

327.82(477)"085/134"

## THE ORIGINS OF THE UKRAINIAN DIPLOMACY: ERA OF KYIV RUS'

## ВИТОКИ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ДИПЛОМАТІЇ: ДОБА КИЇВСЬКОЇ РУСИ

## ИСТОКИ УКРАИНСКОЙ ДИПЛОМАТИИ: ЭПОХА КИЕВСКОЙ РУСИ

### Volodymyr I. Holovchenko

Doctor of Political Science, Professor, Institute of International Relations of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. E-mail: holovchenko@ukr.net

### Володимир Іванович Головченко

Доктор політичних наук, професор, старший науковий співробітник науково-дослідної частини Інституту міжнародних відносин Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка.

E-mail: holovchenko@ukr.net

### Владимир Иванович Головченко

Доктор политических наук, профессор, старший научный сотрудник научно-исследовательской части Института международных отношений Киевского национального университета имени Тараса Шевченко.

E-mail: holovchenko@ukr.net

**Abstract.** *Many Western political analysts viewed Ukraine declared its independence on August 24, 1991 as one of the major geopolitical events in the twentieth century. This is for a fate of Europe to have the same meaning and impact on the situation in the region, as well as German reunification a year earlier. Modern Ukrainian diplomacy deduced in the world of independent state in a much more favourable conditions of complete the cold war and relatively peaceful collapse of the Soviet Union, after more than 40 years, though largely formal, but still physical presence of the Ukrainian SSR in structures and forums UN state as its founders.*

*Today Ukraine claimed their place in the hierarchical structure of the international system, its position is essential for the formation of the system architecture, not only regionally but also at the global level. Especially important to the Foreign Ministry of our country is to take into account critically national historical experience and ability to make its the necessary structural principled position, that in general holds all the modern civilized world: in an independent and self-sufficient state no permanent friends but only permanent interests.*

*Without the critical study and taking into account Ukrainian's own interests and historical lessons of state development – geopolitical, civilizational, socio-economic – can not be understand the fundamental fact, that the current development of Ukraine as a sovereign state - the natural and logical outcome of its previous path.*

**Key words:** *dynasty, expansion, history, policy, state, tradition, Ukraine.*

**Анотація.** *Чимало західних політологів розцінили проголошення Україною своєї незалежності 24 серпня 1991 року як одну з найважливіших геополітичних подій у ХХ ст., що для долі Європи може мати таке ж значення і вплив на ситуацію в регіоні, як і возз'єднання Німеччини роком раніше. Сучасна українська дипломатія виводила у світ незалежну Україну в набагато сприятливіших умовах завершення холодної війни та порівняно*

мирного розпаду СРСР, після більш ніж 40-річної, хоч і багато в чому формальної, але все-таки фізичної присутності УРСР у структурах і на форумах ООН в якості її держави-співзасновника.

Сьогодні Україна стверджує своє місце в багаторівневій ієрархічній будові міжнародної системи, її позиція є істотною для формування архітектури цієї системи не лише на регіональному, але й на глобальному рівнях. Тим більш важливим для зовнішньополітичного відомства нашої держави є критичне врахування національного історичного досвіду і вміння робити з нього потрібні конструктивні висновки, що, в цілому, зводяться до принципового положення, якого дотримується увесь сучасний цивілізований світ: у незалежної й самодостатньої держави немає постійних друзів, а є лише постійні інтереси.

Без критичного вивчення й урахування власних історичних інтересів і уроків суверенного розвитку України – державницьких, геополітичних, цивілізаційних, соціально-економічних – неможливо зрозуміти той принциповий факт, що сучасне становлення України як суверенної держави – природний і логічний підсумок її минулого шляху.

**Ключові слова:** держава, династія, експансія, історія, політика, традиція, Україна.

**Аннотация.** Немало западных политологов расценили провозглашение Украиной своей независимости 24 августа 1991 года как одну из наиболее значимых событий XX века, которая для судеб Европы может иметь такое же значение и влияние на ситуацию в регионе, как и воссоединение Германии годом ранее. Современная украинская дипломатия выводила в мир независимую Украину во много более благоприятных условиях завершения холодной войны и сравнительно мирного распада СССР, после более чем 40-летнего, хотя и много в чем формального, но все-таки физического присутствия Украинской ССР в структурах и на форумах ООН в качестве ее государства-соучредителя.

