

¹¹Rapport «Besoins de main d'oeuvre et politique migratoire». Centre d'analyse stratégique. – Mars, 2006. – P. 5-57. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://lesrapports.ladocumentationfrancaise.fr/BRP/064000296/0000.pdf>.

¹²Favell A. The Europeanisation of Immigration Politics// European Integration online Papers (EIoP). – 1998. – Vol.2., №10. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://eiop.or.at/ei-op/pdf/1998-010.pdf>.

¹³Сутормина Л.А. Правовой статус граждан третьих стран, проживающих в Европейском союзе на долгосрочной основе // Мировая политика: взгляд с университетской скамьи. М., 2009. – С. 86-107.

¹⁴Rostek K., Gareth D. The impact of Union citizenship on national citizenship policies // European Intitiation online Papers (EIoP). – 2006. – Vol.10, № 5. – P. 27-28 [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://eiop.or.at/eiop/iulf4php/iop/article/viewFile/2006_005a/22.

УДК: 327 (470+571:478)(091)

© Igor Chiosa
(м. Кишинів)

RELATIONS BETWEEN MOLDOVA AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION: HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Republica Moldova este un stat mic situat din punct de vedere geografic în sud-estul Europei. În pofida unui teritoriu mic, acest tânăr stat are o istorie bogată și pe alocuri controversată. Teritoriu românesc din cele mai vechi timpuri, și făcând parte din vechea Țară a Moldovei, spațiul Pruto-Nistrean a fost ocupat în anul 1812 de către Imperiul Țarist, iar ulterior de URSS în 1940 și din nou în 1944. În anul 1991, Republica și-a declarat independența față de URSS.

În pofida independenței sale, tânărul stat se confruntă cu serioase presiuni din partea Federației Ruse, care consideră că teritoriul Republicii Moldova se regăsește în sfera sa de influență. Pentru a putea înțelege complexitatea relațiilor dintre Chișinău și Moscova, și pretențiile pe care le formulează Federația Rusă, este necesar să aruncăm o privire în istorie, mai exact în ultimii 200 de ani. Articolul prezintă o scurtă istorie a spațiului Pruto-Nistrean în cele două secole, începând cu finele secolului XVIII și până în zilele noastre, precum și legăturile dintre Chișinău și Moscova în această perioadă.

Cuvinte cheie: Republica Moldova, Federația Rusă, spațiul Pruto-Nistrean, Chișinău, Moscova.

Ігор Кіоса. Відносини між Республікою Молдова та Російською Федерацією: історичний огляд. Республіка Молдова – з географічної точки зору маленька держава в південно-східній Європі. Наперекір маленькій території, ця молода держава має багату історію, а іноді і суперечливу.

Незважаючи на незалежність, молода держава бореться з серйозним тиском з боку Російської Федерації, яка розглядає територію Республіки Молдова як сферу ще свого впливу. Щоб зрозуміти складність відносин між Кишиневом і Москвою, і претензії Російської Федерації, необхідно поринути у історію, зокрема, за останні 200 років. Стаття являє собою коротку історію простору Прут-Дністер за два століття, починаючи з кінця XVIII століття і до сьогодення та зв'язки між Кишиневом і Москвою протягом цього періоду.

Ключові слова: Республіка Молдова, Російська Федерація, простір Прут-Дністер, Кишинів, Москва.

Igor Chiosa. Relations between Moldova and the Russian Federation: historical overview. Republic of Moldova, from a geographical point of view, is a small country in south eastern Europe. Contrary to a small area, this young state has a rich history and sometimes even contradictory.

Despite independence, the young nation struggling with severe pressure from the Russian Federation, which considers the territory of the Republic of Moldova as a sphere of influence is. To understand the complexity of relations between Chisinau and Moscow, and the claim of need to dive into the history, particularly in the last 200 years. The article presents a brief history of the Prut-Dniester region for two centuries, from the end of XVIII century to the present day and connections between Chisinau and Moscow during this period.

Keywords: Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, region Prut-Dniester, Chisinau, Moscow.

Introduction. Republic of Moldova is a small country located in the south-east of Europe, between Romania and Ukraine, with a population of about 3,5 mln peoples, according to official dates¹. Despite being a small and poor, the country has a rich and in many ways a controversial history, especially regarding topics of ethnicity, language and culture, that are marked by political shades.

