

A lack of development of civil society institutions in Ukraine is conditioned by political and legal, socio-economic and cultural terms of their forming and functioning, such as uncertain law basis, poor financial support from the government and local authorities budget, a small percentage of middle class in population structure, lack of social capital and public dialogue, a low level of self-organization of population, lack of norms and values which unite people, conservation of paternalism in the population consciousness and so on.

The fact that there is no political project concerning the national idea aggravates the crises of political identity and makes it stable in modern Ukraine.

Key words: *political identity, civil idea, national consolidation, social capital, social dialogue.*

РЕЦЕНЗЕНТИ: *Антонюк О.В., д.політ.н, проф.; Зеленько Г.І., д.політ.н, проф.*

УДК 323.12 (497.11) (045)

Y. Ryabinin

EXTERNAL INFLUENCE FACTORS IN THE KOSOVO ETHNOSEPARATIST CONFLICT

The article is devoted to such a pressing problem as separatism. Some experts say that separatism is a problem of the past, but the author emphasizes that the XXI st century will be the century of identification factor increasing that will influence the nationalistic issues. It is underlined that the separatism could be catalyzed not only by inner factors but also by outside ones, especially nowadays, when the structure of the world is being changed by the influential actors of the foreign affairs. The author presents the concept that the collapse of the Soviet Union and collapse of the bipolar system of foreign affairs after the end of the Cold war inspired the change of the safety architecture in the whole world. In some cases the world community doesn't pay attention to the genocide cases that take place in the countries and regions that are not important for the political world due to geopolitical or resource reasons. The author analyzes the ethnoseparatism conflict in Kosovo and constituents of the external factors influence. So the author makes a conclusion that nowadays it is really necessary to pay attention to such issues as separatism because it may lead to the break out of hostilities in the country and lead to the genocide no matter whether it is cultural or physical genocide. Besides it is necessary to reform the world law system that is too old for the contemporary world and processes that take place in the world.

Key words: *separatism, ethnoseparatist conflict, genocide, external factors, Kosovo.*

Ethnoseparatist conflicts take place on the territory of one country, but in some cases the conflict escalates with or without external influence and interference. The support of separatist conflicts in this or that country depends upon the geopolitical interests of the influential actors of the international affairs. So, we can see it by the example of the US position towards the separatist conflicts in Kosovo on the one hand and Abkhazia and S.Ossetia on the other.

External factor can show itself in different ways, i.e. by military interference, informational demonization campaign, economical sanctions, supplying military equipment etc.

One of the bright examples of the external factors that supported the ethnoseparatist conflict was the attitude of the US to the situation in Kosovo. So, the main task of this article is to analyze constituents of the external support that was presented to the rebels of Kosovo in their conflict with Serbia.

United States of America is the main problem in the contemporary world. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the collapse of the bipolar system of the political world allowed the US uncontrollably and with impunity to implement the "export of democracy", as they call it. And in fact, during all the time since the collapse of the USSR they have been conducting a "crusade" to establish control over territories which are necessary for them from the resource or geopolitical point of view. The energy resources determine today the direction of the US foreign policy. The author of the article stresses that nowadays the world lives in the state of the 4th world resource war and we can see by many examples that the US conducts it nowadays. The US politicians are considered to be hypocrites taking into account the fact that if some country that doesn't have resources but is characterized by the state of civil war or ethnic cleansing, it will never get help either from US or the world community. During Clinton presidency, the United States has portrayed its policy towards Africa by the principle "Africa can solve most of its problems itself," but this factor didn't work out either in the Republic of Congo, which became the scene of large-scale war and massacre, Rwanda or Nigeria etc. In case of Congo, Clinton rejected the UN request to allocate \$100 thousand to deploy a battalion of peacekeepers in this country. In case of Sierra Leone, Washington delayed the discussion of the British proposal to send peacekeepers to this country in 1997, thus bringing another major catastrophe. The former France president F.Mitteran said that such cases that happened in Rwanda can't be considered to be a genocide. By these examples we can see the attitude of the developed countries leaders towards the people of the third world. Being a state secretary M.Albright commented on the death of half a million of Iraqi children due to the bombing in Iraq in such a way: «It is a difficult choice, but we think the price is justified» [3, p. 58].