Сегодня Украина утверждает свое место в многоуровневом иерархическом построении международной системы. Ее позиция является существенной для формирования этой системы не только на региональном, но и на глобальном уровнях. Тем более важным для отечественного внешнеполитического ведомства выступает критическое восприятие национального исторического опыта и умение сделать из него нужные конструктивные выводы, что, в целом, сводятся к принципиальному положению, которого придерживается весь цивилизованный современный мир: у независимого и самодостаточного государства нет постоянных друзей, а есть только постоянные интересы.

Без критического изучения и учета собственных исторических интересов и уроков суверенного развития Украины – государственных, геополитических, цивилизационных, социально-экономических – невозможно понять тот принципиальный факт, что нынешнее становление Украины как независимого государства – естественный и логический итог ее прошлого пути.

**Ключевые слова:** государство, династия, история, политика, традиция, Украина, экспансия.

**Formulation of the problem.** Ukraine is the border state, that it is reflected not only in its name but also in a location on the west of Large Eurasian steppe which is stretched out from the Great Hungarian Plain to the hills of Manchuria. So-called 'breaks' pass its territory between western christian, orthodox slavonic and by an islam civilization groupments, that is brightly expressed in the foreign policy orientations of different regions of our state. Border bipolarity of Ukraine appears even in a location on its territory of geographical center of Europe in Carpathi-

ans and Eurasian geopolitical pole in Crimea. Thus, Ukraine is on the geopolitical axis of continent which connects the European and Asiatic systems, at the same time it is included in the so-called Eurasian diameter: Portugal/Ireland – France – Germany – Poland – Ukraine – Russia – China – Myanmar – Thailand – Malaysia – Singapore.

On well-aimed determination of the acknowledged classic of modern political science of international relations Z. Brzezinski, such objective geopolitical reality, in essence, converts Ukraine into a geopolitical center [Бжезинский, 1999: 61], into the state, whose value swims out not from its military and economic power and motivation of actions in the international arena, but from importance of location place and consequences of it potential impressionability from the side of geostrategic powers. By them for today for our state there are the USA, the European Union (which on this time present more sharp-edged Euro-Atlantic association), and Russia. Regional meaningfulness of Ukraine is presently predefined importance of functions of communication link between technologically superdeveloped Europe and rich on resources regions of the Middle East, Caucasus and Central Asia (on state of affairs of the last region the growing Chinese ‘center of power’ has a large influence). All this actualizes clarification of the Ukrainian diplomacy origins in the era of Kyiv Rus’.

**The purpose of the article** is to clarify the essence of reason, reason and consequences of the Kyiv Rus’ diplomacy traditions which are important for successful implementation of Eurointegration and Euro-Atlantic course of the independent Ukraine.

**Analysis of the latest publications.** As in the Soviet times mentioned problems were extremely ideologized and suffered considerable fraud, entirely inherited (and even ‘multiplied’ with the arrival of Vladimir Putin) by modern Russian political and historical science, author in several publications reviewed the origins and characteristics of Rus’ as the first Ukrainian state [Головченко, 2006; Головченко, 2007; Головченко, 2008], but international and historical sources of the Ukrainian diplomacy for a long time remained unnoticed by national researchers.

**The main results of the study.** Raising in the historical and political retrospective view of question ‘Ukraine between the East and the West’, when the place of civilization influences is examined in forming of the ‘ukrainstvo’ [Лисяк-Рудницький, 1994: 2], in our opinion, is unacceptable. Ukraine always came forward a legal member both Greek-Byzantium and Western cultures, permanently trying creatively to synthesize these two traditions, foremost, in the majestic epochs of the history, – at Kyiv Rus’ and the Cossack State of the 17-18<sup>th</sup> centuries. Having (in scientific and cognitive plans) no prospects to talk about Ukraine with ostensible goodwill, as it is loved to do the known foreign politicians and diplomats, but at the same time as about nation and state which always aimed to be somewhere laid. Without a critical study and account of it own historical interests – state, geopolitical, civilization, socio-economic – it is impossible to understand the principle fact, that modern becoming of Ukraine as the sovereign state, – natural and logical result of its past way.

