

Ukraine and the USA: diplomatic relations in the context of the challenges of the twenty-first century (on basis materials of the Ukrainian diaspora press) Lesya Bilovus

Summary

The article deals with the analysis of representation of Ukrainian – American diplomatic relations in Ukrainian diaspora's periodicals. The results of the research show that the sovereignty and unity of Ukraine is being consistently supported by the United States, despite the fact that their bilateral relations were not always strengthened. Articles, notes, interviews touching upon this question form a positive opinion about American support of Ukraine especially in the context of modern globalization. Keywords: diplomatic relations, Ukraine, United States of America, diplomatic corps, bilateral relations, ambassador. With the collapse of the Soviet Union in its space, states (in particular Ukraine) were formed, which sought to independently determine their domestic and foreign policy. With the backdrop of the post-totalitarian past, everybody tried to secure the support of as many as possible countries as the reputable and strong players in the international arena. Among the latter is the United States, with which Ukraine today has a genuine, democratic partnership in building civil society, state institutions, economics and security. Of course, this was preceded by the enormous work of the diplomatic corps of both countries, which lasted for a quarter century, starting from January 3, 1992. However, in the context of recent events in our state, the alignment of the Russian Federation with the conditions of the Budapest memorandum and the violation of its integrity of Ukraine, the unchanging support of the United States its sovereignty and unity becomes a pledge of certain economic and security guarantees.

A lot of works are devoted to bilateral Ukrainian-American relations, but diplomatic ties between Ukraine and the United States, highlighted in the periodicals, have not yet become the subject of attention.

From the beginning of the establishment of diplomatic relations between Ukraine and the United States, they were of a different nature, but the process of their development was somehow reflected in the Ukrainian diaspora's press, when the periods of "fatigue from Ukraine" changed with periods of interest and urgency to support the sovereign democratic status of the Ukrainian state. After gaining independence in 1991, the main goal of the Ukrainian foreign policy office in the American direction was to gain Ukraine's real recognition of the United States as an equal partner. In May 1992, the President of Ukraine L. Kravchuk made his first official working visit to the United States, which was marked by the signing of a memorandum of understanding between the governments of Ukraine and the United States and a political declaration, which for the first time recorded the formula of "democratic partnership" between the two countries. Z. Brzezinski, referring in time to the First Deputy Secretary of State S. Tolbotta, emphasized that the decision of the American government to declare Ukraine its strategic partner has become a recognition of the commonality of our values and goals, as well as awareness of the fact that a strong, democratic and independent Ukraine is extremely an important influence on the stability of Europe, which is already fully in line with the strategic interests of US national security. We can assume that such an understanding of Ukraine's role in the region has increasingly determined US foreign policy towards our state more and more to this day.

An increase in the number of publications related to diplomatic relations between the two states is observed only at the beginning of the 21st century, when global interest in Ukraine

as a political entity in the international arena has grown. In 2003, as you know, diplomatic ties between the United States and Ukraine were in a state of threatening (the so-called "chainsaw scandal"). The Ukrainian-language US press was offered to explain the case to an interview with Deputy US Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs S. Paifer. His face, apparently, was chosen not by chance, since he was the third US Ambassador to Ukraine at that time, so he could thoroughly explain the revision of American foreign policy with a projection into Ukrainian realities. The diplomat outlined four stages in the development of bilateral relations between the United States and Ukraine, pointing out the political mistakes of the States towards our state (focusing exclusively on nuclear disarmament, unjustified expectations of rapid reforms and changes, etc.), and formulated the main conclusions of the new foreign policy towards Ukraine. Of these, it followed that the United States still considered Ukraine important, especially for regional stability, and therefore looking for opportunities for its active engagement to overcome misunderstandings and improve relations. After the Orange Revolution, with the appointment of Ambassador to the United States O. Shamshur, it became possible to raise interest in Ukraine and give the relations between the two states a new meaning. Thanks to the joint efforts of Ukrainian and American diplomats, it has managed to achieve several favorable results in virtually all areas of bilateral cooperation. In particular, in 2006, the United States gave Ukraine the status of a market economy, which, on the one hand, recognized democratic change, increased credit rating, and on the other hand, a positive signal for potential investors, gave Ukrainian corporations an opportunity to actively defend their interests in the US market. We can not mention the signing of the bilateral protocol in the context of Ukraine's accession to the WTO, the Ukrainian-American Charter on Strategic Partnership, as well as the abolition of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, the development of a dialogue on visa-emigration issues, the establishment of a Strategic Partnership Commission chaired by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine and US Secretary of State. The change in the administration of George W. Bush with the arrival of B. Obama did not lead to radical changes in diplomatic relations between our states, as witnessed by Secretary of State Steinberg's visits to Ukraine, Vice-President Joseph Biden. In our country, on the eve of the presidential election in 2010, they had meetings with both candidates, but Viktor Yanukovich, who was then leading, appeared to be a good figure, as he was inclined to find compromises with Moscow, but not at the expense of the loss of Ukraine's independence. For the United States, this period is characterized by "fatigue from Ukraine", caused by chaos in domestic Ukrainian politics, the inability of the latter to fulfill a number of bilateral obligations. O. Shamshur explains some relief in Washington of the results of the elections in Ukraine, where the alleged democratic character of their course has shown the impossibility of returning to the authoritarian past, and the ruling party promised stability and reform in the country. In addition, the administration of the early B. Obama suited Ukraine, which declared its non-aligned status, thereby removing the issue of joining NATO, and postponed the issue of EU membership. During a meeting between the two Presidents at the 2010 Washington Summit on Nuclear Security in Washington, the joint statement once again emphasized the strategic nature of the bilateral relationship, and the White House head separately emphasized the security guarantees provided to Ukraine under the 1994 Budapest Memorandum.

During an annual conference in Washington "The search for ways to mature statehood by Ukraine", former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Europe and Eurasia D. Kremer noted that democratic transformations in Ukraine should serve as an example for other countries

in the region. Assistant US Deputy Secretary of Defense S. Wollander spoke about the danger of "reloading" relations with Russia by the Obama administration and the inaction of the latter in the post-Soviet region, especially in Ukraine. Her position was supported by the then deputy assistant secretary of state for Europe and Eurasia D. Russell, noting that the "reset" policy should not undo the commitments taken by the United States against an independent Ukraine that is an extremely important region for the US interests, and Europe. Ambassador of Ukraine to the United States (1994 – 1998) Yu. Shcherbak emphasized the real threat of the existence of the Ukrainian state on the eve of the elections in Ukraine. He emphasized the changes in the international situation, the emergence of new world centers of power, the US involvement in all new confrontations, resulting in some lost some credibility in the international arena. Instead, the Russian Federation strengthened its position in the post-Soviet space, imposing its own view on the international order and preaching the policy of "collecting an empire" (V. Martyniuk). In 2009, despite official statements to Washington, experts have suggested that the United States, in hopes of supporting Russia's resolve of important international issues, especially the fight against terrorism, has in fact recognized Ukraine as the zone of imperial interests of the Federation. However, this was determined by experts as a potential catastrophe for the whole of Europe. Following the restoration of authoritarianism policies in Ukraine, Ukrainian diplomats in the United States are starting to receive from the presidential administration, B. Obama, concerns about the harassment of freedom of speech and selective justice. Although US Ambassador to Ukraine Jeffrey Payett believes that realizing Ukraine's aspirations for association with the EU was quite possible. To this end, US Deputy Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs V. Nuland arrived in Kyiv, who emphasized the support of the United States of Ukraine in her election. In his letter to the President of Ukraine, John Kerry promised comprehensive support, reloading of bilateral dialogue between the countries. However, in two months, the US radically changed its rhetoric towards Viktor Yanukovich. When the failure to sign the Association Agreement caused a confrontation between hundreds of thousands of people and the Ukrainian authorities, John Kerry recommended that the President of Ukraine establish a dialogue with the leaders of the political opposition and postpone the political process of street negotiations in state institutions. However, in general, according to published materials, US diplomats at that time were very cautious in their statements about the situation in Ukraine. On the one hand, they recognize the right of the people to free expression in accordance with the principles of democracy, on the other – in order to avoid destabilization in order to resolve the conflict by peaceful means, it is emphasized on the need to free the entrenched buildings, even to withdraw from the agenda of the Association Agreement with the EU, arguing the possibility of its later signing at any time for any President of Ukraine. However, Yanukovich did not see the need for compromises. White House spokeswoman Jay Carney expressed an official position that peaceful demonstrations in Ukraine can not be considered a coup attempt, and therefore violence from the government is unacceptable. According to the US Embassy in Ukraine, US Vice President Joseph Biden called in a telephone conversation with the President of Ukraine to restrain and recall the offensive of government forces. In a statement by the US National Security Council spokeswoman K. Hayden, it is said that the increase in tension in Ukraine is a direct consequence of the inability of the Ukrainian government to recognize the legitimate right of the people to express their disagreement. On February 14, 2014, the Chairman of the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee, R. Menendez, submitted to the Senate a draft resolution calling on the State Department to immediately impose targeted

