

UDC: [930.2+94](477)

Voronin Viktor Mykolaiovych,

Doctor of Historical science, Director of the Center of organization of the Research, Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, 03039, Kyiv, st. Frometivska, 2, tel.: (044) 490 95 00, e-mail: m.a.u.p@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-1467-9865

Воронін Віктор Миколайович,

доктор історичних наук, директор Центру організації наукової роботи, Міжрегіональна Академія управління персоналом, 03039, м. Київ, вул. Фрометівська, 2, тел.: (044) 490 95 00, e-mail: m.a.u.p@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-1467-9865

Voronin Viktor Nikolaevich,

доктор исторических наук, директор Центра организации научной работы, Межрегиональная Академия управления персоналом, 03039, г. Киев, ул. Фрометовская, 2, тел.: (044) 490 95 00, e-mail: m.a.u.p@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-1467-9865



THE STATE AWARDS OF UKRAINE: DIPLOMATIC DIMENSION (THE NATURE AND CONTENT, MAIN CATEGORIES, CONCEPTS, METHODOLOGY AND PRINCIPLES OF REWARD SYSTEM)

Abstract. The article deals with the consideration and analysis of the nature, content of the system of awards as an important component of diplomatic activity that contributes to the solving of important problems of foreign policy. Special attention is given to the historical retrospective of the formation of reward system that allows, in some way, to understand the ways of development of state and society, their interaction and mutual influence, more systematic grasp complex processes that occurred during the historical development.

Keywords: system of awards, diplomatic dimension, political culture, system of departmental awards.

ДЕРЖАВНІ НАГОРОДИ УКРАЇНИ: ДИПЛОМАТИЧНИЙ ВИМІР (СУТНІСТЬ І ЗМІСТ, ОСНОВНІ КАТЕГОРІЇ, ПОНЯТТЯ, МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ ТА ПРИНЦИПИ НАГОРОДНОЇ СИСТЕМИ)

Анотація. У статті розглядається та аналізується сутність, зміст нагородної системи як важливої складової дипломатичної діяльності, що сприяє вирішенню важливих завдань зовнішньої політики держави. Особливої уваги надається історичній ретроспективі формування нагородної системи, що дає можливість певним чином зрозуміти шляхи розвитку держави і суспільства, їх взаємодію і взаємовплив, системніше осягнути складні процеси, що відбувалися протягом історичного поступу.

Ключові слова: нагородна система, дипломатичний вимір, політична культура суспільства, система відомчих нагород.

ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЕ НАГРАДЫ УКРАИНЫ: ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКОЕ ИЗМЕРЕНИЕ (СУЩНОСТЬ И СОДЕРЖАНИЕ, ОСНОВНЫЕ КАТЕГОРИИ, ПОНЯТИЕ, МЕТОДОЛОГИЯ И ПРИНЦИПЫ НАГРАДНОЙ СИСТЕМЫ)

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается и анализируется сущность, содержание наградной системы как важной составляющей дипломатической деятельности, что способствует решению важных задач внешней политики государства. Отдельное внимание уделено исторической ретроспективе формирования наградной системы, позволяющей, определенным образом, понять пути развития государства и общества, их взаимодействие и взаимовлияние, системно понять сложные процессы, которые происходили в течение исторического развития.

Ключевые слова: наградная система, дипломатическое измерение, политическая культура общества, система ведомственных наград.

Target setting. Reward system with its diversity is one of the essential attributes of statehood, about which clearly shows the history of human civilization. About this rightly said a famous Russian explorer of the history of award of Southeast Asia A. M. Rozanov: "Effective functioning system of awards is an integral component of the modern state, that successfully developed" [1, P.19].

However, despite on the constant and sufficiently systematic work in this direction, and the development of ap-

propriate detailed proposals, especially important is the question of historical retrospective of award system, in its various forms, covering the entire spectrum of human activity – military, civilian merit, etc.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Systematization of the key aspects of reward system, as an important component of diplomatic activity, reflected in the works: A. Rozanov [1] A. Diomin [2], B. Burkova [3] D. Tabachnik [4] J. Galic [5] and other domestic and foreign researchers.