Almost a thousand years ago, at the solemn consecration of the main church in Rus – Sofia Kyiv, presbyter of palace church of Apostles – Illarion spoke in view of Grand Prince of Kyiv Yaroslav the Wise ‘Word about a law and plenty’. He was soon destined to become the first the Metropolitan-Rusin (1044-1053), and after displacement from a department on call of Byzantium – under the name of the monk Nikon the Great to strengthen tradition of domestic annals and to lead the glorious Pechersk monastery. The known philosopher and bookman formulated the patriotic version of world history in this speech, taking in it the honorable place to Kyiv state and predicting the majestic future of its people.

With an exhaustive capacity and at the same time brevity prince’s confessor outlined the place of Rus’ and its rulers in of that time Ecumene: “All territories, and towns, and people giv-

ing thanks and do they worship each his teacher that taught them Orthodox Faith. Will praise and we, on force to our, though by small praises, the one who large and strange matter created, our teacher and tutor, great khagan of our land – Volodymyr, grandchild of Old Igor, and son of glorious Svyatoslav, about a courage and bravery of which in the years of his dominion an ear spread on many sides, and victories of him and power pass and remembered yet and presently. Not in poor and a terra incognita he ruled, but in Rus' about which to know and to hear on all four ends of earth" [Буслаев, 1901: 15].

For many ages to the epoch of positivism, practical formation of diplomacy and science of international relations, political sociology, marketing, and science about imagery, the main representative of original spiritual academy, which concentrated round Yaroslav the Wise, caught essence, after modern terminology, keeping of Rus' positioning at the turn of the Early and the High Middle Ages. Glorified in songs and Varangian sagas, magnified by domestic chronicles, described in the Byzantium and Western-European chronicles, outlined on the maps of the Arabic and Persian geographers, Kyiv Rus' for the days of its active territorial expansion and relative administrative centralization of the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> – the first third of the 12<sup>th</sup> centuries was the largest state in the Medieval Europe (about 1,1 million sq km and near 4,5 million of population).

In history of the Eastern Europe Kyiv Rus' has special place, analogical to the empire of Charles the Great and Louis the Pious 800-843 occupied in history of the Western Europe as a direct predecessor of modern France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxemburg. Occupying enormous territory – from the Baltic Sea and the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea and from Carpathians to Volga, – Rus' made historically an important contact area between the Arabic East and the Western Europe, Byzantium and Scandinavia. This led to the rapid including of Rus' in the European historical and cultural landscape and system of the international relations of the High Middle Ages.

It is hard to overestimate the payment of Kyiv Rus' to the political and diplomatic history of the medieval Europe and Asia. About the strong Eastern Slavs state began to speak in different parts of the Old World. Information of the Arabic and Byzantium authors, data of Scandinavia's sagas, French epic works (only in 28 French 'chansons de geste' Rus' is remembered all about 70 times) present the Kyiv state as mighty country, which occupies an important place in the system of the European political and economic ties. Famous Old-French knight's epos 'Song about Roland' (about 1170) testifies participating of Rus' warriors in the war against Charles the Great. Byzantium historian and statesman of the 12-13<sup>th</sup> centuries Niketas Choniates noted in the 'Chronicle', that 'the most Christian' Rusyn people rescued Byzantium from the invasion of nomads [Хониац, 1862: 297].

Simultaneously with international recognition of Rus', the awareness of own involvement to the world history grew and got strong, as well as understanding of the place in the system of international relations of that time world. Not by chance on the coins of Volodymyr the Great in the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> century the Grand Prince of Kyiv is represented as the Byzantium emperor. The strategic foreign policy task of the first members of Rurik dynasty (Ihor and Ol'ga, their son Svyatoslav the Conqueror and his direct successors – Volodymyr the Great and Yaroslav the Wise) was confirmation of Rus' in the quality of the eastern European power center of Christian Ecumene, isometric Byzantium superpower and the 'Roman Empire', which was restored by coronation of the German monarch Otto I the Great (under the name of August) on 2 February 962 in Rome.