Contemporary state Republic of Moldova gained its independence from Soviet Union on 27 august 1991² as a result of a series of political processes that happened that year³. Since its independence and to our days, the young republic had struggle to find a proper way to prosper, mostly because of the indecision of the political actors inside the country and the external factors as well. One of the external factors that strongly influence the fate of the small country is Russian Federation. As a regional power, as American president Barack Obama said⁴, Russia has maintained its influence since the fall of the Soviet Union through various instruments, such as political, economical and cultural.

In order to understand Russia's interest in this region, and particular in Republic of Moldova, we have to look back in history to find why and how the terri-

tory between rivers Prut and Nistru has become important for imperial aspirations of Russia.



The map of the Principality of Moldova in 1811

The Treaty of Bucharest and the annexation of Bessarabia. In the second half of the XVIII-th century, as a result of the continuing decline of the Ottoman Empire, Russia started to increase its influence in the Romanian Principalities and Balkan region. After the Russian-ottoman war of the 1768-1774, russian positions in the Romanian Principalities became more stable. The Treaty of Kuciuk-Kainargi signed in 1774 at the end of the war, offered the right to the tsar to protect the wellbeing of the "orthodox brothers" in Balkan region⁵. After such success, the supporters of Russian interests become to grown in the mentioned Principalities, especially during and after another Russian-ottoman war of the 1788-1792⁶.

We must mention that during the second half of the XVIII-th century, the local boyars addressed a lot of petitions to Russian government. The main reasons behind that petitions were personal interests of the local boyars, their desire to rule countries by their own and to manage in safe their affairs. Russian government new about their mercantile interests, but used the petitions in the diplomatic war with Ottoman Empire to press and to obtain more concessions⁷.

At the beginning of the XIX-th century the relations between the two empires were the same as in the previous 50 years. In 1806 a war between Ottoman Empire and Russian Empire has started, and the Romanian Principalities were the theatre of war⁸.

As a result of the war, and according to the Treaty of Bucharest, signed on 16/28 may 1812⁹, Russian Empire gained the territory between rivers Prut and Nistru and renamed it Bessarabia¹⁰. Despite initial intensions to incorporate both Romanian Principalities, tsarists have been satisfied with a smaller territory, but very important¹¹. According to the historian W.P. Van Meurs, the reasons behind the annexation of

Bessarabia were multiple: control of the Danube delta; to demonstrate to the Balkan's people the advantages of Russian domination, etc¹². Despite the intentions to show to the locals and to others that the new administration will give them a better life, the first years of the occupation where a disaster. Famine and various epidemics ravaged the Romanian province incorporated into Russian Empire¹³. Also, more than 5000 Romanian families took refuge across the Prut river, as they feared that the Russian administration will introduce the serfdom¹⁴. As a result of the exodus and the expulsion of tatars and ottomans from Budjak, the Russian administration brought Russians, ukrainian and german colonists in Bessarabia, as well as Bulgarians and gagauz people¹⁵.

From 1812 until 1828, Bessarabia had a so called autonomy during which the old legislation of the Principality of Moldova was used, as a continuation of traditions, but in fact it was a smart move made by tsarists government to eliminate any tensions in the new "acquisition"¹⁶. The local boyar, Scarlat Sturdza became the first civil governor of the new province when he was named in the office on June 23, 1812¹⁷. However, less than in a year, he was relieved from office on June 17, 1813, due to health reasons, according to official statements¹⁸. He was the first and only Romanian governor of Bessarabia during the occupation of the Romanian province by tsarists.

In 1828 the so called autonomy was suppressed. The local boyars were excluded from participation in the administration of the province and replaced by Russian officers¹⁹.

For 106 years, until 1918, the Romanian territory renamed Bessarabia will remain part of the Russian empire.

The Soviet Ultimatums and the second annexation of Bessarabia. As a result of the fall of Russian Empire and the chaos that happened after, on December 2, Bessarabia declared itself Moldavian Democratic Republic²⁰ and later proclaimed its independence from Russia²¹. On march 27, Sfatul Țării (the legislative body) voted the Unification of The Bessarabia with Romania²².