The purpose of the article. The purpose of the study is to examine the award system as an important component of diplomatic activity that contributes to the solving of the important problems of foreign policy.

The statement of basic materials. The famous philosopher A. L. Diomin who studied the impact of award systems on the political culture of the society mentioned on this occasion: "State attributes by which the state is assessed and impressed include the parliament, the armed forces, the emblem, the flag, the anthem and also the award system" [2, P. 12].

The value of honors to the society is reflected even in ancient legends. For example, according to the ancient Greeks' legend, it was believed that Hercules received a wild olive wreath for the win in the Olympic Games.

Ancient Rome created sufficiently detailed award system accordingly explained primarily by its statehood with all its attributes (including state rewards), which later became an integral part of human civilization.

Formerly the awards in all ancient states were mostly in the form of diverse material values, with few exceptions, in particular, the above-mentioned Olympic medals. For the first time in the human development history the awards in Rome had the form that reached our time. At that time the main form of incentives was not material but primarily moral bonus manifested as the major principle for all award systems in various historical periods and world regions.

As early as the days of the Republic in ancient Rome, alongside with the usual forms of incentives for the troops

(monetary payments, trophies, valuable gifts and honorary weapon) a specific type of rewarding for military services was introduced — the so-called *dona militaria*. In the history of civilization it became the first state award in its modern sense, when the priority is given exactly to moral incentives.

At that it is important to emphasize that a self-sufficient award system originates from ancient Rome. *Dona militaria* was divided into the following types: *coronae* (honorary garlands), *vexilla* (decoration pennants), *hasta pura* (award spears), *torques* and *armillae* (honorary necklaces), *phalerae* (honorary medals) [3, P. 27–30].

Based on the archeological research fact that *phalerae* (actual analog of medals in the modern award system) were of various degrees — gold, silver and bronze with various images on them, the award system in ancient Rome bears record to clear reasoning and sophistication of its hierarchical structure.

It may be acknowledged that breakdown into award types and classes (now simplified) originate from the ancient Rome times (except for some specific types of awards, including decorations in the Soviet award tradition). They may be divided into orders, medals and honorary weapon (both cold steel arms and firearms). Such awards as *vexilla* should be mentioned separately. For the first time in ancient Rome a collective rather than an individual award was introduced, this being a significant and fundamental step to the award system development [3, P. 29].

There were other fundamentally important innovations to form the modern award tradition, primarily the

European one. It is important to note that centurions and simple legionnaires were awarded Roman decorations. In addition, for the first time in history the award recipients began to wear insignias/merit badges.

The Roman system became the base for further development of the European award system, which was particularly actively developed at the Renaissance times. However, in medieval times when the achievements of antiquity were hardly taken into account in most areas of life, the award prototypes existed even in Kievan Rus.

It is necessary to emphasize that in all ages – from ancient Rome to the present times the award systems in different countries were an extremely important part of the statehood, a tool of its creation and state management in the broad sense of this definition. As was correctly stated in one of the first studies on the history of the national award system entitled “Awards of Ukraine. History, facts and documents” published back in 1996, “... in the modern Ukrainian society the view is embedded on the awards as an important and final attribute of the state, one of the most important features of its independence and sovereignty. Almost all the world countries have now their own developed award systems and their non-availability is perceived as an exception to the general rule. The international community considers the award as a kind of “business cards” in history and contemporaneity of each separate state. Therefore it is no exaggeration to define the awards as good signs of a civilized country, its desire to build and develop the own statehood. However, orders, medals and badges

are an important dimension of the historical and state-building way covered by the country. They are the unique memory milestones to read the individual’s biography as well as the whole country’s one. Behind the decoration exterior and brief language of its symbolism one can see the joy of victory, the pain of defeat, and the hope for better fate” [4, P. 29].