In a tense fight for realization of such scale purpose the Kyiv rulers tested the rich arsenal of both peaceful (diplomatic) and military (power) facilities. Thus unlike most states of the Early

Middle Ages time, that in foreign policy questions gave obvious advantage for force, Rus' skillfully enough combined battle actions with a negotiations process. Whether the first convincing certificate of sure output of sovereign Rus on an international scene was demonstrated by the new of Annales Bertiniani (brilliant annalistic memorial of 'Karolings' Renaissance' of the 9<sup>th</sup> century) about arrival in May of 839 to the Franks' emperor Louis the Pious in Ingelheim of the Byzantium emperor Theophilus embassy. As an author of chronicle bishop Prudentius marked, Theophilus mentioned in the letter about "some [people], which talked that them, that their people named Ros [Rhos], and which, as they talked, tsar their on the name of Khagan [Chacanus], sent in him [Theophilus] for the sake of friendship" [Кочин, 1936: 23].

The ruler of Byzantium asked Louis the Pious, that he "kindly enabled them to return [in the country] and guard on all empire, as ways, which they arrived to him to Constantinople went among barbarians... and he would not like, that they, returning by them, got in a danger". Louis ordered to find out, who those ambassadors-Ruses were, and thorough investigation testified that they "belonged to nationality Swedish [eos gentis esse of Sueonum]". Counting them 'quick by secret service agents', both in Byzantium and in his empire, Louis decided to detain the 'guests', "that it is possible it was for certain to know, whether with good intentions they came there or not". About the subsequent fate of Ruses embassy Annales Bertiniani are quiet [Кочин, 1936: 24].

From this report of Annales Bertiniani it is evident, that in the second fourth of the 9<sup>th</sup> century in the Western Europe did not yet know about Kyiv Rus', but appearance of ambassadors of Ruses 'khakan' (khazar's transcription of Turkic title of 'khagan' is a 'great khan') in Constantinople, as well as Byzantium in Ingelgeym, looks fully logical. The Byzantium empire suffered from the offensive of Arabic Caliphate, in summer of 838 in a battle on Dazimona plain the Arabs nearly got himself emperor Theophilus, there was a threat directly to Constantinople, that is why the idea of crusade became actual against the Moslem world.

Only two decades passed after the events described higher, as Rus' loudly reported about the existence, compelling to begin to tremble mighty Byzantium. At dawn on 18 June 860 Constantinople – the capital of Empire, which scornful attitude toward other and especially 'barbarian' people was the norm of foreign policy, was attacked from the sea. 200 ships of Ruses without difficulty walked up to the bank and landed landing force, which began a siege immediately, an infantry came in time simultaneously. The Grand Prince of Kyiv Askol'd headed a campaign, time for attacking Constantinople was select not by chance: yet in spring emperor Mikhail III at the head of 40-thousand moved troops deep into Asia Minor for a rebuff of Arabs, a Greek fleet operated in the district of Crete against the pirates, there is only an insignificant garrison in the capital. Most researchers consider that Askol'd was perfectly informed about foreign policy difficulties and weakness of empire army.

Emperor had to leave the army in Asia Minor and with a risk for life to make way to the capital, to lead its defensive. A position of besieged was critical, as patriarch Photius remembered in the sermon, "city barely, so to speak, was not raised on a spear", that it is taken assault [Головченко, 2008; 24]. But making sure in impossibility of overcoming of giant walls (only at the end of 12<sup>th</sup> century siege machines in Rus' appeared), Askol'd went on secret negotiations with Mikhail III and for large redemption on June, 25 in 860 raised the siege, coming home 'with a triumph'. And in 867 ambassadors from Kyiv arrived to Constantinople and concluded a peaceful treaty with a new emperor Basil I.

Treaty foresaw proceeding in halted war trade between Rus' and Byzantium, providing of the privileged status, for Ruses merchants in Byzantium, and Greek – in Rus', payment for Rus'

by Byzantium annual tribute and grant of military help for empire by Rus'. The important condition of agreement was a consent to adopting Christianity by the Grand Prince of Kyiv Askol'd and the nearest surroundings. So 'diplomatic confession' of Kyiv Rus' took place by the world empire of the Middle Ages – by Byzantium.

On the wave of Rus' international position strengthening Askol'd helped the Prince of the Great Moravia Rostyslav to defend the independence from East-Frank king Louis II of Italy and Bulgarian khan Borys I. But, unfortunately, in the apogee of international power of Askol'd's Rus source lost it from view together with a ruler on one and a half decades. Chronicles again talk about Askol'd in connection with appearance near-by Kyiv in 882 of Varangian konung Oleh – him uninvited competitor and organizer of putsch which resulted in assertion afoot of new princely dynasty – Ryuryk Dynasty. However, after that comparatively short duration period of relationships with Kyiv on the basis of agreement of 'peace and love' in 867 skilled Byzantium diplomacy came to the conclusion, that a north competitor lost its offensive potential.