sanctions on those involved in the use of violence against peaceful protesters. The project also calls on the White House administration to strengthen government programs in support of democracy and human rights in Ukraine. As a result, periodicals of Ukrainians in the United States are increasingly beginning to record the word "sanctions" in the statements of American politicians and diplomats. Ukrainian diplomats in the United States supported Ukraine + then, when there was a real threat to its territorial integrity. This is evidenced by a statement issued by Liberty, signed by all the staff of the Ukrainian diplomatic mission in the United States, where sympathy is expressed to the families of those who died on the Independence and hopes for a peaceful settlement of the confrontation. The Ukrainian-language press of the Ukrainian diaspora of the United States during this period contains a number of expert and diplomatic assessments of the conflict in Ukraine, information on visits by US diplomats and politicians to resolve the situation. Such publications are the result of Ukrainian events that cover Washington's efforts to intervene and influence the situation, to resolve it, taking into account its geopolitical interests, the victory of democracy. In an interview with John McCain, the problem of sanctions, the impossibility of the United States to make concessions to Russia on the Ukrainian issue, despite the certain passivity of the Obama administration's democratic administration, recognizes Russia's pressure on the Ukrainian government and the right of the Ukrainian people to decide for themselves the way for their further development. WE Ambassador to Ukraine Jeffrey Payet also express this official position of Washington. Ex-Ambassador of Ukraine to the United States, O. Shamshur, appreciates the arrival of Secretary of State John Kerry very positively as he considers this a powerful signal of Ukraine's support and its sovereignty and unity, noting that the actions of the American side are adequate, because the United States acts within existing instruments. Many publications covered the visits to Ukraine in 2014 by US Vice President Joseph Biden, his official meetings. The politician has voiced Washington's official position regarding Ukraine's support for Russia's international isolation through its aggressive actions against Ukraine, joint activities in the eradication of corruption in our country, constitutional reform, assistance in returning stolen assets and achieving energy independence. Political analysts and international experts believe that the repeated visit to Ukraine of such a level automatically increases the protection of the country. The United States, as stated in the widespread statement of the White House administration, is considering imposing sanctions on Russia's use of its own armed forces on the territory of another state. The US Ambassador to Ukraine Jeffrey Payett, who in his interview raised the issue of sanctions against Russia, the implementation of P. Poroshenko's peace plan and all the provisions of the Minsk treaties, as well as security assistance, adheres to the same position. A. Yatsenyuk, as Prime Minister of Ukraine, held talks with US President Obama about supporting Washington's country and resolving the crisis in Ukraine. Ukrainian diplomat B. Yaremenko believes that such a high-level meeting is a demonstration of the US recognition of the legitimacy of the changes that took place in Ukraine, readiness for cooperation, and a signal for all countries, including Russia. The result of such bilateral negotiations was the law "Act to Support Sovereignty, Territorial Integrity, Democracy and Economic Stability of Ukraine", signed by the President of the United States B. Obama and published in "Liberty", which explains the principles of US policy on the situation in Ukraine, aggression by Russia, propagating provisions in support of Ukraine in the economic, democratic sphere. Today, the Ukrainian diplomatic representation in the United States is a very active force in influencing the American government through regular meetings with congressional

representatives, senators, representatives of the White House administration. The first official visit of the President of Ukraine P. Poroshenko to Washington became crucial for further relations between Ukraine and the United States, and therefore was widely covered in the Ukrainian diaspora press. The then US Ambassador to Ukraine, Jeffrey Payet, noted the exclusive acceptance of the Ukrainian Head of State at the White House and receiving guarantees for Ukraine's support. The speech of the Ukrainian head of state in Congress testified to the full support of Ukraine's initiatives. Ukrainian-language newspapers contained comments by American politicians, diplomats and experts in the context of P. Poroshenko's visit to the United States, in particular the chairman of the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee R. Menendez and political advisor to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe O. Deychakivskyi noted the efforts of the Ukrainian President in the direction of uniting two parties in the bicameral parliament of the United States on the basis of awareness of the role of Ukrainians struggling for the victory of democracy. The consequence was the approval of the iconic bill "Act to Support Freedom of Ukraine", which provides for expansion of sanctions against Russia, increased financial assistance to Ukraine, the provision of arms and status of a special US partner outside of NATO. In addition, the document identifies areas of assistance to Ukraine in the energy sector, in the fight against Russian propaganda and assistance to temporary migrants. However, when considering and voting on the final version of the document, the item on the granting of the status of the US main ally to the United States, which is not a NATO member, has been deleted. The periodicals of the Ukrainians in the United States also became a controversial site for the issue of military aid and the constant vetoing of Mr. Obama's lethal weapons. In turn, Jeffrey Payette calls a misleading impression that the US government is not heading towards Ukraine – on the contrary, he believes that the States are concentrating their help on Ukraine in such areas, developing, which, it could protect itself. Former US Ambassador to Ukraine S. Pifer, on the one hand, would have wished action that is more active on this issue from the United States, and on the other, he understood the concern that open military support for Ukraine could lead to an escalation of the conflict on the part of Russia. Practically all the significant moments of diplomatic relations, especially those relating to the intensification of hostilities on the territory of the Ukrainian state (for example, high-level telephone conversations with regard to silence, the need for monitoring by the OSCE, coordination of activities under the Minsk agreements, negotiations in the Normandy format etc.), have been reflected on the pages of the Ukrainian-language press in the United States. In 2015, Vice-President Joseph Biden visited Ukraine in the meantime, although with another mission, as evidenced by his speech in the Verkhovna Rada and a meeting with P. Poroshenko, – the fight against corruption, the unity of democratic forces and the impossibility of lifting sanctions against Russia without full fulfillment of all requirements. The High Official noted that not only the United States, but the whole world is watching events in Ukraine, because its success in the fight against the Kremlin and general corruption can have an impact on many countries. US Deputy Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs V. Nuland, who came along with D. Biden, discussed the results of cooperation between the two countries with the head of the SBU V. Grytsak. Diplomat and public figure Boris Yaremenko considers this a warning to Ukraine, because in case of ignoring US recommendations regarding the main positions in cooperation between the two states, we risk provoking a revision of the position of this influential country in Ukraine.

With the advent of the White House, President D. Trump, experts expressed fears that the

United States could donate to Ukraine in exchange for cooperation with Russia, including the settlement of the situation in Syria. However, the meeting of the American President with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine P. Klimkin, prepared by the diplomatic services of both countries, confirmed all the important US positions for us. T.Kaidanov, US Assistant Secretary of State for Political and Military Affairs, during a meeting with First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine V.Pristai, also stated about Ukraine's priority in foreign policy of the new US administration; as well as Adviser to the President of the United States on Cyber Security R. Giuliani during his visit to Kyiv. However, most likely, diplomats were preparing for a working visit by P. Poroshenko to the United States to meet with the newly elected head of the White House, about the course and pitfalls of which was reported by the Ukrainian-language US press. S. Pifer and O. Motsyk, as former ambassadors and experts, unanimously note that the meeting between Ukrainian and American presidents took place much earlier than the meeting between D. Trump and V. Putin. Mr. Poroshenko received an important message from the head of the White House, as well as Vice-President M. Pens, Secretary of State R. Tillerson, Defense Minister J. Mattis, heads of ministries of energy and trade on the support of Ukraine and the prolongation of sanctions against Russia. Instead, the United States wants to see acceleration of economic reforms in Ukraine and a real fight against corruption. A definitely positive and symbolic signal of the broad political and military support of Ukraine is the first visit of the United States Secretary of Defense James Mattis to our country over the past ten years, especially his presence in the parade on the Independence Day of Ukraine. In the context of the issue, the journalistic material provides an opportunity for subsequent generalizations. Every day, Ukraine is becoming more and more powerful in the international arena. Moreover, the world learns about us not only through the prism of scandals, but also due to the painstaking and titanic work of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine and its diplomats in different countries. Particular attention is paid to US diplomatic services, where the ambassador is extremely important in defending the interests of Ukraine in the country, which determines world politics. From the very beginning, the United States consistently supported the sovereignty and unity of our state, although bilateral relations did not always move upward. Before the Orange Revolution, Ukraine was not the first number on the agenda of US foreign policy, given the involvement of the latter in many conflicts, the policy of "reloading" with Russia in order to combat world terrorism. However, the events of 2004 became a prerequisite for signing several important strategic documents for bilateral relations, which experienced another downturn after further defeat of democratic forces and political chaos in Ukraine. But the revival of the policy of authoritarianism and the expansion of the neo-imperial ambitions of the Russian Federation led to the intensification of the Ukrainian and American diplomatic corps in both countries in the direction of closer contacts, since it is extremely important for the United States to maintain an independent and democratic Ukraine in the center of Europe. There are many articles, notes, interviews covering this issue in the Ukrainian periodicals, and give some grounds for a positive opinion about the level of support provided by the states of Ukraine. Of course, journalistic material can not and does not give full picture of the diplomatic relations between Ukraine and the USA at different stages of their development. Nevertheless, periodicals remain an important and promising source of information on various aspects of diplomatic relations between Ukraine and the United States, especially in the context of modern globalization factors.

References

1. Brzezinski Z. Ukraine in the geostrategic context. – Preface / Sb. Brzezinski – K. : VD "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy", 2006.
2. Zlenko A. Diplomacy and Politics / A. Zlenko. – X.: Folio, 2003. – 348 p.
3. Ivchenko O. Ukraine in the system of international relations: historical retrospective and modern state / O. Ivchenko. – K., 1997.
4. Komarova L.V. Formation and development of strategic partnership Ukraine-US in the 90-ies of XX century. / L.V. Komarova // Historical and political studies. – 2013. – No. 3 (53). – P. 368-372.
5. Krapivin O.V. US Policy toward Ukraine at the Beginning of its Independence / O. Krapivin // Bulletin of the Donetsk National University. Series B. Humanities. – 2008. – Vip. 1. – pp. 124-133.
6. Oliynyk S.D. Geopolitical position of Ukraine from the point of view of the USA / S.Oliynyk. – K., 1994.
7. Shcherbak Yu. Marked by unprecedented dynamism / Yuri Shcherbak // Politics and time. – 1996. – №11. – P. 4-9.