Above-mentioned facts show that US democracy doesn't take into account the value of human life, cause the control over natural resources and countries must be achieved by all possible methods, one of which is the intervention or influence of all kinds. In cases where military intervention are unreasonable the US organize and conduct "color revolutions". The events in the former USSR, former USSR republics and the former Yugoslavia are characterized by the fact that their internal armed conflicts became the way of solving world foreign policy problems.

As has been already mentioned, the policy of double standards clearly manifested in the situation in Yugoslavia. United States and its NATO allies spoke about moral order, holding an immoral position. During their aggression in Yugoslavia they said: «We will kill your civilians, until you accept our terms and conditions». This is an approach of terrorists, but not the countries that try to guarantee peace in the whole world. NATO aggression didn't prevent, but on the contrary, was the main cause of the humanitarian disaster in Kosovo. A significant part of the population fled Kosovo not because of ethnic cleansing, but because of NATO bombing. US constantly alleged that they could not just stand aside, while atrocities took place in Kosovo. This absurdness of this argument can be illustrated by the following example – imagine that you see a scene of crime on the other side of the street, so you take an automatic rifle and kill all the participants of this event: criminals, victims, witnesses. Should the world community consider such a reaction as reasonable and morally justified? [3, p.62].

NATO military intervention could have been justified from a moral point of view only if it had restored justice and ensured the peaceful coexistence of all citizens of Yugoslavia living in Kosovo, regardless of their ethnic origin. In the case of Yugoslavia the Serbs were initially

called criminals and thousands of peaceful people perished not because of Miloshević regime but due to NATO interference [2, p. 22].

Analyzing the external factors in the ethnoseparatist conflict in Kosovo, we can single out three constituents – informational, financial and military support factors.

The demonization campaign of the Serbs was launched in the end of the 80th. In one of the issues of the Foreign Affairs journal an article by David Gompert, former Director of the European Department of the National Security Council, was published, in which “he offered for years, if not decades, to keep Serbia in isolation and poverty, keep it in quarantine until it loses virus that it has inside. Serbia must be treated as a leprosy”. British military expert James Gow believed that “Serbian nationalism is a hissing snake on the chest of the world community”. And Richard Holbrooke called the Serbs «bloodthirsty scoundrels» and that Serbia and Montenegro did not receive international recognition, because they are not civilized enough for admission to the world community. Philosopher from the University of Jerusalem Shlomo Avineri believes that after 1945 the Germans were able to return to the community of civilized nations, not only because the Allied occupation gave them a democratic system, but also because they had to admit the horrors committed on their behalf against the Jews and other peoples and that the same fate awaits the Serbs [3, p. 150]. But this philosopher in his work seems to forget to mention about atrocities of the Jews against Palestinians and Americans against Indians.

Zbigniew Brzezinski expressed such an opinion in his article «Stop the Serbs» in 30.03.99 «Washington post»: “The West should provide weapons to the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA). The decision of this kind is justified both politically and morally”.

Commenting on this statement, it is necessary to clarify that it is morally from the American point of view, which is a priori immoral, but not from the point of view of really democratic community. This statement sounded really strange taking into account that before events in Kosovo KLA functioned on the money got from drug trafficking and was in the American black list of terroristic organizations. In this situation we can see double standards in the foreign policy of US – KLA can be terroristic organization on the one hand, and ally on the other when it is necessary.

The pretext for war against Yugoslavia appeared far-fetched. Finnish experts who investigated events that happened in the village of Rasak in Southern Serbia in January 15, 1999, said in the official statement that in reality it didn't take place. At the same time, anti-Serb propaganda reached its top. The American newspapers made up stories about atrocities that were committed by the Serbs in order to show the world community that only intervention can stop genocide in Kosovo that really didn't take place.

The second external factor was financial and equipment support of Kosovo rebels by the US and western European countries. The third factor was military one when NATO launched a military campaign against Serbia. In the course of NATO aggression 35,000 combat airflights were conducted, which involved about 1,000 planes and helicopters that dropped 79,000 tons of explosives (including 156 containers with 37,440 cluster bombs, banned by international law) [4].

The damage to Yugoslavia done to industrial, transport and civilian objects in the result of almost three-month bombing, according to various estimates, measured by the sum of 60 to 100 billion dollars. The number of dead soldiers and civilians are still uncertain. It ranges from 1,200 to 2,500, 800 of which were children. The NATO airplanes bombed not only bridges, industrial plants, but also railway stations, hospitals, kindergartens, churches built in the Middle Ages. Bombs that were thrown by the British airplanes had such inscriptions as: «Happy Easter», «We hope you will like it», «Do you still want to be a Serb?» [5, p. 134].