Indeed, there is no developed country that would not have its own sophisticated award system, although sometimes they differ in manner. For example, Switzerland has no state awards; it is officially considered that this “violates the equality of citizens”. However, it would be a mistake to believe that this country, one of the most developed in the world, has no own award system. Its role is successfully implemented in the deployed system of departmental awards, which replace the state honors acceptable for the rest of the world.

Even the emerging countries created the award system extremely fast, because it was considered quite rightfully an integral component of the statehood. Significantly, it refers not only to the states recognized by the international community but also to self-proclaimed ones especially actively striving to get legitimacy in the international community.

It should be noted that almost from the beginning of introducing the honors into human civilization the awards are widely used not only to achieve internal political goals, but also to face the international challenges. To this end, foreigners, first and foremost foreign state leaders were awarded in various forms. Over time, these awards

became an integral and important part of diplomatic protocol and foreign policy at large.

This applies to the award system of Ukraine, which should be considered as a dialectical unified one created on synthesis of the national award systems from various historical periods.

The modern award system in Ukraine is an extremely interesting research synthesis of award traditions from various historical periods. It is not only a valuable material for purely faleristic research. Deep and versatile study of all aspects of the award system makes possible to understand in a certain manner the ways of the state and society development, their interaction and mutual influence, more systematically understand the complex processes occurred during its historical progress. This is true for the history of Ukraine's foreign policy and diplomacy, which cannot be fully understood without taking the "award aspect" into account.

After Ukraine's independence during Hetman P. P. Skoropadskiy's Ukrainian State the award system commenced its development. We note that over time it became holistic and it was possible to identify the components of the award traditions from different epochs – Russian Empire, P. P. Skoropadskiy's Hetmanate, the UPR Directorate, the Soviet period and common European traditions in award creation. However, this does not make it eclectic. Different historical layers of award tradition united organically and created a new award system enriched with experience from different epochs, the system that meets the requirements of the time (that of course does not exclude the need for its further develop-

ment) including the ability to perform foreign policy and diplomatic tasks.

Thus, rephrasing the thought of the reputed faleristic researcher

Mozheiko, it has to be said that the history of Ukraine's award system is as dramatic as the history of Ukraine itself.

It is significant that from the very beginning of the award system creation in Ukraine it made available to use it in the international activities of the state.

As was above stated, the beginning of the award system creation in independent Ukraine falls on the period of the Ukrainian Hetman State in 1918.

The draft award system of the Ukrainian state was accurately described just in the 30-ies in the manuscript of the former hetman army's centurion B. Monkevych entitled "Arrangement of Ukrainian state regular army in 1918". At present this manuscript is kept in the Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Lviv city.

B. Monkevych describes the final version of the Hetman Ukrainian state award system prepared by the main headquarters commission chaired by colonel G. I. Goncharenko (who was imposed the task to develop awards for the Armed Forces). The system contained two types of state awards – the crosses and the orders themselves:

- "Iron Cross for liberation struggle;
- Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order – for merits in social field;
- St. Olga Order – for women merits in the public field;
- St. Prince Volodymyr the Great Cross, for state civil service;
- St. Archistratigus Michael Order for military valor (similar to

Russian St. George the Victory-bearer);

- Cross and Dawn of Glory and Revival of Ukraine” [6, P. 11–12].

According to this draft the competence of the award commission was much wider than the assigned task to develop awards for the armed forces. It is enough to analyze for what merits Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order, St. Olga Order, St. Prince Volodymyr the Great Order and the Cross and the Dawn of Glory and Revival of Ukraine were proposed to be awarded. Three out of six state awards proposed by the commission were purely civil. One decoration could be awarded to both military and civilian persons. It may be acknowledged that it was a question of creating the state award system in the Ukrainian Hetman State in general rather than just individual orders for the troops.