"Wisla" action in the information activities of the American Lemkos: the diplomatic aspect **Volodymyr Nakonechny**

Summary

The article is devoted to the study of the activities of the representatives of the Lemko Diaspora in the United States and Canada in informing the citizens of the Western states about the genocidal nature of the "Wisla" campaign. The diplomatic dimension of this work, which was represented in picketing diplomatic representations of countries-organizers of the mass expulsion of Lemkos from their native lands, has been investigated. As a result, the importance of these events is pointed out in order to draw general attention to the tragedy of Ukrainians of Zakerzonia. Keywords: lemkos, "Wisla" campaign, genocide, diplomacy, Polish-Ukrainian relations

This year's widespread celebration of the 70th anniversary of the tragedy of the Ukrainian minority in Poland once again attracted the attention of the general public and experts in this tragic page of Ukrainian-Polish relations. At the same time, the historiographical aspect of the problem is becoming more acute: to find out the attempts of the Lemko community to spread true information about the Golgotha of Ukrainians in the free world – Zakerzonia. This was especially important during the 1940s-80s, when, in the absence of Ukrainian statehood, the Western mass media usually duplicated the aggressively imposed Polish and Soviet propaganda distorted information about the alleged voluntary and non-conflict nature of the "relocation" of Lemkas from their ethnic lands. In such circumstances, the unequal (in terms of financial organizational capacity) of the information war, Lemko's societies on the American continent first began a systematic campaign to inform the public of the Western countries about the current state of affairs at Zakerzonia. At the same time, interestingly, the means of social influence on diplomatic missions were used for the first time. Unfortunately, this aspect of linguistic historiography remains practically unexplored. The action "Wisla", given its ethnocidal character and decisive influence on the fate of the Rusyn subethnos in the Polish lands, has long been in the field of view of the researchers and has quite a lot of literature. Therefore, the circumstances of planning and the mechanism for the implementation of this crime against humanity are now fully investigated. Finally, for the most part, it was found out that the victims of Lemkos, not only

human, but also material and spiritual, were also found in the immediate and delayed time. At the same time, by that time there was no special attempt to recreate Lemkas's attempts to organize an organized resistance to information sabotage of the Polish and Soviet communist authorities in coverage of the course and consequences of Operation "Wisla". This is due to the relevance of our intelligence.

The purpose and objectives of the article are to attempt a comprehensive study of information events organized on the American continent with the help of which the leks sought to convey true information about the course and effects of the "Wisla" campaign, using instruments of public influence on diplomatic missions. As you know, the Wisla campaign was accompanied by a powerful propaganda campaign, expanded by the Polish and Soviet communist regimes, who attempted to demonstrate ethnic cleansing as a act of "voluntary" relocation of Lemkas. However, the cruelty that was not seen in post-war Europe, with which the "Wisla" campaign was implemented, thanks to the well-coordinated communication of Polish Lemkas with its fellow countrymen in the West, quickly became known in the Western world. The most organized Lemko communities in the US and Canada, outraged by the cynicism of communist propaganda, decided to oppose it in every possible way. A "Committee against Mass Execution", which worked closely with other Ukrainian organizations in the diaspora, first of all, with the Ukrainian Congressional Committee of America, was set up very operatively, with its center in New York. It should be noted that, in addition to the leaders of the Lemko organizations in the diaspora, the Committee also included prominent figures of American politics and public life: writer and publicist Christopher Emmett (headed by the Committee), editors of America magazine J. La Farge and WJ J. Gibbons, publicists and writers U. G. Chamberlin and Dorothy Thompson, chairman of the American Socialist Party Norman Thomas et al.

The first step towards communicating the truth to the world community about the "Wisla" campaign was the English-language information brochure authored by a well-known public figure and journalist, Doctor of History Volodymyr Dushnikov, "The Death and Ruins on the Curzon Line", which appeared in the next 1948 [1]. In it, on the basis of numerous eyewitness accounts, a shocking imagination was presented, a real picture of the extermination of the indigenous population of the Lemko Territories. It was in the brochure of V. Dushnik, for the first time, that genocidal optics were offered at the characterization of the action "Wisla". Let's remark that in the future Lemko organizations will approve such an interpretative model in their further information campaigns.

V. Dushnik's book was sent to the diplomatic missions of Poland and the USSR, as well as to the editors of the most influential periodicals of the USA and Canada. Thanks to such actions, a year after the tragic events the world learned about the actual circumstances of the latest barbaric extermination of the autochthonous population of Lemkivshchyna. On the content of the book, V. Dushnikov informed their readers of such key American editions as Catholic Gerald in St. Louis, the Brooklyn Tablet, Catholic Sentinel in Portland, the Detroit Michigan Catholic, and the Monitor in San Francisco, Rochester Carrier-Journal [2].

Lemkos conducted an information campaign in 1948 proved the effectiveness of targeted campaigns to bring the truth about Lemko genocide to the world community. So the Lemko organizations in the USA and Canada decided to continue working in this direction. So, when Lemkivshchyna magazine was founded in New York in 1979, one of its main tasks was to define the struggle "with hostile Polish [...] false ideas" – that is, the attempts of the chauvinist part of the Polish politician to present resettlement actions as a natural retribution for activities in the Lemko territories of the units of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army

[3, p. 1]. Another important goal of the magazine's publishers was considered counterpropaganda as a necessary response to the ideological sabotage of the Polish politicians of various parties, united in an impulse to "cling to a sense of inferiority among Ukrainian youth and to reinforce traditional Polish contempt and hatred of everything Ukrainian", thereby profane the tragedy of Lemko genocide [3, p. 1]. In order to deepen the information campaign on the genocide of the Ukrainians Zakerzon, Lemko's organizations on the American continent decided to use the 35th anniversary of the Wisla action, which took place in 1982. In defining the tasks of the Rusyn community for this tragic year, the Lemks in the United States and Canada, among others, turned "With a warm call and a request from the entire Ukrainian community [...] to include in the program of their work the commemoration of the 35th anniversary of the forced eviction of Lemkas by corresponding publications and representations before the state or nicks Canada, USA and Poland to create the best conditions for our brothers [...]" [4, p. 22].

In the context of the implementation of the above-mentioned task, it was first proposed to resort to acts of civilian pressure on the diplomatic institutions of the perpetrators of the Lemko genocide – first of all, socialist Poland. For the first time, the need for such actions to picket diplomatic missions of the Polish state in the free world was told at the Fifth ordinary general assembly of the Lemko Association of Canada on May 2, 1982. Discussing the content of the events dedicated to the 35th anniversary of Lemko genocide, the speakers, in particular, pointed to the need for "the barbaric acts of the" people "of Poland to speak to the entire cultural world" [5, p. 24]. At the same time, one of the most effective measures was the picketing of diplomatic missions. This proposal was reflected in the resolution adopted by the congress. It said, among other things: "Organizing protests in front of the buildings of the Polish ambassadorial office in Canada to disguise our claims regarding the direction of the injustices caused to Ukrainians in Poland and the recognition of their full rights enjoyed by all other Polish citizens" [6, p. 25].

Realizing this task, regional representations of the Lemko Association in Canada and the United States conducted a series of loud pickets of Polish ambassadors, whose coverage attracted the Ukrainian public and influential media. The most prominent action was the picketing by the Canadian Lemans of the Polish diplomatic mission in Toronto on October 16, 1982. At that time, both the Lemko activists and public activists of the human rights movement gathered under the Polish ambasada, who kept numerous banners with relevant events in slogans in English and Ukrainian: "Full freedom Ukrainians in Poland!", "Poland for the Poles – Lemkivshchyna for Lemkos!", "Let Lemkas return home!", "Stop persecuting and intimidating our brothers in Poland!". The crowd of demonstrators covered the unfolded blue-and-yellow flags. Then the audience began spontaneously and rhythmically chanting those slogans that were written on the banners. Every once in a while, you heard the exclamation: "We want the will of our brothers!", "Want to do it yourself – give it to another!"

Stepan Babyak, chairman of the Lemko Association of Canada, announced in a speech that he emphasized the genocidal nature of the expulsion of Lemkas from their homes, and called on the Polish authorities to comply with their obligations to protect the rights of national minorities and to provide them with the full civic right. The speaker ended his speech with a prophetic appeal to the Poles: "Who needs our mutual hatred? Wipe your eyes; create conditions for the free life of all. Point out the injustices that our people could forget and forgive you of old and present suffering! Look sober eyes on the present reality! Until then Ukraine will be in captivity!" [7, c. 3].

Subsequently, other protesters, such as the Lemko and the human rights movement, spoke in protest actions, which indicated Poland's criminal actions against the Ukrainian minority of the country. Most of the audience liked the speech of the well-known leader of the Lemko movement, Dr. Valentine Moroz, who immediately translated into English. The speaker, in particular, emphasized the eternal connection of Lemkos with Ukraine and spoke about the importance of celebrating this tragic anniversary from an all-Ukrainian point of view. He stressed that Ukraine would never forget its bloody Lemko brothers, never leave them in their competition for freedom. The speaker demanded the immediate demolition of a law that does not allow landowners to buy land in their own ancient villages and sought to ensure that the cultural and educational activities of Ukrainians in Poland were transferred from the specific "custody" of the Ministry of the Interior to the jurisdiction of the relevant civil authorities. The picketing of the Lemko songs and the national anthem was completed and the relevant resolutions of the Lemko organizations were given to the representatives of the diplomatic mission of Poland in Toronto.

The experience of public pressure on Polish diplomatic missions, obtained in 1982, was deepened after five years when the Ukrainian public in the free world massively celebrated the 40th anniversary of the Wisla action. Like before, in the context of commemorating the anniversaries, the Lemko organizations set themselves the task of "first of all telling the world about the events of 1947 and beyond, and creating a spiritual atmosphere in which the future Polish generations knew that nothing would go unpunished, that for Everyone is inflicted on the wrong side – we must answer and that this responsibility will fall on a whole population, if he has not been detached from criminal elements for a moment" [8, c. 2]. Thus, during 1987 Lemki again resorted to protest actions under the Polish embassies in Canada and the United States, which attracted the attention of the world community not only to the very fact of the recent genocide of Ukrainian Zakarzon, but also to the continued disenfranchisement of Lemkas in the Polish state. As before, Lemko's organizations prepared English-language information brochures, which were sent to diplomatic establishments of many countries of the world and to the editors of the most influential Western publications.