Imperial administration began to do obstacle for Rus' merchants both in Constantinople and in other large cities. But mainly, there was that Byzantium renounced to pay for Rus' foreseen acceding to Askol'd annual contribution. Therefore in 907 the Grand Prince of Kyiv Oleh at the head of large cavalry army which crossed the territory of Bulgaria (its ruler – a prince Simeon was interested in a task to blow an arch-enemy), and fleet which landed again, from everywhere blocked Constantinople and ravaged its environs. Probably, Kyiv scouts, as well as in 860, successfully calculated time for the leadthrough of offensive operation against Byzantium's capital: as a result of fight of the mighty landed magnates against the emperor of Lion VI Philosopher a revolt happened in the army, and the best legions from the north scopes of the state were sent against the Arabs.

As well as half of century before Askol'd, Oleh sent ambassadors to Constantinople, that after tense negotiations with Lion VI and his junior brother Alexander concluded a treaty of the "peace and friendship" – the first international agreement of Kyiv Rus', text of which was saved to our days in the Primary Chronicle by Nestor. It was succeeded substantially to decrease the sum of valid for one occasion levy the Byzantium side, but an annual contribution was widespread "on Rus' towns – at first on Kyiv, and then and on Chernihiv, and on Pereyaslav, and on Polots'k, and on Rostov, and on Lyubech, and on other towns, – because princes sat on those towns, under Oleh rule". From the side of Rus', as follows from subsequent development of events and evidences of the Byzantium sources, promised to give empires permanent military help.

Byzantium authorities were also obligated to supply with Rus' ambassadors and merchants all the necessary for a reverse way: by sails, anchors, ropes, and food. Similar privileges, it follows to think, Kyiv side gave for Greek merchants. The most important in an agreement was that Rus' took right for free trade in Constantinople [Мишанич, 1989: 12]. An agreement in 907 was confirmed and developed more detailed by an agreement of 911, celled in Constantinople without previous negotiations in Kyiv and made on two charters (parchments). The row of new articles determined the order of conflicts solution at the operations of purchase-sale among the citizens of two states, and also exchange and redemption the prisoners of war back, returning of slaves and criminals that escaped, protection products Ruses in Constantinople, inheritance of property, the return of wealth died in Constantinople.

But double game of Byzantine diplomacy (solicitation of Rus' help for the conduct of wars in Italy and at the same time setting Pechenigs on Rus' and stopping of payment a regular contribution), and also diplomatic pressure over on Kyiv from the side of Khazar Khaganate was

brought to the break between the states and the next campaign of Rus' against Constantinople in June-September of 941. It appeared not quite successful, but it did not stop the Grand Prince of Kyiv, and Igor began to prepare a new offensive, resorting to striking diplomatic and mobilizational preparation. Disturbed by the union of Igor with the Pechenigs horde and warned by Bulgarians about approaching of large fleet to Danube and cavalry of Rusyns and Pechenigs, an emperor Roman I Lakapin offered the peace. After the newest researches, bilateral peaceful agreement in 944 was celled in Constantinople after previous negotiations of the Byzantium ambassadors in Kyiv with Igor.

Thus, in the first time in diplomatic history of Rus' official foreign delegation, besides from that time superpower, visited Kyiv, in the first time and equal in rights and civilized exchange by embassies with an Empire took place. In the text of agreement in 944 already there was not speech about free trade of ruses merchants in Byzantium, and it is not mentioned about payment of contribution for Rus' by Empire. But an agreement defined regional foreign policy positions of the Kyiv state, which officially became the ally of the Byzantium empire in the Black Sea region. For the young Kyiv state, passing to the new stage of its relationships with the Byzantium empire meant 'exit to international arena' not only in relation to the Mediterranean but also in relation to Europe on the whole. By then, Byzantium (the former East Roman empire) was the Christian state with a millennial political culture, enormous tradition of patristics, diplomatic relations and documentary, thoroughly worked out foreign policy doctrine, withstand state life.