In his memoirs G. I. Goncharenko (who wrote under the pseudonym J. Galic) described the exteriority of the state decorations proposed by the hetman award commission (no other evidence as to their external appearance is identified in archival sources): “... Archistratigus Michael Cross similar in its designation to St. George the Victory-bearer Order almost did not differ from the latter by the form, the color or the ribbon. The same applies to St. Vladimir Order” [5, P. 204].

After analysis of the award system proposed by the hetman commission it becomes clear that it (and the armed forces of the Ukrainian State) was created, according to B. Monkevych, “upon the principles generally accepted in the European states”. At the same time the created draft award system did not

differ fundamentally from the previous one in the Russian Empire (note the direct reference to the Russian Order of St. George the Victory-bearer), which in its turn was also built on the principles of the European award tradition.

The latter results from the fact that the old imperial award system was familiar to draftsmen, while there was a need to create the Ukrainian State award system as soon as possible. In addition, effective implementation of the Ukrainian State foreign policy required availability of state awards to resolve protocol issues in foreign policy, first and foremost, to award foreign leaders, members of foreign state delegations, representatives of foreign diplomatic corps in Kyiv and other influential foreign citizens. Military decorations were of utmost importance to honor foreign military men because Hetman P. P. Skoropadskyi relied on direct military support by expeditionary forces of the Entente states.

Hence, it follows that the hetman award commission did not manage to prepare the relevant rules of each award and obviously each of the proposed state award had a direct analogue in the Russian Empire award system.

For instance, Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order was conceived as an analogue of the Russian St. Stanislaus and St. Anne Order. St. Olga Order is similar to St. Princess Olga honor established in 1911 (the only award took place in 1916). St. Vladimir Order completely preserved its old name and functions. Iron Cross was not called an Order but was an absolute analogue of the old St. George Medal designated for mass award of soldiers and non-commissioned officers in the armed

forces. As to St. Archistratigus Michael Order, it was above stated that this Order was an analogue of the Russian St. George Victory-bearer Order.

Cross and Dawn of Glory and Revival of Ukraine were created as an analogue of the highest honor in the Russian Empire – St. Andrew the First Called Order.

According to their Rules, each of the above-listed awards in the former Russian Empire could be used to reward foreign nationals. Thus, their hetman analogues were quite suitable for use in diplomatic purposes. At that, establishing the “Cross and Dawn of Glory and Revival of Ukraine” Order worth special attention. Similar to St. Andrew the First Called Order it was designated to award the leaders and senior executives of foreign countries to promote greater implementation efficiency of the Ukrainian State foreign policy.

Lower status awards of the hetman draft could be effectively used to honor foreign diplomats, media, servicemen etc. This was also important for effective implementation of foreign policy.

Because in December 1918 the UPR Directorate came to power, the hetman award draft was never realized.

Naturally, the shortest and the most rational way would be to simply implement without changes or with minor corrections the award system developed at the Hetmanate. However, the UPR Directorate did not wish to do it for purely ideological reasons.

The fact that just on January 10, 1919 the UPR Council of Ministers decided on establishing the first awards of the newly formed republic – decorations of the Republic and Glory of Ukraine – witnessed that the Direc-

torate leaders paid great attention to creation of the national award system.

Almost immediately after the resolution of the Council of People’s Ministers on January 24, 1919 the Directorate adopted a special law regulating major issues on the award system creation. It was the first law in the history of the award system of Ukraine. The first paragraph governed the issue of wearing the awards. The second paragraph established a special badge for participation in anti-hetman uprising. This was to rally the most loyal supporters round the Directorate.

The third paragraph founded the first UPR state award of two classes, which could reward both civilian persons and servicemen. As had been said: “Establish a special award of the Republic of two classes for those citizens of Ukraine particularly distinguished themselves by their work in the revival of Ukraine during the last fight against the hetman and his government and during all the time of the Ukrainian People’s Republic revival” [7, P. 3].

The fourth paragraph founded a purely military award for distinguished conduct under fire: “Establish the badge of honor Glory of Ukraine of two classes for those sergeants and Cossacks who showed their knighthood in battle” [7, P. 3].