The aforementioned numerous Lemkas-organized campaigns during the 1980s, however, as well as public pressure on diplomatic institutions, eventually yielded results: the loud discussion of Lemko's post-war tragedy coincided in time with democratic transformations in Poland itself. Democratic opposition to the communist regime, united in the ranks of Solidarity, recognized the need for Poles to reconcile with national minorities, first of all, with Ukrainian. The first step towards such a reconciliation was the recognition of the crime of the events of 1947. Polish intellectuals began to frankly show the violent nature of resettlement actions, wholly laying the blame on communist rule [9]. Finally, at its historic meeting on Aug. 3, 1990, the Polish Senate condemned the action of Wisla. The decree condemned the principle of collective responsibility, which was guided by the Polish communist regime, justifying the ongoing genocide [10]. On the eve of Ukrainian independence, the majority of Polish intellectuals, captured by the ideas of the international consensus of Jerzy Gedroits and the Parisian "Culture", recognized the need for reconciliation with the Ukrainian minority in the region in recognition of guilt and sincere apologies.

The analysis convincingly demonstrates the prominent role of American Lemkas in disseminating true information about the "Wisla" campaign among the public of the countries of the free world in the 1940s-80s. The proven important initiative of public

pressure on the diplomatic representations of the countries-organizers of the Lemko genocide was a major consequence of the recognition of the tragedy of Ukrainian Zakeozonya not only by Western governments, but ultimately by the leadership of Poland itself, which gradually got rid of a heavy totalitarian heritage by the turn of the 1980s and 1990s. Finally, we note that the successfully tested Lemkas practice of organized picketing of diplomatic missions of anti-Ukrainian-minded countries proves to be effective even today, when our state is confronting hybrid aggression not only on the battlefield, but also in the information space.

References

1. Dushnyck W. Death and devastation of the Curzon line: the story of deportations from Ukraine / Walter Dushnyck. – New York : Committee Against Mass Expulsion in cooperation with the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, 1948. – 32 p.2. The American press of 1948 about the tragedy of Zakerzonya // Lemkivshchyna. – 1982. – Part 3. – P. 8.3. Dear fellow countrymen, a wide Ukrainian community! // Lemkivshchyna. – 1979. – Part 1. – P. 1.4. The Unification of the Lemkos of Canada. Craiova Administration Communiqué // Lemkivshchyna. – 1982. – Part 2. – P. 21-22.5. S. Bk. Regional congress of OLK / From the organization's life // Lemkivshchyna. – 1982. – Part 3 – P. 23-24.6. Resolutions of the Fifth Ordinary General Congress of the Lemko Association of Canada, May 2, 1982 / From the Life of the Organization // Lemkivshchyna. – 1982. – Part 3. – P. 24-25.7. Nazarevich Ya. Days of mourning and protest in Toronto / Yaroslav Nazarevich // Lemkivshchyna. – 1983. – p. 2. – pp. 2-3.8. Will we be ready // Lemkivshchyna. – 1987. – Part 1. – S. 2.9. Action "Wisla" – How Hate Hate. With the historian Eugene Misil speaks Married Semprich // Lemkivshchyna. – 1990. – Ch. 4. – pp. 2-4.10. Polish Senate Condemned Action "Wisla" // Lemkivshchyna. – 1990. – Part 3 – P. 19.

United Slovenia (1848 – 1941): national idea trapped in international relations

Kateryna Malshyna, Voladyslav Volobuev

Summary

The article deals with the origin of the Slovenian national political program of United Slovenia, its main issues and determined stages of development. Its impact on Slovenian politics in terms of interethnic and international relations during the 2nd half of XIX – 1st half of XX cent. is analyzed.

Keywords: Slovenia, United Slovenia, national political idea.

Part II. Slovenian lands have been a controversial area for Austria and Italy for centuries; from the middle of the nineteenth century. An important factor in their reunification was the idea of irredentist, which concerned, first of all, the Italians and Germans who were still in a state of fragmentation, but their removal from the territorial division of the world forced them to look for an incentive to take as many neighboring territories as possible. For example, in 1867 Prussia annexed Schleswig, and in 1871 it joined Alsace and Lorraine. Even earlier, the idea of the need to unite in one state territories whose population speaks one language, and the implementation of state boundaries according to linguistic was called the

"principle of nationality". The combination of the Italians with the "principle of nationality" with the idea of national sovereignty became the ideological basis for the establishment of the Italian Kingdom.

Also, in the middle of XIX century were recognized the following procedures of "popular will" regarding the status of territories as plebiscite. According to their results, the accession of Nice and Savoy to France in 1860, the Ionian islands in Greece – in 1862. It all prepared the emergence of the term "self-determination of nations" and the concept of "the right of nations to self-determination," which were first voiced at the Berlin Congress in 1878. This idea was soon widely accepted, taking a strong place in the programmatic provisions of many liberal and socialist movements. In the period of the First World War, the warring countries considered it their duty to proclaim the slogan of self-determination of peoples who lived on the lands of the enemy. The Entente and the United States first nominated the principle of national self-determination, as a possible norm of the post-war system. Since the beginning of 1918, the Allies have taken the course of dismembering the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the creation on its territory of states that would be in the sphere of influence of the countries of the coalition.

Based on the main provisions of the American Constitution, US President Woodrow Wilson expressed his support for the principle of national self-determination at the end of the war and during subsequent peace talks. In the early stages of discussing the idea of self-determination, he was opposed to the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. His concept was not unchanged – he supplemented and developed it in discussions with advisers and world politicians. One of the influential politicians of the time who entered into an acute discussion with Wilson and actually convinced him of his thoughts about the fate of Austro-Hungarians and its colonial peoples, was T.G. Masaryk. In May 1916 Wilson spoke only of the right of peoples to choose a government in which they would be more comfortable to live – that is, the idea of "internal self-determination" was offered. A little later, the American president formulated the principle of "external self-determination", according to which any people could choose the form of sovereignty they wanted. Finally, the extreme acuteness of the contradictions on the European continent at the end of World War I. led Wilson to think of the need to "link" self-determination with the national principle. In February 1917, W. Wilson came to the idea of the need for the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary. [1]

Among his "Fourteen Points" dated January 8, 1918, XIX – XI Paragraphs concerned the self-determination of the peoples of Austria-Hungary and the order of the Kingdom of the Holy See:• IX. The correction of the borders of Italy must be made on the basis of clearly visible national borders.• X. The peoples of Austria-Hungary ... should receive the widest opportunity for autonomous development.• XI. The liberation of the territories of Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, the provision of reliable access to the Adriatic Sea by Serbia, and the guarantee of the independence of the Balkan states. [2]

Wilson said that "the resolution of each territorial issue that has sparked during this war must be determined by the interests of the population concerned, not as a moment of a simple equation or compromise of the requirements of the opposing sides," and further, "that all clearly expressed national requirements should be on opportunities are being met on the widest scale, and new developments, or the old currents of discord and hatred that threaten the peace of Europe and, therefore, the rest of the world, must be eliminated". But the main thesis of Wilson that the main subject of power is the people who have the right to self-determination, somewhat contradicted point XI on the granting of access to the

sea to Serbia – this meant that it would receive territory with an international population. That is, from the very beginning, it was the expansion of Serbia at the expense of all other former Habsburg peoples and Montenegro – a kingdom without a king. We see that in this American view of the Balkans, the will of the Western Balkan peoples, including the Slovenes, was not taken into account. Therefore, the Paris Peace Conference, which initiated and established the main principles for drawing up Slovenian and, in general, Yugoslavian borders, also listened only diplomatically, but in fact did not take into account the Slovenian territorial requirements.

The position of Italy, the Entente's ally, which was actually defeated on the Sochi front, helped a lot in this, but after the collapse of Austria-Hungary and the withdrawal of its army, it took advantage of the opportunity and occupied the Slovenian lands that were conquered in it during the fighting of 1915-1918. The entire line of the Slovenian section of the Yugoslav border with Italy, which went to the lands of the Sochi front, further south to the Croatian Dalmatia, did not correspond either to geographical or ethnic separation principles. Italy occupied the territory for which it signed the London Pact in 1915 and entered the war, but went far beyond the demarcation line promised to it in London – its troops captured even the northern Dalmatia and some of the Kvarner Islands. Therefore, the Italian harassment led to a delay in the process of determining the boundary, requiring the signing of separate treaties, Rapallsky 1920 and Roman 1923, but still did not give a fair, ethnically, demarcation. The Slovenes here lost one fifth of their number – about 340 thousand people, the "Giant's part" of their ethnic and historical territory, which after 1922 began a violent Italianization.

No less unfair, from the Slovene point of view, was demarcation in Carinthia. The Slovenians also lost two fifths of their ethno-historical territory and population (more than 600 thousand people) – moreover, Carinthia was a cradle of Slovenian statehood since the 7th century. Therefore, its violent state separation caused trauma in historical memory Slovenian people. The decision in favor of Austria, the defeated party, was taken in Paris not for the sake of Austria, but against Yugoslavia, and this complicated the relations of the Slovenes not only with neighbors along the state borders, but also with the central authority in Belgrade. Thus, in 1920, Slovenian national politics, based on the program of United Slovenia, collapsed in international relations. After 1921, she collapsed inside the Kingdom of the Sahwa / Yugoslavia, under the conditions of the Thawtan Constitution, which introduced a national unification. At the same time as in Slovenia the Slovenes in the national struggle were united, at all times of the Kingdom of the Sahara / Yugoslavia they were divided into two camps, the national-Slovenian and Yugoslavian. The Liberal Party was in a unitary camp. The liberals, who considered the party's position as erroneous, were also not so small, they were bent on nationalists-clerics.