Despite the legal aspect of the Unification, the desire of the major part of the population (after 106 years, romanians were still the majority in Bessarabia) and the recognition of the act of the union by the Great Powers²³, the Soviet Union²⁴ did not recognized *de jure* the Union of Bessarabia with Romania, but did recognized *de facto* by signing a serie of treaties with the Kingdom of Romania²⁵. However, the relations between the Kingdom of Romania and Soviet Union remained tensioned during the interbellum period.

On August 23 1939, the world witnessed almost the impossible: two dictators, Stalin and Hitler, signed a treaty of non-aggression²⁶. The Treaty had an additional secret protocol that divided the sphere of influence in Eastern Europe²⁷. The 3 paragraph of the additional secret protocol stipulated the Soviet interes

for Bessarabia and the political disinterest from Nazi Germany for the same territory²⁸.

On June 26, 1940, after the fall of France four days earlier, the Soviet Union delivered an ultimatum to the government of Romania to withdraw from Bessarabia and Northern Bucovina²⁹. Romania proposed to negotiate and after the second ultimatum, agreed to withdraw from Bessarabia and Northern Bucovina³⁰. On August 2, 1940, the supreme soviet of USSR created Moldavian SSR from parts of Bessarabia and Moldavian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic³¹.

After the liberation of Bessarabia, Northern Bucovina and Hertza region³² in 1941, the soviets regained control of this Romanian territories in 1944 and instaurated a great terror.

The relations between Republic of Moldova and Russian Federation after 1991: a short review. As it was said in the introduction, Republic of Moldova gained independence from Soviet Union on August 27, 1991, recognized by Moscow on December 18, 1991³³. However, after a short time, on December 21, 1991, then president of the Republic of Moldova signed the Alma-Ata protocol which stipulated the creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States³⁴. It is good to emphasize that the president Snegur signed the protocol without consulting the parliament of the country³⁵.

Despite the recognition of the independence and the joining of the CIS by Republic of Moldova, Moscow continued to suspect Chisinau of desire to reunite with Romania. In 1992, on march 2 a conflict was started³⁶. Separatists from the left bank of the Nistru river were heavily aided by Russian Federation through 14 army stationed in Tiraspol, with weapons, intelligence, etc.³⁷ The fights were ended by the signing on July 21, 1992 in Moscow, of the Eltsin-Snegur Convention³⁸. However, the convention did not solve the conflict and as of 2015 its considered a "frozen conflict". Debates surrounding this conflict still persists, but almost all of the international actors and organizations had recognized the *Russian government's ultimate responsibility for laws of war violations and for facilitating the escalation of human rights abuses by making arms available to known abusers, is perhaps clearest in the 1992 conflict in eastern Moldova*.³⁹

After the conflict, Moscow provided itself with a key tool to keep Republic of Moldova under its influence. In 1999 at the Istanbul summit, Russian Federation agreed to withdraw and/or destroy Russian conventional armaments and equipment by the end of 2001⁴⁰. Back in 2003, Moscow proposed a way to "solve" the conflict, by federalization, with an equal status for the separatists, the so called Kozak Memorandum⁴¹. Fortunately, the memorandum was not signed by then president of the Republic of Moldova, Vladimir Voronin. The so called memorandum was not a way to solve the crisis, the conflict, it was just a plan to control better the activities of the official authorities of the Republic of Moldova, through Tiraspol, by blocking all the awkward policies and

movements for Moscow, especially the foreign policy. As of 2015, Russian military and equipment are still present on the occupied territory of the Republic of Moldova and there are no serious signs that Russian Federation will withdraw its military presence and equipment from the territory of Republic of Moldova in the near future. Despite being called a "frozen conflict" there are still numerous incidents, involving civilians also: on January 1, 2012, a young man was shot dead by a Russian "pacificator" on the bridge in town Vadul lui Voda⁴².

Also, a very important tool used by Moscow in its relations with Chisinau is the Autonomous Territorial Unit of Gagauzia. That entity was formed under the pressure of Moscow and recognized by the central authorities on 13 January 1995⁴³. Despite not being Russians, or even Slavonic, Gagauz speaks mostly Russian language and are pro-Russians, frequently threatens to declare independence if Republic of Moldova will join EU or NATO.