Thus, we can say that at the initial stage of the award system creation in the UPR Directorate the state awards were aimed at rewarding Ukrainian citizens only, while rewarding foreigners was not stipulated. That is, the rewards meted out by the new government could not be used to meet the foreign policy goals, first and foremost rewarding top leaders of foreign states,

which was especially important in the UPR crisis period.

Further reward activity of the UPR Directorate was aimed at creating military decorations impossible to be used in diplomatic activities.

On October 19, 1920 a decree signed by S. V. Petlyura, Chief Ataman, and Lieutenant General O. S. Galkin, acting Secretary of War of the General Staff, was issued on establishing “Liberation” Army Order and “Iron Cross” Badge: “Three years of continuous struggle of the best sons of our people against the enemies of independence of our country deserves the highest praise and urgently requires to specially distinguish those who by their courage in battles or energy and tireless work benefited the state. To this end, two orders are established in the Ukrainian Republican Army: 1. Liberation Order and 2. Iron Cross Badge, their Rules are enclosed” [8, P. 2].

It should be noted that for the first time in the UPR Directorate reward practice the issue of conferring foreign nationals with state decorations was resolved. It was a significant step forward in the development of the national award system. Follow the provisions of the signed decree: “Taking into account the possibility of awarding the above orders not only military men but also civilian persons and subjects of the other states the Secretary of War should simultaneously take care to approve the Rules at the Council of People’s Ministers” [8, P. 3].

However, due to emigration commencement, the UPR Directorate did not award any of the foreign nationals with “Liberation” Order, to say nothing of foreign state leaders.

Together with the drafts of “Liberation” Order of two classes and “Iron Cross” Badge the draft of another state honor was submitted for consideration to the Chief Ataman S. V. Petlyura and the Council of People’s Ministers. It was the “Order of Republic” of Ukrainian People’s Republic (Order of Republic), which was supposed to become the UPR highest state honor.

Analyzing the draft Rule of this unrealized state award, a conclusion may be immediately drawn that it is not in any way the improved Rule of the Republic’s military insignia offered earlier. If the latter was aimed exclusively to award for outstanding war services and its main objective was to boost the army morale, then the new award draft was aimed at rewarding the highest state elite and contained substantial corporate elements.

The following Rule paragraph had to underline the highest status of Order of Republic in the state award system: “Order of Republic is never removed and must be worn above all the orders of appropriate classes” [9, P. 171].

Another paragraph of the Rule of Order is also important: “All UPR citizens, military men or civilians, officials or not, without distinction in nationality and sex, as well as foreigners when they performed certain useful deeds to liberate, protect and develop Ukraine may be awarded Order of Republic” [9, p. 172]. Thus, Order of Republic could be efficiently used in diplomatic activity to honor influential foreigners, including the highest state leaders of foreign countries.

On the one hand we see demonstration of democracy in the reward creative work traditional for the UPR Di-

rectorate and observed in all the award drafts when all citizens of the state could receive the award regardless their social status. However, the fact that it was envisaged to award foreign nationals (not necessarily for distinguished services) testified once more that it was the highest state award established in view of the further prospect for the UPR peaceful development.

Attention should be also paid to the following paragraph of the draft Rule: "Who by their diplomatic, cultural and educational, literary and scientific work, as well as by various inventions yielded significant benefits to the statehood and formation of the Ukrainian Republic." [9, P. 175].

That is, for the first time in the Ukraine's award creativity the merits in the diplomatic area were highlighted to promote development of the Ukraine diplomatic service through rewarding its most professional staff.

The Soviet Ukraine award system functioning within the framework of the all-union one did not stipulate for its use in the international activities, regardless of the UkrSSR membership in the UN and availability of the republican Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Applying the UkrSSR award system to the diplomatic activity was not stipulated even in the award proposals made by the First Secretary of the CPU Central Committee P. Yu. Shelest in 1967. The UkrSSR party leader proposed to establish the Order of the Ukrainian SSR State Flag – the highest degree award to honor both individuals and collective groups of particularly distinguished workers and the Order of Labor Glory and the Medal "For Labor Merits" to honor

the foremost workers, cultural and scientific professionals for high performance in labor [10, P. 3]. However, the proposed new state awards of the UkrSSR were intended for the internal use only.

