that owned transit pipeline