And however to introduction of Christianity by Volodymyr the Great Rus' remains a young barbarian country with single chronicles attractions of the first ages of state existence and tribal organization at the head with soldiery fuglemen which had a title of 'khagan'. As Byzantium palace formulars testify that to the Grand Prince Ihor was written with less diplomatic etiquette, than to the Khazar khagan, not speaking already about the Bulgarian tsar. Therefore already in the middle of 980<sup>th</sup> Volodymyr the Great and his comrade-in-arms became firmly established in a mind officially to enter Christianity to Rus' from Byzantium. Tradition of the Byzantium church, that was it was subjugated for inferior supreme power of ruler (unlike the Roman church with its claims on scorn above secular sovereigns), in Kyiv counted already more than one hundred years, beginning from the agreement in 867.

However, the Grand Prince of Kyiv, obviously, hesitated to carry out a decision step: and he, and his advisers – senior combatants (boyars) understood that to accept a new faith from the hands of the Byzantium emperor and Constantinople Patriarch would mean to be in the real danger to get in ideological, and even political (through church organization on Rus') dependence on Byzantium. Therefore the Kyiv negotiations in 986 with the Volga Bulgarians Muslims, by the representatives of Roman Pope John XV, Byzantium government and Jews must demonstrated to Constantinople, that, at first, empire the not unique country from which Rus' can perceive a new state religion, and, secondly, that it is impossible to impose a faith Kyiv, it elects it.

Hardness to say, what steps Volodymyr the Great would accomplish, going to inculcate Christianity to Rus', if he was not helped by a coincidence – civil war in Byzantium, caused by Asia Minors' military landlords against the brothers-emperors of Basil II and Constantine VIII. In this difficult situation in Constantinople reminisced possibility the receipt of military help from Rus' in obedience to positions of previous bilateral agreements. The proper Byzantium embassy arrived in Kyiv, but, taught bitter experience of predecessors by approaches of the 'Byzantium diplomacy', the Grand Prince of Kyiv demanded the hand of sister of emperors for a help – Anna, who was the peculiar guarantor of implementation of agreement terms from the Byzantium side, foremost, in relation to grant Rus' of point-of-sale privileges.

In the Middle Ages dynastic marriages were the means of achievement of peaceful agreements and military unions; in an epoch, when diplomacy as an instrument of realization of foreign policy yet formed only, such unions had been considered the most reliable ones. But the official foreign policy doctrine of Byzantium asserted that emperor Constantine the Great (306-337) forbade the members of ruling dynasty to become relatives of the possessors of any states, both unchristian and Christian, doing an exception only for Franks. Therefore ambassadors cast aside marriage solicitation of Volodymyr the Great and went to Constantinople. Meantime, a blaze of civil war in Byzantium flamed up all stronger, it was to go proud Greeks to give in the Grand Prince of Kyiv, and at the end of 987 the allied agreement was celled in Kyiv, true Basil II pulled out the claim in return the quality of pre-condition: christening of Volodymyr and population of Rus.

After christening of the Great prince in Kyiv and ratification of agreement in Constantinople, in spring of 988 6-thousand a select Rus' corps left for Byzantium, where it played a decisive role in the defeat of rebels. But, feeling master of the situation, an emperor found out a black ingratitude in relation to the Grand Prince of Kyiv and perfidiously violated the promise to give a princess Anna for him. Then, to compel the Byzantium rulers to observe the word, Volodymyr the Great in 989 carried out an attack on Crimea and besieged Chersonesus – the main granary of Byzantium and bulwark of its domination on a peninsula. Conquering the city by the supporters into a fortress, Volodymyr got a possibility from the position of a winner to dictate Byzantium the advantageous for him terms of the peace.

Exactly in Chersonesos he in second times 'officially' baptized and solemnly entered into marriage with a princess Anna in autumn 989. Circumstances of 'choice of faith' and introduction of Christianity in its Byzantium, future orthodox version, trick into to the conclusion, that, pursuing for the hand of the princess Anna, the Grand Prince of Kyiv aimed to heave up international authority of the state, extend and deepen its foreign policy copulas. By the fact of cognation with a Byzantine Porphyrogeneta princes Volodymyr the Great (as well as his grandchild Vsevolod, who became married with daughter of Constantine Monomachos – Anastasia in 1046, whether great-grandchild Svyatopolk II of Kyiv who entered into marriage with the daughter of Alexios I Komnenos – Irene in 1104) in the eyes of contemporaries was attached to the glorious family of the Roman Caesar – unattainable ideal of power, influences, prestige of that epoch, as traditions of the 'eternal Rome', large religion and culture stood after the Byzantium dynasties.