The main merit of the central Serbian authorities was seen by the unitarians in liberating him from German domination and in defense of the Italians and the Austrians; any independent Slovenian policy was defined as an opposition and even separatism, slandering opponents as austrophils. Already the creation of Yugoslavia has led to the formation of a kind of mentality that was as strongly emphasized by Yugoslavism and was always afraid to speak of a Slovene. Even the Declaration of Slovenian Cultural Workers in February 1921, which spoke for the "autonomy of the Slovene, already sufficiently cut earth," praised Yugoslavia as "the unification of all three tribes in one country with a single sovereign power externally and internally." Its author is Dragothin Lonchar opposed federalism or confederation, for the "autonomous position, which is the middle ground between

centralism and federalism" [3]

Day 6 January 1929 brought more than 60 years of lack of democracy. Of the subsequent programs of autonomy, of course, the most well-known are "Punctuations" SNP of December 31, 1932 [4] As in the Austrian period, the Slovenes in Yugoslavia adapted to the possibilities of the moment. Radical tendencies took place almost exclusively on a personal level or among such illegal banned parties as Communists. Persistent Italian and German threats led to a strong Slovenian commitment to Yugoslavia. The fascist occupation in April 1941 again showed that the Slovenes do not have a nation. Its territory was divided between Italy, Germany and Hungary. In all three countries, Slovenian lands were divided into administrative units that had topographical names (for example, the province of Ljubljana, Italy). We see that since the launch of the program of United Slovenia to the international level, it has entered into a sharp contradiction with the aspirations of the great subjects of international relations. As for Primorye, for example, it became clear that United Slovenia was not really feasible, especially since the border of 1866, which brought the Kingdom of Italy to Venetian Slovenia, was not contradictory to the international community and did not call into question, and the superpowers did not consider it necessary to review it in 1918.

Also, contrary to Slovenian expectations, in the years 1941 – 1945, international factors (including the USSR) did not really have the correct understanding of Slovenian territorial claims in the north, in Carinthia, therefore, United United Kingdom during the Second World War was also not achievable, regardless of which side at the end of the war would represent the Slovene interests to the international community. A number of international circumstances were not so favorable for the implementation of national requirements, because in any case, from the outset, Italy and Austria played an important role in the Union plans in the reorganization of post-war Europe. On the other hand, D. Bieber points out that many international factors, generally favorable to the Slovenes, perceived the Slovenian territorial claims differently than the Slovenian politicians expected. British studies of these issues, for example, show a fundamental misunderstanding in the fact that the existing demarcation criteria based on ethnic principles took into account the Austrian census of 1910, while the Slovene side insisted on correcting the historical injustice of the past to restore the national situation, at least from the middle of the past century. From such a very different point of view, the Slovenian territorial claims arose from differences, which led to such assessments – for example, data of PL Rose, when he said that Slovenian demands are "wild and politically exaggerated".

According to B. Godes, "an ideal, about which it soon became clear that it would hardly be possible to realize it, ... experienced a similar fate, like other Maximalist programs of other nations. From this point of view, in the European context, the Slovenes do not represent any exceptional tragic peculiarities." Thus, we see that, at the borders of the Austrian Empire, the Slovenes felt divided only administratively – the main purpose at that moment for them was the protection of the Slovenian language as an ethnic identity, for which they claimed unification into a single administrative unit of an autonomous nature: in general, in mid-nineteenth century. the program of United Slovenia was a protest against Germanization, which still threatened to intensify in the event of the unification of Germany and the accession of Austria. The program came out of the clerical cell and remained a general Slovenian political program, strengthening the Tabor movement in 1868 – 1871, when it became clear that the Slovenian policy is still small and weak and should fight for a national idea with Croats and Serbs – at that time the idea of reunification of Slovenia gives way to

Yugoslavism.

Yugoslavism, in turn, arose on the basis of the results of the Italian-Austrian war, which, first, led to the expansion of the rights of Hungary within the empire, and, secondly, to the loss of the first slice of Slovenian land – Venetian Slovenia (Friuli), showing that the Slovenes can not protect themselves. Understanding the Italian threat pushed for Slovenian politics to cooperate with the Croats in the struggle for Yugoslavism. An additional factor of such ethno-historical misunderstanding was the certainty that the Slovenes were a “non-historical” people who never had their own state. Under these conditions, all the Slavs of the empire began to feel themselves the only people, and this, at that time, fruitful, idea led the oppressed peoples to collapse the empire. But at the same time, the great freedom and state disorder of the huge conglomerate of the Western Balkan peoples forced Slovenian politicians to see the possibility of a moment and once again raise the idea of United Slovenia on the shield.

Within the State of the SCS, at the inter-ethnic level, this idea did not contradict the national ideas of the associates of the collapse of Austria-Hungary – Croats and Voivodine Serbs. But at the same time, the Slovene national idea came to the international level: the 20th century’s main conflict between Slovenes and Europe, between the pawn and the queen on the world chess board was launched. The unforeseen Italian occupation of Primorje in November 1918, the Slovenian-Austrian war of 1919, the Carinthian plebiscite of 1920, and the unfair demarcation defined by the Paris Peace Conference showed that the Slovenes, as a people, are not an object, nor a subject of world politics. They are only a controversial territory for four countries. In both cases, with both the Italian and Austrian problematic areas of the Slovenian border of the Kingdom of the SSC, which left about 40% of the population of Slovenia outside of their native country, international intervention created these problems and only delayed the outbreak of international conflicts around them before the Second World War.

As you can see, in 1918, in that historic mill, which rebelled three European empires and dispersed the fourth, the Slovenes emerged as a living example of the fate of the small people in international relations. The program of United Slovenia at the Paris Peace Conference placed on the agenda theoretical issues of international law – the right of nations to self-government, the principles of state separation, the validity of the use of the plebiscite in international relations as a form of expression of will in the polyethnic territories. In internal political affairs, United Slovenia also posed many questions concerning the need to develop theoretical problems of ethnopolitics, and the main issues were the correlation between the concepts of ethnos and confession, the national idea and the idea of state-building, the processes of nation-building and state-building. Slovenian politics until 1918 under the influence of external factors demonstrated the lack of understanding of the difference and complementarity of these concepts and processes, confusing them among themselves. On the other hand, since from the XIX century the sovereign was considered a state which had political recognition and whose status was based on “the lawful prescription and the inclusion of it in accordance with custom” [5], the program set before the Slovenian cultural and political elite the task historically to prove the right to the existence of the Slovenian ethnic group and its national state.

The new phase began with the emergence of the State of the CPS, when, in defense of the reunification program, a clerical Slovenian people’s party, which by the end of the Second World War was at the positions of nationalism, changed tactics, depending on political tendencies in the central government. In 1923, illegal communists moved to the position of

nationalism. "United Slovenia" became the flag of the struggle for the return of the cut off Slovenian lands and for national existence – against, respectively, the Italianization and Germanization, as well as against national unification within the First Yugoslavia. And if the second goal had already been achieved relatively in 1945 within the framework of the Second Yugoslavia, the first goal still remains to be questioned.

References

1. Moritsch A. Koroški plebiscit / Andreas Moritsch // Slovenija 1848-1998: iskanje lastne poti. – Ljubljana: Zveza zgodovinskih društev Slovenije, 1998. – Str.267.2. Melik V. Die nationalen Programme des Matija Majar-Ziljski / Vasilij Melik // Matija Majar-Ziljski: zbornik / Andreas Moritsch (Hg). – Klagenfurt: Hermagoras, 1995. – Str. 98-99.3. Granda S. Graška Slovenija v letu 1848/1849 / Stane Granda. – Zgodovinski časopis. – 1974. – Letnik 28.- Str.53.4. Zarnik V. 21., 26. in 30. januar / Valentin Zarnik // Novice. – 6. 02.1867. – Tečaj 25. - List 6. – V Ljubljani: J.Blasnikovi nasledniki, 1848. – Str.43-45.5. Melik V. Ideja Zedinjene Slovenije 1848-1991... – Str.18.6. Perovšek J. Oblikovanje slovenske nacionalne države leta 1918 / Jurij Perovšek // Prispevki za zgodovino delavskega gibanja. – 1985. – Letnik 25. – Str.59.7. Svoboda G.J. Robert J.Kerner and the US Conception of Czechoslovak Independence // T.G.Masaryk (1850-1937). – L.: McMillan Press, 1989. – Vol. 3: Statesman and Cultural Force. – PP. 49, 52.8. Wilson W. Fourteen Points Programme of 8 January 1918 // The Papers of Woodrow Wilson. – Princeton, NJ: Princeton Un-ty Press, 1982. – Vol.44. – PP.534-539.9. Lončar D. Slovenci in jugoslovanstvo / Dragotin Lončar // Naši zapiski. – 1921. – Št.13. – Str. 25-26.10. Prunk J. Slovenski narodni vzpon / Janko Prunk. – Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije, 1992. – Str. 261.11. Grushkin D.V. The right of peoples to self-determination ... – P.7

Functioning of Consular Offices in Donetsk (2002 – 2014) Igor Todorov

SUMMARY The article considers the creation and functioning of consular offices of foreign countries in the city of Donetsk at the beginning of the XXI century. It analyses the role of the regional representation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, local authorities and self-government in these processes. It shows the determining role of the Russian Federation in terminating the activities of the consulates in Donetsk. Key words: consular office, honorary consulate, European integration of Ukraine, Russian aggression.