Since Ukraine gained independence, creation of its award system was commenced to fulfill both internal and foreign policy functions.

On August 18, 1992 President of Ukraine L. M. Kravchuk signed the Decree "On Establishing Badge of Honor of the President of Ukraine". Its first paragraph read: "Establish the Badge of Honor of the President of Ukraine. The Badge of Honor of the President of Ukraine will be awarded to citizens for personal merits in building up the sovereign democratic state, developing the economy, science and culture of Ukraine, for active peace-making, charitable, merciful and public activities" [11].

The Regulation also provided for the possibility to award foreign nationals for services to Ukraine. This made possible to use the first award of independent Ukraine in diplomatic activities. However, the award did not acquire a broad nature because of the uncertainty in the award status lower than the Order in the European award tradition. Therefore rewarding foreign state leaders became impossible.

However, before adoption in 2000 of the Law of Ukraine "On State Awards" (which opened the door to establishing perfect awards including the Orders) the solution was found to raise de facto the status of newly established awards. In 1995 two awards of the President of Ukraine were established: "Bohdan Khmelnytsky Order" and "Yaroslav the

Wise Order”, which had already a definition “Order” in their titles.

Before establishing “Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order” the President of Ukraine received numerous requests from the representatives of the state branches of government and the public to establish the highest award of Ukraine. Almost no one was engrossed in the intricacies of the award legislation that enabled to establish not the highest state award but rather the honorary badge of the President of Ukraine. Ultimately the Presidential Award Commission decided to recommend establishing the honor of the President of Ukraine, which after the adoption of the Law of Ukraine on State awards could be immediately transformed into the highest state award.

The text of the Presidential Decree read as follows: “Taking into account numerous requests from the central government executive bodies and the judicial branch, the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, the Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine and NGOs and in line with paragraph 9.2 of Article 114.5 of the Constitution of Ukraine (888–09), I decree:

1. Establish the honor of the President of Ukraine – “Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order” (hereinafter referred to as Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order) of the First, Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth Class to award the citizens for outstanding personal merits to the Ukrainian state in the field of state-building, strengthening the international authority of Ukraine, development of economy, science, education, culture and arts, public health, charitable, humanitarian and public activities” [12].

Particular attention should be paid to the Rule of the established award, which at that time was the pinnacle of the national award creativity. It took into account absolutely all the details stipulated by the faleristic laws and became a significant step in bringing the national award system towards the European award traditions and standards.

The Rule established in details the award procedure by each class of the Order and its designation in full conformity with the samples of the European highest state awards. We’ll quote the relevant part of the Rule: “Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order is awarded successively starting with the Fifth Class. Awarding the next class of Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order is possible not earlier than 3 years after the previous class order is awarded... Foreign citizens and stateless persons are awarded:

First Class Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order – heads of sovereign states;

Second Class Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order – heads of governments and parliaments of sovereign states, prominent state and public figures;

Third Class Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order – foreign ministers, heads of other foreign agencies, ambassadors of foreign states to Ukraine;

Forth and Fifth Class Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order – known scientists, artists, writers, clergymen, businessmen, human right activists, athletes and other persons” [12].

The established highest award of Ukraine was immediately actively used in diplomatic activities to achieve the objectives of Ukraine’s foreign policy. Awarding a number of influential foreign witnessed at once the authority

of the highest award in the Ukrainian state.