In February 2008, the Serbian province of Kosovo, with the support of the United States declared its independence, and most of the Western countries recognized its independence. The events in Yugoslavia are essential for understanding the strategy and tactics of the United States in the establishing the world order. US aggression against Yugoslavia has several causes. The first reason is due to the task of strengthening the dominant position of the United States over the whole world. After the collapse of the Soviet Union the United States received an overwhelming advantage, including new types of weapons. Destruction of the enemy can be performed using missiles that may be hundreds of kilometers away from the object. There was a need for a full-scale tests of new weapons. The second reason was related to the development of new types of impact (informational, environmental, financial) to eliminate potential threats to the US position. The third reason was due to the fact that the internal situation of the US ruling group demanded demonstrations of American power.

All these factors led to the following specific objectives of aggression: 1. to destroy the countries with the mentality of resistance, Yugoslavia was a test country; 2. to minimize the competitive ability of Europe, especially Germany; 3. to test the new weapons of precise actions in a combat situation; 4. to show the power of the United States, its invincibility and impunity; 5. to oppose Orthodoxy to Islam; 6. to test the environmental weapons; 7. to work out the informational weapon; 8. to put the control of the United States over the richest resources of manganese in Kosovo; 9. to destroy the infrastructure of Yugoslavia and paralyze economic life, because even under the most severe restrictions and pressure from the United States this country continued to develop its economy; 10. to work out specific methods of creating and instigating conflict that would lead to its collapse [3, p. 130].

This military operation also had the mission to show the whole world what can happen if the state pursues an independent policy without consultation and approval from the US. US action against Yugoslavia was an attempt to relapse power politics and undermine the whole system of modern international law. Two operations of the alliance in the Balkans showed that the post World War II European system was in crisis, but also gave birth to three quite dangerous tendencies:

- war revival factor in the construction of modern Europe, the situation virtually impossible in the bipolar confrontation between nuclear superpowers;
- internationalization of internal conflicts, i.e. the creation of models to eliminate internal sovereignty;
- formation NATO-centric system in which one military-political bloc controls all European processes [6, p. 51].

NATO military action against the Serbs set a precedent of open intervention of the military-political bloc in the internal armed conflict on the side of one of its members. Local ethnic clashes escalated into a full-scale regional war, so since the mid 90-s Balkans crises gradually transformed from a regional problem into a question of European security and a kind of political-military “chess game” between the “great powers” [6, p. 52].

It is necessary to draw attention to some of the results of the crisis on post Yugoslavian space from the point of view of international organizations and the European security system:

- for the first time mechanism was put in place where a region that wished to secede from the multinational federation, is not regulated by international law or the Constitution of the Federation, but by the decision of a group of people or political leaders of some great powers; thus a precedent was set exit from the federation of its separate parts;
- the essence of the UN peacekeeping concept has changed, a transition to the use of force to punish one of the conflict sides (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Yugoslavia);

- for the first time the use of military action was used to solve the conflict and to impose vision of the internal structure of a country;
- the independent role of the UN in resolving international conflicts was legalized. It happened in the Balkans gradually. First NATO appeared as a part of peacekeeping operations, and then began to function as an independent factor under the banner of peacemaking, and then without approval of United Nations;
- the mechanisms of international organizations were used to replace political leaders and change the political system of the country;
- the policy of double standards was applied in the Balkans as for the conflicting parties, when world organizations and NATO openly rejected an objective approach to the conflicting parties [1, p. 77].

The final stage of the external factor usage was used during the coup d'etat in 2000. The following mechanisms were used in the process of power change in Serbia:

- ten months before the elections in 2000, the head of German diplomacy, Joschka Fischer together with US Secretary of State M.Albright secretly gathered in Berlin, members of the opposition who have agreed that V.Kostonica would become a president;
- \$30 million were secretly transferred from Budapest to Serbia in order to supply the opposition with computer equipment before the elections;
- 45 million German marks under the guise of humanitarian aid were transferred to 40 Serbian cities where local authorities represented the opposition;
- the oppositional mass media was supported secretly, some journalists had internship in Germany;
- the results of the elections were not announced but the opposition declared itself to be a winner and it was supported by the West.