The celebration of the jubilee of Ukrainian diplomacy draws attention to the activities of diplomatic and consular institutions in our country. From the beginning of the 2000s in the east of Ukraine there was a marked increase in the creation of official consular offices of foreign countries. Donetsk was especially highlighted, and it was not accidental. It is this city because of its economic role, the influence of the oligarchs on the political power in the country was considered by foreign partners of Ukraine as one where it was necessary to create consular institutions. Initially, they were honorary consulates, but their activities always depended on the subjective factor. Also, the factor that influenced the opening of consular offices in Donetsk was the operation of the Office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine in 2003 -2010. The establishment of the activities of the representative office was in accordance with the order of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine of December 10, 2003 No. 758-p. The Government agreed with the proposal of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the establishment of a Representative Office in Donetsk with the allocation of a permanent

unit within the limits of the number of employees of the Ministry. Financing of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Donetsk was carried out at the expense of the expenditures envisioned by the state budget for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Donetsk Regional State Administration was instructed to provide the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Donetsk with the necessary premises. Maxim Lazarenko (a graduate of DonNU in the specialty "International Economics") was appointed Head of the representation. Over time, the state was enlarged, the graduates of internships DonNU were involved in the work, the institution was headed by Valentin Kuzechkin. On February 28, 2006, the Center for Assistance to Ukrainian Citizens was opened in Donetsk. He became the fifth similar center on the territory of Ukraine. It was thanks to the support and promotion of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs representation in Donetsk that the official consulates of foreign countries began to work. However, at the beginning of Yanukovich's presidency, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine was closed in Kharkiv, Uzhgorod and Donetsk (Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No. 1871-r of September 22, 2010) in order to save state funds. Of course, the initiative to establish consular offices was based on the political will of the respective states.

The Consular Office of the Embassy of the Republic of Bulgaria in Ukraine became the first permanent foreign consular establishment in Donetsk. She was not an independent unit, however, she successfully served consular functions during 2002 – 2008. The main function of the Consular Office was, according to the head of the consulate's office, Nikolay Yurukov, issuing visas. In certain periods of activity, the office issued a visa more than the Bulgarian Embassy in Kiev. This was due to the fact that visas were received not only by Ukrainian citizens but also by neighboring Russia, where at that time there were no Bulgarian consular posts. However, in July 2008, the consular office was closed because of the lack of financial capacity of Bulgaria to hold its representation in Donetsk.

In 2006, the Czech Republic requested the opening of the Consulate General in Donetsk and in summer 2007 the first foreign Consulate General in the city began its activities. An experienced diplomat Antonin Murgash was appointed Consul General of the Czech Republic in Donetsk. The consular district includes Donetsk, Luhansk, Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporozhye, Kherson regions, as well as the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol. The opening of the Consulate General of the Czech Republic in Donetsk prompted the close relations of our countries, the desire to promote their development, naturally, with an emphasis on the economy, to facilitate the possibility of Ukrainian citizens traveling to Europe, as well as the desire to deeper acquaintance of the Southeast of Ukraine with the Czech Republic, a member state of the European Union and NATO. Since the beginning of the activities of the Consulate General of the Czech Republic, good relations have been established with the state administration of the Donetsk region and the city leadership. Effective assistance was provided by the Delegation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine to Donetsk and the President of the Donetsk Chamber of Commerce and Industry Gennady Chizhikov [1].

In September 2008, at the initiative of Antonina Murgash in the house, along with the Consulate General, Czech Prime Minister Mirek Topolánek opened the Czech House. This institution is intended to facilitate contacts between business circles of Ukraine and the Czech Republic. Mirek Topolánek also inspected the construction of the Donetsk stadium for Euro 2012. The Prime Minister of the Czech Republic took part in the Ukrainian-Czech business forum, which took place in the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, having met with the leadership of the Donetsk region and the Donetsk mayor. During the presidency of the Czech Republic in the European Union, the Consulate General in June 2009 initiated a

visit of accredited in Kyiv ambassadors to Donetsk. During the meetings, the support of the European and Euro-Atlantic aspirations of Ukraine was clearly expressed. In the miner's capital, in the end of 2009, the Christmas Nativity Show was held. Among its organizers is the Consulate General of the Czech Republic in Donetsk. According to the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Czech Republic to Ukraine, Yaroslav Bashti, the exhibition was intended to present the people of the region with the traditions, culture and customs of the Czech people. This knowledge will help to develop cooperation, to implement joint mutually beneficial business projects. The Czech side is interested in contributing to the re-equipment of the Donbass industry. The region supplies coal mining equipment, machine tools and the like. In addition, assistance is provided for the modernization and reconstruction of urban communal transport. The Consulate General in Donetsk organized a meeting of the Donetsk Regional Branch of the Ukrainian Association of European Studies with the Ambassador of the Czech Republic to Ukraine Yaroslav Bashta. According to Yaroslav Bashti, in the gas conflict, Russia hoped to get more support for its alternative gas pipeline projects. The ambassador noted that Russia is not a reliable gas supplier. Yaroslav Bashta supported the initiative of holding the European Year of Creativity and Innovation in Ukraine, which is the theme of the project, which is being implemented by the Association with the support of the European Commission's Delegation [2].

Fruitful contacts were established at the Consulate General of the Czech Republic with the Donetsk National University. Antonin Murgash, vice consuls participated in the Autumnal Academies of NATO (2008, 2010), at many scientific conferences. Before the international students, the Consul General and other Czech diplomats spoke repeatedly with lectures. On the excursions to the consulate, there were systematic students and teachers. The high quality of the visa service of the Consulate General of the Czech Republic in Donetsk was evidenced by the results of monitoring conducted over several years by a consortium of NGOs "Europe without barriers". The number of refusals to grant Schengen visas did not exceed 3% [3].

A number of diplomatic scandals between Ukraine and the Czech Republic in early 2011 influenced the work of the Consulate General in Donetsk. After the end of the cadence Antonina Murgash, Ukraine was delayed with the provision of exequatur to the new consul general. By the way, he did not respond to the request of the agréman regarding the new ambassador. This led to corresponding demarches from the Czech Republic. To this step, the Czech foreign policy office succeeded as a result of the long-term inaction of the Ukrainian side in the issue of administrative support for the subdivision. From July 1, 2011, visas for visas were stopped in Donetsk. The reason for these measures was the fact that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine did not give consent to the arrival of the new consul general to Donetsk, a request that the Czech Foreign Ministry filed on February 23, 2011. As a result of this delay, the Consulate General of the Czech Republic in Donetsk has been working for a month without a head. The Ukrainian authorities reacted promptly, and the Czech Republic restored the work of the visa department of the consulate in Donetsk on July 19, 2011.

According to the Embassy of the Czech Republic in Ukraine, the Consulate General of the Czech Republic in Donetsk on May 7, 2014, suspended the application for a Schengen (short-term) visa. In September 2014, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine named the seizure of the Consulate General of the Czech Republic and Poland in Donetsk as a flagrant violation of international law.

At the end of 2009, the Consulate General of the Federal Republic of Germany had to open

in Donetsk. It was planned that his staff would consist of 25 people. Consulate was supposed to carry out visa operations. However, the Foreign Ministry refused to do so with the aim of saving and, as it turned out, unfounded hopes for the introduction of a visa-free regime with the EU. That is why the Consulate General of Germany in Donetsk focused on economic, humanitarian and cultural issues. The Consulate General of the Federal Republic of Germany in April 2011 acted as co-organizer of a scientific conference devoted to the Holocaust on the anniversary of the Donetsk Jewish Center. Together with the Delegation of the Heinrich Böll Foundation, the Consulate organized a film show of the film director of the German director Jacob Proiss "The Other Chelsea". The film is not so much about football, but first of all, about the city of Donetsk, about the people who lived in it and about the huge problems that were observed in this region of Ukraine. The Consulate General of Germany on October 28, 2011, along with the Road Safety Association, the Union of Motorists, the European Union of Youth of Ukraine in the framework of the Decade for Road Safety, proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations, held a rally in the central streets of the city. In preparation for the signing of the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the EU, Donetsk was visited by deputy of the German parliament, EU foreign affairs spokeswoman Viola von Cramon. She was accompanied by the Consul General of Germany in Donetsk Klaus Cillikens. On June 17, 2013, a podium discussion "Structural Reforms in the Donbass. Chances and opportunities for the region after possible signing of the Association Agreement with the EU" [4]. Interestingly, after the opening of the Consulate General of Germany in Donetsk, the Honorary Consul – Victor Kalashnikov, Professor of Donetsk National Technical University, Doctor of Technical Sciences continued to work in Donetsk.

The Consulate General of the Federal Republic of Germany, after the start of the "Russian Spring", helped to visit Donetsk members of the Bundestag Committee on EU Affairs in April 2014. Following this visit, the chairman of the committee, Gunter Krihbaum, noted that there is no self-proclaimed republic in eastern Ukraine. Instead, there are militants, separatists. After the actual occupation of Donetsk in September 2014, the German Embassy turned to the police for the kidnapping of unknown persons from the underground garages of private housing by the Consul General of the Federal Republic of Germany in Donetsk and his substitute for the Subaru Legacy and Dacia Duster vehicles belonging to the Consulate. In early January 2015, the Consulate General of Germany in Donetsk was officially closed. At the same time, the activity of the temporary office in the Dnieper was initiated. Consular district remained unchanged, covering Donetsk, Luhansk, Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporozhye regions. Since March 2017, the consulate has resumed the following consular services: the certification of copies, the certification of applications for a certificate from the Central Register of foreigners, the certification of applications for a certificate of legality, a certificate of border crossing, etc. [5].