The process of formation of the large and mighty Central-East-European state, important subject of international policy of the Medieval Europe, with which since quite a bit crowned persons aimed to set equal in rights and mutually beneficial intergovernmental mutual relations was so completed. Acceptance of new religion at the above-described terms not only eliminated political dependence of Rus' from Byzantium, but also put a church under the state control, making it an obedient instrument in the princely hands. At the same time, as a result of such christening arose the original historical-cultural phenomenon, which did not have analogues in the Slavonic world. State, which in that time after the socio-economic and political mode was near to Czech and Poland, that adopted Christianity from Rome and entered in the circle of civilization and culture of Latin Europe, in a cultural relation drawn together with the South-Slavs people of the Balkan peninsula, that were in the field of influence of Byzantium and developed after Byzantium pattern.

It in a great deal defined the features of foreign policy development and culture of country on great while. Together with that, 'choice of faith' on behalf of Constantinople immediately resulted by Volodymyr the Great in intensification of diplomatic contacts between Kyiv and the



Apostolic throne. And although Roman influences, in the end, were not won in Rus', frisky diplomatic contacts between Kyiv and Apostolic the capital had played the positive role: they induced Byzantium which rather afraid of Roman influence on Rus, to behave to the last not as to the junior partner, but as to equal.

The far-sighted policy of the Kyiv rulers – to support close diplomatic contacts not only with Byzantium but also with its permanent competitors – German ('Sacred Roman') empire, with Bulgaria, with Hungary, with Georgia, – proceeded in the next ages. Western authors of that time, mainly German chronicles, present Rus' the large and mighty state on European East and unchanging name it 'rerum', that means the large state with a strong ruler at the head, and the Grand Prince of Kyiv for them is named 'Rex Ruthenorum' ('Rus' king') or even 'potentissimus of Ruthenorum Rex' ('mightiest Rus' king') [*Січинський, 1992: 51*].

Thus, in the middle of the 11<sup>th</sup> century forming of geopolitics of the Kyiv state, which appeared on break of settled Christian and nomadic Islam civilizations in quality of 'shield' for defence of 'rears' of Europe, was completed. For Rus' outlined lead South-West (Byzantium-Balkan), Black Sea regional, Western (Central- and Western-European) and North-Western (Scandinavian) foreign policy vectors. At the same time, organic impressionability of positions of Kyiv appeared in the East.

The first Grand princes of Kyiv, as a rule, stuck to geopolitical axis 'North – South', aiming to build the state 'from the sea to the sea'. The model, which analogical approach, was widely used in the process of creation of the state by other European people, foremost, by Lithuanians and Poland. Thus, at first (9-10<sup>th</sup> centuries) dominant for Kyiv was an southward orientation, that fully coincided with the main direction of the Slavonic colonization of free territories along North-South landmark of the Ukrainian rivers – the Dniester, the South Bug, the Dnieper, and the Sivers'kyi Donets'. This direction had a primary value for getting up of general cultural and economic level of Rus' society by attaching to the achievements of ancient civilization.

In course of time, with activation of 'Migration Period' from the depths of the Central Asia, the possibility of geopolitical advancement southward from Kyiv appeared to a great extent blockaded. It was compensated by re-erecting of other foreign policy vectors, foremost, Western, and the major form of its realization, distribution and strengthening of international connections in the epoch of the Middle Ages were the dynastic marriages. Exactly developing and strengthening of Western- and Central-European orientation of the geopolitics, giving advantage to diplomacy, but not to power facilities, Yaroslav the Wise provided the greatest level of development of the Kyiv state and carried out, possibly to the end and not a conscious, attempt to tear up Rus from under Byzantium influence and give it new dynamic impulse of development.