References

1. Гуськова Е. Югославский кризис начал разрастаться с момента его интернационализации / Е. Гуськова // Международная жизнь. – 2006. – №5. – С. 73–85.
2. Кружков В. Югославский прецедент опасен для мира / В.Кружков // Международная жизнь. – 1999. – №10. – С.19–29.
3. Лисичкин В. А. Глобальная империя зла / В. А.Лисичкин, Л. А.Шелепин – М. : Изд-во Эскмо, 2003. – 448 с.
4. Мартынова Е. Уничтожение Югославии: история конфликта [Электронный ресурс] / Е. Мартынова. – Режим доступа : <http://www.vesti.ru/doc.html?id=266550>
5. Хомский Н. Государства - изгои. Право сильного в мировой политике / Н. Хомский. – Москва : Логос, 2003. – 320 с.
6. Фененко А. Балканский фактор и военно-политическая безопасность Европы / А. Фененко // Международная жизнь. – 2002. – №2. – С.51–67.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 01.12.2014 р.

Є.В. Рябінін

ЗОВНІШНІЙ ФАКТОР ВПЛИВУ В ЄТНОСЕПАРАТИСТСЬКОМУ КОНФЛІКТІ В КОСОВО

В статті автор розглядає доволі актуальну тему сьогодення – сепаратизм. Як відомо сепаратистські процеси відбуваються на території якоїсь держави, але ці процеси можуть розвиватися лише за умов ендегенних чинників, а в деяких випадках саме екзогенні чинники посилюють та прискорюють розвиток конфлікту, що може призвести до військового конфлікту між центральною владою країни та бунтарського регіону. Конфлікт в Косово виявився яскравим прикладом подвійних стандартів в зовнішній політиці Сполучених Штатів Америки. Автор наголошує на тому, що США після розвалу СРСР та біполярної системи міжнародних відносин залишилися єдиною

наддержавою, яка визначала перебіг політичних процесів як в тій чи іншій країні, так й в окремому регіоні в цілому. Слабка позиція Росії на міжнародній арені в 90-х роках минулого століття дозволила євроатлантичній коаліції провести агресивну військову кампанію проти Сербії, а отже, підтримавши сецесіоністські процеси Косова. В статті наголошується, що є декілька методів підтримки сепаратистських процесів, а саме, інформаційна, фінансова, технічна, гуманітарна, інформаційна, військова. Розглядаються такі складові зовнішнього впливу на етносепаратистський конфлікт в Косово як інформаційна, під час якої в світовій пресі відбувалася антисербська кампанія; технічна та фінансова в межах яких терористична організація Армія визволення Косова отримувала фінансову підтримку від Заходу, а також технічну, тобто США постачали бойовикам зброю; військова – під час цього виду підтримки євроатлантична коаліція провела військову кампанію проти Сербії, під час якої загинуло декілька тисяч людей та зруйнована інфраструктура. Крім того, автор аналізує завдання, які США ставила перед собою під час цієї військової агресії та її наслідки.

Ключові слова: сепаратизм, етносепаратистський конфлікт, геноцид, зовнішні чинники, Косово.

РЕЦЕНЗЕНТИ: Войналович В.А., д.політ.н, проф.; Трофименко М.В., к.політ.н, доц.

УДК 330(438)''1991/2014''(045)

М. Ryba

THE PRIORITIES OF THE POLISH ECONOMY IN THE LAST 25 YEARS IN THE UKRAINIAN CONTEXT

Ukrainian economy faces the huge strategic challenges at present. The great example may be the experiences of the other countries, such the Poland's economic policy from the near past. The Polish economy in the last 25 years of its sovereignty and almost permanent economic development, has become a developed economy recently. How did it happen that two economies, which started from the very similar point and from the same level of the GDP per capita, go the very different way and develop significantly differently?

What were the key challenges and priorities of the Polish economy? Is there any key in order to avoid the mistakes and the middle income trap? Which tools and strategy is crucial to implement in order to release the full potential of the Ukrainian economy? The world seem to be more and more dynamic, especially in the last years and even months. The significant context of the deliberation is the current Ukrainian situation and its challenges, which using the Polish experience and at the same time being very similar in many issues, could avoid many structural and strategic mistakes in the economic development.

Key words: Poland, Ukraine, development, transformation, economy, reforms.

POLAND 1989

Poland's economic transition is one of the most impressive transformations of the last 25 years in the world and one of the most positive examples of the European changes after the collapse of the Iron Curtain, unless the brightest. In 1989 Poland was one of the poorest countries among those transforming in the Central-Eastern Europe, including those which