Poland traditionally has the most extensive network of consular institutions in Ukraine. At the same time, since 2010, there has been talk of the need to open another general consulate. To a practical level, the issue turned into the middle of 2013, when Poland planned to open its eighth consulate in Ukraine. Polish Consul General in Donetsk Yakub Volonsevich, a career diplomat started his work in June 2013. The consular district included Donetsk, Zaporozhye and Luhansk regions. The Consul General was hoping for significant results in the trade, investment, science and culture spheres. It was assumed that the new institution will pay significant attention to legal and visa issues, but among its priorities will be the deepening of cooperation between Polish territories and cities and districts of

Donetsk, Zaporizhzhya and Luhansk oblasts. One of the first events of the Polish Consulate was the dedication of commemorative tables to the miners who, in January 1945, brought from Upper Silesia in Poland for forced labor in the Donbas mines. The consecration took place on September 29, 2013 in the parish church of the Roman Catholic Church of St. Joseph. In 1945, about 70 thousand people were forcibly removed, the overwhelming majority of whom died there. Archbishop Victor Skvorts, Katowice Metropolitan, who arrived in Donetsk together with the representative delegation of the Silesian Voivodeship, sent and delivered the Holy Mass. The exarch of the Donetsk-Kharkov bishop Stepan Men'ok (UGCC), the Polish Ambassador to Ukraine Henrik Litvin, and representatives of local authorities also took part in the ceremony.

Already in conditions of Russian aggression, the Consulate General of Poland began the visa action. On this occasion, at the Donbass Palace Hotel on April 29, 2014 a festive reception took place. Symbolically, the first visa was received by a resident of the Russian occupation of the Slavic occupied by that time. The Vice-Consul for visa issues was the former head of the Polish Consulate General in Sevastopol, which at that time had already ceased its work through Russia's annexation of the Crimea. Already in May, the activities of the consulate are minimized. However, thanks to the efforts of the Consulate, several hundred representatives of the Polish ethnic minority of Donetsk and Lugansk region were evacuated to Poland. In September, the premises of the Consulate General were captured by militants. The final liquidation of the Consulate General of the Republic of Poland in Donetsk took place on February 27, 2015, at the decision of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Poland. On May 30, 2011, the opening of the General Consulate of Georgia in Donetsk was held in Donetsk. It was confined to the 20th anniversary of the restoration of Georgia's state independence. The general consul was Teimuraz Nishnianidze. However, after two years the institution has lowered its status and was accredited as the Consulate of Georgia in Donetsk. The leader was Irakli Advadze. Consular district, within which the consulate acted, covered the territory of Donetsk, Zaporozhye, Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk and Luhansk oblasts. Even after the proclamation of the DNR, the Georgian Consul took part in public debates on the topic "The chances and opportunities for the inhabitants of the eastern regions from signing the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the European Union." The organizers of this project were the Institute for Social and Political Design "Dialogue" and the Information Center of the European Union of Donetsk National University, and as speakers – the Consul General of the Federal Republic of Germany in Donetsk Dr. Voltaire Detlef and the Consul General of the Republic of Poland in Donetsk Yakub Volonsevich. For more than 15 years the talks on the opening of the Consulate General of the Russian Federation in Donetsk continued. Even there were reports that on January 1, 2011 it started its work. Planned, Ukraine will open its consulate in Nizhny Novgorod, and Russia – in Donetsk. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine Konstantyn Gryshchenko stated this at a press conference in Moscow. However, such a statement once again demonstrated that real Ukrainian-Russian relations were outside the competence of the foreign policy department. The Honorary Consulates have their own specifics, which follows from the Vienna Convention of 1963. It was with them that the development of consular offices in Donetsk began. At the same time, their activities are very much related to the person of the honorary consul. For example, the Honorary Consulate of the Republic of Armenia was one of the first in Donetsk, however, it ceased its activities in connection with the transfer of the head. And only in early 2014, it opened again. Honorary consulates in Donetsk served residents of the region and the city, made contacts with local authorities, carried out work aimed at

protecting the rights of citizens of the represented countries in the consular district, engaged in the issuance of certificates, passports, sometimes visas. The embassies of the respective countries monitored the work of their honorary consulates. Consulates were usually located in premises of business structures or institutions headed by honorary consuls. In addition to the Honorary Consulate of Armenia, freelance consular offices of Austria, Lithuania, Slovakia, France, the Netherlands, Croatia, and the Federal Republic of Germany operated in Donetsk. Already on the eve of the Russian invasion it was planned to open honorary consulates in Italy and Brazil. The main reason for the emergence of honorary consulates in Donetsk was the economy, the establishment of ties between Ukrainian entrepreneurs and the business of the respective countries.

However, not only was it – at the initiative of the honorary consul of Lithuania in December 2007, the Center for European Studies with the participation of former President of Lithuania Algirdas Brazauskas was opened in Donetsk. It is interesting that at the opening ceremony of this center in the premises of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Donetsk region, the only official person who made his own speech in the Ukrainian language was Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Lithuania, Algirdas Kumža. Donetsk officials traditionally performed in Russian. At the initiative of the consulate in May 2008, the head of the Lithuanian mission to NATO Linas Linkavičius (current Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania) visited Donetsk. He took part in the security conference held at the Donetsk National University. Thus, during the period of 2002 – 2014 before the Russian invasion in Ukraine, the consulates of several European states successfully operated in Donetsk. Their work contributed to the regional implementation of the state policy aimed at European and Euro-Atlantic integration of Ukraine.

References

1. Consul General of the Czech Republic in Donetsk: "Our consulate will also issue Schengen visas" [Electronic resource] – Access mode: <https://www.ostro.org/general/society/articles/1104/2>
2. Participants of the Donetsk Oblast Branch of UESA met with Yaroslav Bashta, Ambassador of the Czech Republic to Ukraine [Electronic resource] – Access mode: eustudy.at.ua/news/2009-02-04-1393. The Czech Republic is one of the leading EU Member States in terms of the number of visas issued to Ukrainian citizens. [Electronic resource] – Access mode: europewb.org.ua/vizova-politika-i-praktika-konsylstv-cheskoi-respybliki-v-ykraini/
4. Association Agreement with the EU: Donbass prophecies for modernization [Electronic resource] – Access mode: www.dw.com/uk/%8E/a-168892615. "Consulate General of Germany in Donetsk" started working in Dnipro. HTNNOVOSTI.DN.UA/NEWS/267721-V-DNEPRE-ZARABOTALO-GENERALNOE-KONSULSTVO-GERMANYY-V-DONECKE

**Philip Alphonse Freiger von Schwarzentain – german "diplomat of old quenching"
Lyudmyla Vovchuk**

Summary

The article reveals the personality of the German baron Philip Alphonse Freiger von Schwarzenstein, who devoted his whole life to a diplomatic affair. Special attention is paid to his diplomatic activity in Ukraine during the days of Hetman P. Skoropadsky. Kyiv business trip was the last in his diplomatic career. For all his years of diplomacy, he has proven himself a professional and influential diplomat who has always fulfilled the tasks of his government. Keywords: Philip Alfons Freigher Mumm von Schwarzenstein, ambassador, attaché, Germany, Ukraine

After signing the Brest Treaty, the UPR acquired all rights and obligations of the subject of international law. Thanks to the ratification of this treaty, Ukraine has established its diplomatic missions in Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey and Bulgaria. In the Ukrainian cities, in turn, the diplomatic missions and consulates of the countries of the Fourth Union began to function again. The first among foreign representatives on June 2, 1918, in Kyiv was presented the authorizing documents of the hetman of the Ukrainian state P. Skoropadsky, the German ambassador Baron von Mumm and the Austro-Hungarian Count Forgach. In ambassadorial letters, ambassadors "on the instructions of their governments confirm the recognition of the new state system of Ukraine and express a desire to enter into a business relationship with the Ukrainian government" [1].

Ambassador of the Kaiser Germany, Baron Philippe Alfons Freigher Mumm von Schwarzenštejn (March 19, 1859 – July 10, 1924) – "diplomat of old quenching" – came to Kiev during the days of the Ukrainian People's Republic [2]. It was a diplomat with a capital letter. A man who has devoted all his life to the service of Germany on the diplomatic field. Son of the merchant and part-time Consul General of Denmark Jacob Georges Hermann Mumm and Ezioni Sophie Latteotro, Alphonse Mumm graduated from the municipal gymnasium in Frankfurt, and later (from 1879) studied law in Gettingen, Leipzig, Heidelberg and Berlin, having received a doctoral degree in lawyer which gave him the opportunity to become a member of the Hannover Corps in Gettingen, and then join the diplomatic service of the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The diplomatic activity of Philip Alphonse Freiger Mumm von Schwarzenstein began from London, where he, the Attache at the Embassy, arrived in 1885. Three years later, he was appointed secretary of the German Embassy in Washington. From 1892 to 1893, he served diplomatic functions in Bucharest, and during the years 1893 – 1894 – under the Holy See. Returning to his homeland in 1894, Mumm became a counselor in the Politburo Office in Berlin. Only in 1898, already as a German ambassador, he was sent to Luxemburg. Beginning in 1899, he worked as an envoy of the Emergency Mission again in Washington. [3] In 1900, due to the death of Baron Clemenceau von Kettler, who was killed during the Boxing Uprising in China (rebellion against foreign interference in the economy, domestic politics and religious life of China, which reached its peak in the last years of the Qing dynasty (1636 – 1912 gg.) [4], Alphonse Freiger Mumm von Schwarzenstein was appointed German ambassador to Beijing. So in July 1900, he left Genoa and went to the ship to Shanghai, and from there to Beijing.

Representing the interests of Germany, A. Mumm contributed to solving the problems that led to the Boxing Uprising, and as a result – the signing of the "Final or Boxing Protocol" on September 7, 1901. Under this agreement, China undertook: to send a special ambassador to Germany to apologize for the murder of the German Ambassador C. von Cotteler, as well as to place a monument to him; to send a special ambassador to Japan to apologize for the murder of a staff member of the Japanese mission Sugiyah; punish the leaders of the

uprising; to put monuments on destroyed foreign cemeteries; to prohibit the import of weapons and ammunition to China for 2 years; to pay an indemnity in the amount of 450 million pairs; to allow permanent military protection in the embassy quarter, etc. [5].