Within the time when the honor “Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order” had not yet been a state award rather than a formal honor by the President of Ukraine, its First Class was awarded to the following foreign state leaders: Fernando Henrique Cardoso, President of the Federal Republic of Brazil (October 25, 1995); Kim Yong Sum, President of the Republic of Korea (December 6, 1996); Carlos Saul Menem, President of the Republic of Argentina (October 27, 1995); Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle, President of the Republic of Chile (October 30, 1995); Jiang Zemin, President of the People’s Republic of China (December 2, 1995); Martti Ahtisaari, President of the Republic of Finland (January 10, 1996); President of Indonesia Suharto (April 1, 1996); Aliyev Heydar oglu Alirza, President of the Republic of Azerbaijan (March 20, 1997); Oscar Luigi Scalfaro, President of the Italian Republic (April 20, 1997); Sedilo Ernesto Ponce de Leon, President of the United Mexican States (June 25, 1997); Alexander Kwasniewski, President of the Republic of Poland (September 10, 1997); Nazarbayev Nursultan Abishevych, President of the Republic of Kazakhstan (October 13, 1997); Karimov Islam Abduhaniovych, President of the Republic of Uzbekistan (February 17, 1998); Jorge Fernando Branco de Sampaio, President of the Republic of Portugal (April 10, 1998); Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela, President of the Republic of South Africa (July 3, 1998); Jacques Chirac, President of the French Republic (September 2, 1998); Thomas Klestil, Federal President of

the Republic of Austria (October 13, 1998); Valdas Adamkus, President of the Republic of Lithuania (November 5, 1998); Alma Adamkene, the wife of the President of the Republic of Lithuania (November 5, 1998); Carl XVI Gustaf, His Majesty the King of Sweden (March 19, 1999); Sylvia, Her Majesty the Queen of Sweden (March 22, 1999); Fidel Castro Ruz, Chairman of the State Council of the Republic of Cuba (April 10, 1999); Yasser Arafat, President of the Palestinian National Autonomy (September 2, 1999); Eduard Amvrosiyovych Shevardnadze, President of Georgia (October 1, 1999); Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, President of the Russian Federation (January 22, 2000); Saparmurat Atayevych Niyazov, President of the Republic of Turkmenistan (February 18, 2000).

It should be noted that the developers of Prince Yaroslav the Wise Order made all reasonable efforts in line with the European award tradition to approve this Order as the highest and very prestigious state award.

Following the adoption in 2000 of the Law of Ukraine “On State Awards” this highest state decoration has acquired the status of the full order, which has become an integral part of the diplomatic toolkit. Actually, during each foreign state visit of the President of Ukraine or the visits of foreign state leaders to Ukraine mutual reward with the highest state decorations takes place.

It is also important that after the adoption of the Law of Ukraine “On State Awards” the Rules of some state awards contain the availability to award foreign countries. This made possible to frequently use the state awards in diplomatic activities.

Conclusions. In general it may be concluded that the state awards of Ukraine have become an important component of diplomatic activity. They contribute to solving important issues of foreign policy and strengthening the international authority of the state.

REFERENCES (in native language)

1. *Розанов О. Н.* Наградные системы в политике и идеологии стран Северо-Восточной Азии [дис. ... д-ра ист. наук]. — М., 2010.
2. *Демин А. Л.* Наградная система государства как компонент политической культуры [дис. ... канд. филос. наук]. — М., 2003. — С. 12.
3. *Бурков В.* Фалера и фалеристика // Вест. Ленинградск. ун-та. — 1981. — № 2.
4. *Нагороди України.* Історія, факти, документи: У 3 т. / керівник авт. кол. Д. В. Табачник. — К., 1996. — Т. 1.
5. *Галич Юрій.* Красный хоровод. — Владивосток: Типография Иосифа Коротя, 1921.
6. ЦДІАЛ України. — Ф. 316. — Оп. 316. — Спр. 1.
7. Вісник державних законів для всіх земель Української Народної Республіки. — 1919. — Вип. 75.
8. ЦДАВО України. — Ф. 3172. — Оп. 1. — Спр. 30.
9. ЦДАВО України. — Ф. 1429. — Оп. 2. — Спр. 56.
10. ЦДАВО України. — Ф. 1. — Оп. 18. — Спр. 258.
11. <http://zakon0.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/418/92>
12. <http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/766/95>