From the independence to our days, Moscow used and is using a lot of weapons to press Chisinau and to achieve its goal. Economic pressure is very often used, for example 2006 Russian ban of Moldovan wines⁴⁴, and once again in 2013. The embargo is a kind of "punishment" of Republic of Moldova by Russian Federation because of the official policy of EU integration. Natural gas is also used as a tool of pressure by Moscow. Republic of Moldova, has no natural gas resources and buy gas from Russian Federation, and despite being the poorest country in Europe, Chisinau pays a really high price for the Russian gas⁴⁵. However, there is a chance that Russian monopoly on gas sector will vanish because of the agreement between Chisinau and Bucharest to cooperate in this domain, and the desire of Chisinau to buy Romanian gas⁴⁶.

Conclusions. The goal of this article is to show why Russian Federation consider Republic of Moldova as part of its sphere of influence and how the relations between two countries evolved. Often, Russian Federation operates with historical dates in order to legitimize its interference into the affairs of young republic, so it is very important to see if these claims have a historic background. Of course, for the last two centuries there is a strong link/connection between Republic of Moldova and Russian Federation and its predecessors, but these connections are a result of a rapture of a Romanian territory in 1812, called by occupants Bessarabia and its subsequent domination. More dramatic are the other two occupations in 1940 and 1944, which were succeeded by the Soviet terror, including deportations, famine, that killed tens of thousands of Bessarabians⁴⁷. These were acts of violence, and not of liberations as many may think.

As a result of these occupations, Russian have provided itself with more than one tools that could influence the destiny of the tiny republic. Beside from Transnistrian region, there is also, Gagauz Autonomy, a pro-Russian region that is used by Moscow to press and influence Chisinau⁴⁸. Also there are ethnic minori-

ties such as Ukrainians, Russians, Bulgarians that speak mostly Russian language and are used as an opposite to the official policy of integration in EU, despite that many of them have passports of Romania and Bulgaria-- EU and NATO members. As a reminiscence of the past, but with a very strong position in the society is Orthodox Church. After the occupation of the Bessarabia in 1812, at the insistence of the Gavril Banulescu-Bodoni, the Metropolitan of Chisinau and Hotin, tsarist government created an autonomous Bessarabian church as an eparchy of the Russian Orthodox Church⁴⁹. After the independence, Republic of Moldova have two orthodox churches: one, called Metropolis of Chisinau and All Moldova is under Russian Orthodox Church, the other one is called Metropolis of Bessarabia and is under Romanian Orthodox Church. The Metropolis of Chisinau is the largest and is used often by Moscow to influence citizens of Republic of Moldova⁵⁰.

Beside from these "tools" Moscow has a lot of supporters in Republic of Moldova. These "supporting team or teams" includes politicians, businessman's, scholars, NGO's, TV stations, etc. Through that instruments, Russian interests are promoted, and in many cases, in a very aggressive mode. We can make a parallel and to affirm that the old policy of *divide et impera* is working perfectly for Moscow, because civil society in Republic of Moldova is divided which is bad for the country. The ongoing question *with whom and where?:* with the East or with the West, with Moscow or with Bucharest and Brussels? has created a rift in Republic of Moldova.

As we can see, relations between Republic of Moldova and Russian Federation are complicated because, Moscow is treating Republic of Moldova like a former colony, like a territory that belongs to Russians and Chisinau have no right to think itself. Such attitude is damaging and regretful, and Russian Federation must treat Republic of Moldova like an equal partner. The historical argument used by Moscow is false and have no future.

¹ <http://www.statistica.md/category.php?l=ro&idc=103>

² <http://www.presedinte.md/eng/declaration>

³ http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/worldwars/coldwar/soviet_end_01.shtml

⁴ <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/mar/25/barack-obama-russia-regional-power-ukraine-weakness>

⁵ George F. Jewsbury. *Anexarea Basarabiei la Rusia:1774-1828*. Iași. ed. Polirom,2003, p.26.

⁶ *Ibidem*,p.28.

⁷ *Ibidem*, p.29-30.

⁸ Anton Moraru. *Istoria Românilor. Basarabia și Transnistria 1812-1993*. Chișinău, 1995. p.7-10.