A.F. Mumm was a versatile and gifted man, as evidenced by his passion for photography. So, staying in China (1900 – 1902 gg.), He made many interesting photos of different cities of this giant, presenting in the future a whole collection. During 1906 – 1911 A. Mumm represented the interests of the German Empire in Tokyo. Quite interesting is the fact that, despite the importance of developing bilateral relations with Japan, Alfonso Freiger Mumm himself has repeatedly noted that German-Japanese relations are more distant or neutral. And the reasons for this were the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905), in which, as is known, the German government spoke on the Russian side, and Japan's complicated relationship with the United States in the Pacific.

After completing the term of office of the German Ambassador to Japan, Mumm retired and moved to his estate Castello San Giorgio in Portofino. There he conducts a calm, measured life with his wife Jenny. In 1914 he even became an honorary citizen of this municipality in Italy. However, with the outbreak of the First World War, Alphonse Freiger Mumm von Schwarzenstein again returns to diplomatic activity. Only this time as the head of the department for external advocacy of the Central Office of the diplomatic service in Berlin. In March – November 1918, with the reputation of an experienced diplomatic representative, the German Reich is in Kyiv [6], although the attitude of Ukrainians towards it was ambiguous. Thus, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the UNR Doroshenko noted in his memoirs that "it is common for certain countries to send an ambassador to her that he knows something about this land, knows him, has any relation to the policy pursued by the state, that he sends to this country. But then the German government deliberately sent people to Kyiv, which did not have any notion about Ukraine, did not care about it, and looked at the issue of Ukrainian statehood from the high. Mum, as an old man, was still somehow able to keep himself ... "[7]. However, if some foreign diplomatic representatives knew at least some Ukrainian and, in fact, traditions, customs, peculiarities of life, then Mumm and his assistants did not consider it necessary. Interesting in this case is the memoirs of the Bulgarian ambassador in Kyiv I. Shishmanov of May 22, 1918, who, after meeting with representatives of the German embassy at the Continental Hotel, wrote: "Earl Burcham was an ambassadorial advisor to Mum. He spoke about Kiev with disgust. Accustomed to comfort and cultural life in London, Paris and St. Petersburg. One of the reasons is that they do not know what the Ukrainian language is. And there are few speakers in French. And the high cost here. He wants to escape from here as soon as possible. I these people – in their mood, they want to create Ukraine! Poor Ukrainian!" [8]. About poor command in Ukrainian language by Mumm spoke a politician at the hetman's government D. Dontsov. Thus, on June 14, 1918, at a diplomatic reception, organized in honor of the Berlin guest von Walden, he was ordered by Mumm to translate into German the speech delivered by D. Doroshenko. But Dontsov, engaged in conversations with his colleagues, did not listen to the speech, for which he had to improvise and speak from himself [9]. At the same time, returning to the main tasks of Alfonso Freiger Mumm von Schwarzenštejn, it should be noted that on March 26, 1918, the German foreign ministry in a telegram emphasized that the main purpose of the German troops' stay in Ukraine is to provide grain exports from Ukraine to the Central Powers, and this should be the basis of the relationship with the Ukrainian government.

Subsequently, Mumm von Schwarzentein reported to the Reich Chancellor of Germany G.

von Hertling on a plan to ensure unimpeded harvesting of Ukrainian grain. In addition, during meetings with the Minister of Land Affairs and Nutrition of the Ukrainian People's Republic, M. Kovalevsky and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the UNR V. Golubovich expressed his wish to restore private ownership of land, the need to change the socio-economic policy of the UCR. And on April 2, Mumm von Schwarzenstein sent a letter to V. Holubovich, in which he expressed dissatisfaction with the disruption of measures for the procurement of products. A. Mumm headed the German delegation in Kyiv in the work of the joint Ukrainian-German-Austrian commission on the development and signing of conditions for mutual exchange of goods. As a result, the Economic Agreement (from April 23 to July 31, 1918) and the Economic Agreement (from September 10, 1918 to June 30, 1919) were concluded between the parties on supplies to the Central States of large volumes of grain, forage, oil, m ' bacon, sugar and other food products, iron, manganese ore, timber, etc., as well as supplies from the Central Powers of coal, oil, petroleum products, agricultural machinery, machinery, etc.

Concerning the ratification of the Ukrainian-German financial agreement of May 15, 1918, according to which Ukraine provided Germany and Austria-Hungary with a loan of 400 million rubles for solving the important issue of payment facilities in Ukraine, Mumm von Schwarzenstein wrote in his report to the German Foreign Ministry: "During the negotiations on the issues of currency and the state emission bank, we proceeded from the realization that the fundamental political idea to urge Ukraine to be as independent of Russia as possible should also affect the currency domain, since and the currency belongs to the most important factors that determine the degree of dependence or independence of the country. If, despite the national interests of Ukraine, the Russian ruble will remain in its territory, Ukraine's independence from Russia will be questioned. The introduction of its own, independent of the Russian ruble and the currency will ensure the length of the separation of Ukraine from Russia" [6]

The influence of this representative also speaks of the fact that after the coup in Ukraine that occurred, as is known, not without the participation of Mumm (was among the participants of the meeting of the highest military and diplomatic representatives of Germany and Austria-Hungary on April 23-24, 1918 in Kiev, who sharply opposed the UCR and its socialist orientation [6]), Hetman P. Skoropadsky came to power, then Alphonse Mumm tried to replace his entire person with the whole leadership of the Ukrainian foreign policy department. The German diplomat systematically set the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ukrainian State in the position of the plaintiff and made significant adjustments to the configuration of the consular corps in Kyiv. And the appointment of Dmitry Doroshenko as minister, not the "managing foreign minister" took place only after the assurances of Ambassador A. Mumm, who tried to control the activities of the Hetman Cabinet of Ministers, in the loyalty of the head of the foreign policy department to Germany [1]. Another striking example is the letter of appeal of the teacher of the Miziakivka 2-class school Vinnytsia district V.T. Illnitsky through the Vinnitsa branch of the National Union to the German Embassy with a request to assist in revising the lawsuit against his brother, who was baselessly guided by the "slanders of uncertain people" in confrontation with the German authorities in Ukraine, and ordered by the German court in the city of Nikolaev to be sent outside of the homeland forcibly work [10]. Unfortunately, the further fate of this case is not known. On September 7, 1918, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the UNR asked the Baron von Mumm with a note verbally to assist in resolving the issue of protecting the Ukrainian population in Muscovy, who were subjected to arrests and

executions on the basis of the same allegations. It was A. Mumm who had to turn to the German government to "... the high government used all its high authority to protect innocent Ukrainians ..." and that "Ukrainians, like a friendly German government, had the same rights as the Germans" [11].

However, in the autumn of 1918, Mumm von Schwarzenstein resigned, relocating to his family estate in Portofino, where he died on July 10, 1924. The Kiev mission was the last in his diplomatic career. For all his years of diplomatic practice, he has proven himself a professional diplomat who has always fulfilled the tasks of his government. He was an ambitious man and prone to flattery (according to PP Skoropadsky). He was perceived differently, but despite this, he was an extremely influential diplomat who played an important role in the formation of international relations of the Ukrainian State of Hetman's times.

As an epilogue I would like to quote a fragment of A. Mumm's speech on a diplomatic reception on May 21, 1918: "I hope that our present joint residence will become a symbol of the commonality of Ukrainian and German interests. With our and our loyal allies, the help will build a Ukrainian nation in the middle of the World War its native home. Germany followed with sympathy with Ukraine's struggle for its state rebirth and decided to give a hand to Ukraine in a decisive moment. This decision indicates a Buddhism. We trust and believe that, in a viciously end-of-war, military aid, brought to the young state, will develop a permanent peaceful, collaborative work with Germany in the field of cultural, economic and political ...

References

1. New Council. 1918. June 4 / May 22.2. Matyash I.B. Ukrainian Consular Service 1917 – 1923 as a state institution: formation, functioning, personalities. Kyiv: Institute of History of Ukraine, 2016. 482 pp., P. 346-347, 349, 349.3. Alfons Mumm von Schwarzenstein [Електронний ресурс]. URL: https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alfons_Mumm_von_Schwarzenstein
4. This day in history. Boxing uprising. [Electronic resource]. URL: www.jnsm.com.ua/cgi-bin/m/tm.pl
5. History of diplomacy: [cb.] / Sost. A. Lactinov Moscow: AST, 2005. 709-710.
6. Kulinich I. M., Krivets N.V. Mumm von Schwarzenstein // Encyclopedia of the History of Ukraine: T. 7: Mi-O / Redcock: VA Smolij (head) and others. National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Institute of History of Ukraine. Kyiv: In "Naukova Dumka", 2010. 127, S.128.
7. Doroshenko D. My memories of the recent past (1914 – 1920). Munich: Ukrainian Publishing House, 1969. S. 267-268.
8. Shishmanov I. (Ambassador of Bulgaria in the Ukrainian state). Diary (May – June 1918) Translation by M.G. Stancheva [Electronic resource] // Personal site P. Guy-Nizhnik. URL: [www.hai-nyzhnyk.in.ua/doc2/1918\(05-06\).shyshmanov.php](http://www.hai-nyzhnyk.in.ua/doc2/1918(05-06).shyshmanov.php)
9. Dontsov D. Year 1918. Kyiv-Toronto: View of "Homin of Ukraine", 1954. P. 21.
10. Central State Archives of the Supreme Power and Administration of Ukraine. F.3669. Op.1 Спр.18. Ark.19-19zv.
11. New Council. 1918. September 20/7; New Council 1918. May 24/11