⁹ 200 de ani din istoria românilor dintre Prut și Nistru. 1812-2012, volum coordonat de Ioan-Aurel Pop. Chișinău, 2012. p.48

¹⁰ The name Bessarabia (Basarabia) was used to define the south parts of the region known as Budjak. For more informations: http://www.istoria.md/articol/436/Originea_numelui_Basarabia

¹¹ The main reason why tsarists didn't occupied both Principalities was Napoleon I. Shortly after the signing of the Treaty of the Bucharest, Napoleon I invaded Russian Empire.

¹² Wilhelmus Petrus Van Meurs. *Chestiunea Basarabiei în istoriografia comunistă*. Chișinău, 1996, p. 65

¹³ *Ibidem*: p.66.

¹⁴ 200 de ani din istoria românilor dintre Prut și Nistru. 1812-2012, volum coordonat de Ioan-Aurel Pop. Chișinău, 2012, p. 69.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*: p.67.

¹⁶ 200 de ani din istoria românilor dintre Prut și Nistru. 1812-2012, volum coordonat de Ioan-Aurel Pop. Chișinău, 2012, p. 58.

¹⁷ Dinu Poștarencu. *O istorie a Basarabiei în date și documente:1812-1940*. Chișinău, ed. Cartier.1998, p. 5.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 6.

¹⁹ 200 de ani din istoria românilor dintre Prut și Nistru. 1812-2012, volum coordonat de Ioan-Aurel Pop. Chișinău, 2012, p, p.63

²⁰ Anton Moraru. *Istoria Românilor. Basarabia și Transnistria 1812-1993*. Chișinău, 1995. p. 163.

²¹ *Ibidem*: p.172.

²² 200 de ani din istoria românilor dintre Prut și Nistru. 1812-2012, volum coordonat de Ioan- Aurel Pop. Chișinău, 2012, p. 115.

²³ De jure the recognition of the union was confirmed by the Treaty of Paris (28.10.1920)

²⁴ Created in 1922.

²⁵ Wilhelmus Petrus Van Meurs. *Chestiunea Basarabiei în istoriografia comunistă*. Chișinău, 1996, p. 374

²⁶ Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact signed in Moscow. Also known as Stalin-Hitler Pact.

²⁷ Anton Moraru. *Istoria Românilor. Basarabia și Transnistria 1812-1993*. Chișinău, 1995. p. 314.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 314.

²⁹ Wilhelmus Petrus Van Meurs. *Chestiunea Basarabiei în istoriografia comunistă*. Chișinău, 1996, p.195.

³⁰ *Istoria Românilor*, vol. VIII. București, 2003, p. 572-573.

³¹ 200 de ani din istoria românilor dintre Prut și Nistru. 1812-2012, volum coordonat de Ioan- Aurel Pop. Chișinău, 2012, p.155-157.

³² Hertza region was not demanded by soviets but subsequently occupied by soviet troops.

³³ <http://www.rusia.mfa.md/diplomatic-relations-ro/>

³⁴ The text of the protocol in russian language is available on the following adress: <http://www.cis.minsk.by/reestr/ru/index.html#reestr/view/text?doc=4>

³⁵ 200 de ani din istoria românilor dintre Prut și Nistru. 1812-2012, volum coordonat de Ioan-Aurel Pop. Chișinău, 2012, p. 201.

³⁶ Conflict started with a diversion organized by separatists near the Dubasari: Paraschiva Badescu. Conflictul din Transnistria/Republica Moldova după 20 de ani. <http://revista.ispri.ro/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/17-30-Paraschiva-Badescu.pdf>

³⁷ 200 de ani din istoria românilor dintre Prut și Nistru. 1812-2012, volum coordonat de Ioan-Aurel Pop. Chișinău, 2012, p. 202.

³⁸ The text of the convention in romanian: <http://tribuna.md/2012/01/04/doc-vezi-documentul-care-%E2%80%9Elegalizeaza%E2%80%9D-aflarea-trupelor-ruse-in-moldova/>

³⁹ War or Peace? Human Rights and Russian Military Involvement in the "Near Abroad" http://www.hrw.org/reports/1993/russia/#P169_26952

⁴⁰ Istanbul Document. <http://www.osce.org/mc/39569?download=true>, p.237.

⁴¹ 200 de ani din istoria românilor dintre Prut și Nistru. 1812-2012, volum coordonat de Ioan-Aurel Pop. Chișinău, 2012, p. 204.

⁴² 200 de ani din istoria românilor dintre Prut și Nistru. 1812-2012, volum coordonat de Ioan-Aurel Pop. Chișinău, 2012, p. 204

⁴³ Ibidem, p. 205

⁴⁴ <http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1075697.html>

⁴⁵ 331,8 US dollars from January 1, 2015.

⁴⁶ <http://www.hotnews.ro/stiri-esential-19542669-livrarile-gaze-pentru-republica-moldova-prin-conducta-iasi-ungheni-incep-miecuri.htm>

⁴⁷ 200 de ani din istoria românilor dintre Prut și Nistru. 1812-2012, volum coordonat de Ioan-Aurel Pop. Chișinău, 2012, p.184-189.

⁴⁸ Jones Eric. Gagauzia Ș Strategic Point of Pressure, 31 march 2015 <http://foreign-intrigue.com/2015/03/gagauzia-strategic-point-of-pressure/>; Rinna Tony Ș Moldova, the EU and the Gagauzia Issue, 14 february 2014 <http://neweasterneurope.eu/interviews/1097-moldova-the-eu-and-the-gagauzia-issue>.

⁴⁹ Igor Chiosa. Revista Societății Istorico-Arheologice Bisericești din Basarabia (1909-1934). Chișinău. Institutul de Studii Enciclopedice, 2014, p. 88-89.

⁵⁰ <http://unimedia.info/stiri/video-episcopul-de-balti-si-falesti-marchel-face-agitatie-politica-pentru-ppcr-68476.html>

УДК: 323.232

© Любов Годнюк
(м. Чернівці)

ДИСПОЗИЦІЙНИЙ ПОТЕНЦІАЛ ІНФОРМАЦІЙНОГО РЕСУРСУ ВЛАДИ

Стаття аналізує один з ключових аспектів розуміння влади (серед яких вагомість і причинність, потенційність проблеми, інтенціональність влади, ресурси влади, структури і впливи. Серед основних джерел та засобів влади влади вирізняють (сила, примус, спонування, маніпуляція, авторитет, інформація). Стаття пропонує виокремити інформацію як окрему диспозиційну можливість владного ресурсу.

Ключові слова: влада, ресурси влади, інформації, маніпулювання, "dispositional" влади, "potetnail" харчування.

Lubov Hodniuk The dispositional potential of information resources of power. This artical discusses a set of key problems in undstanding power (power and causation, actual / potential problem, the intentionality of power,resources and power, structure and power).Depending on the sources of the subject's submission to a powerholder's will, six basic forms of power are distinguished (force, coercion, inducement, persuasion, manipulation, authority, information).

Key words: power, resources of power, information, manipulation, dispositional power, potetnail power.

Liubov Godniuk. Potențialul dispozițional al sursei de informații și puterea. În articol este abordat unul dintre aspectele cheie în perceperea puterii: importanța și ponderea, intenționalitatea puterii, sursele, structura și influența puterii). Printre

principalele surse și mijloace ale puterii pot fi enumerate: forța, constrângerea, stimularea, manipularea, informația. În articol informația este abordată ca o sursă dispozițională aparte a puterii.

Cuvinte cheie: putere, sursele puterii, informația, manipulare, dispoziționalitate.

Концептуальний аналіз влади буде неповним без розгляду основ (джерел, ресурсів) влади. Що лежить в основі влади суб'єкта? Яким чином він здатним змусити об'єкт робити те, що той в іншому випадку не став би робити? Чому одні люди підпорядковуються іншим? Поняття ресурсів (засобів) влади дозволяє пояснити ці та інші проблеми і є важливим при проведенні емпіричних досліджень влади.

Будь-які диспозиційні поняття виражають *можливість (ймовірність) якихось подій у майбутньому*, вони можуть бути досить різними, так як за певних умов ці властивості *обов'язково* реалізуються. Люди володіють не тільки простими диспозиційними здібностями (властивостями), а й такими, які здійснюються з *їхньої волі*. Науковець П.Морріс використовує поняття „здатність” для характеристики саме цього виду диспозицій: „здатність включає в себе, в деякому розумінні, акт волі, вибір або рішення. Здібності тому залежать від самого актора, що здійснює їх активізацію: однією з обов'язкових умов даної здатності є рішення актора зробити це”¹. Здатність – це диспо-