During his rule (1015-1018, 1019-1054), the Kyiv state so confidently entered in the circle of the European international keyactors, that without the account of it diplomatic and military and political positions and interallied relations formed as dynastic marriages set with it, it is impossible thoroughly and objectively to understand medieval diplomatic history not only of Byzantium, Bulgaria, Poland and Hungary, but also of Scandinavian countries, Germany and even distant England and France. 'Marriage diplomacy' of the Rurik Dynasty only from the middle of 10th century (the marriage of Svyatoslav the Conqueror with a daughter of the Magyar prince Tashkon) up to 1320<sup>th</sup> (marriage agreements of great-grandchildren of King of Rus' – Danylo of Galicia) is exceeded by 100 cases. And in chronicles only from the 11<sup>th</sup> century are 38 marriages of representatives of the Rurik Dynasty fixed: with German representatives – 8, Polish – 7, Hungarian – 6, Scandinavian and related to them English – 5, French – 2, one marriage was celled with the Byzantium princess and three – with Cumans princesses.

Thus, ‘a lion’s share’ of marriage unions of the Rurik Dynasty touched the states of Central and Western Europe in the 11<sup>th</sup> century, from those annalistic data in the following century part of Byzantium grew to 7 cases, but not due to the substantial diminishing of the marriage acceding to the rulings dynasties of Central- and Western-Europeans states. Whatever downplayed some researchers importance of dynastic factor in the questions of cultural orientation of the Medieval states, the resulted numbers convincingly testify that in the 11-12<sup>th</sup> centuries Kyiv Rus’ in the political life was considerably closer related to the Western Europe, than with Byzantium and Balkan Slavs.

In any event, these dynastic unions, together with participating of the Kyiv state in European diplomatic combinations, coalitions and wars, demonstrate evidently, that it was included in European state political system and realized itself as a part of this system. Rus’ had lived by an intense international life, and its foreign policy of the 11-12<sup>th</sup> centuries – it foremost, as suitable marked Moscow philosopher of history M. Alpatov, “meeting motion of the large European state westward” [Алпатов, 1973: 279].

Then to a great extent noted directions of geopolitical interests of the Kyiv state and its legal successors were saved in next ages, playing an important role in to subsequent cultural and historical development of the Ukrainian people. The Medieval Rus’ diplomacy, certainly, developed on its own national-state basis, but as on forming of international law in medieval Europe the Roman state tradition and Roman law had a substantial influence, a conductor of which was Byzantium, its diplomatic customs and standards of international acts were partly perceived by the state of the Rurik Dynasty.

### References

1. Алпатов М. А. (1973) *Русская историческая мысль и Западная Европа XII-XVII вв.* [Russian historical thought and Western Europe in 16-17<sup>th</sup> centuries]. Москва: Наука.
2. Бжезинский З. (1999) *Великая шахматная доска: господство Америки и ее геостратегические императивы* [The grand chessboard: American primacy and its geostrategic imperatives]. Москва: Международные отношения.
3. Буслав Ф. (1901) *Русская хрестоматия. Памятники древней русской литературы и народной словесности* [Russian anthology. Records of the old Russian literature and folk philology]. Москва: Типография Г. Лиснера и А. Гешеля.
4. Головченко В. І. (2006) “Звідки пішла Руська земля...” (Міжнародно-політичні обставини виникнення Київської держави) [“Where the Rus’ land originated from... (International and political circumstances of origination of the Kyivan state)], *Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка: Міжнародні відносини* 33-34: 4-10.
5. Головченко В. (2007) ‘Київ – центр євроінтеграції за часів середньовіччя’ [Kyiv as the center of European integration in the Middle Ages], *Пам’ять століть* 2: 105-119.
6. Головченко В. (2008) ‘Дипломатична історія Галицько-Волинської держави: королівський період’ [Diplomatic history of the Galician-Volynian state: Royal period], *Україна дипломатична – 2008. Науковий щорічник* 9: 79-110. Київ: Планета.
7. Лисяк-Рудницький І. (1994) *Історичні есе* [Historical essays]: Volume 1. Київ: Основи.
8. *Літопис Руський (За Іпатським списком)* [The Rus’ Chronicle. (According to the Ipatsky list)] (1989), Мишанич О. В. (ed.). Київ: Дніпро.
9. *Памятники истории Киевского государства IX-XII вв. Сб. документов* [Records on the history of the Kyivan state in 9-12th centuries. Collection of documents] (1936), Кочин Г. Е. (ed.). Ленинград: Соцэкгиз.

10. Січинський В. (1992) *Чужинці про Україну: вибір з описів подорожей по Україні та інших писань чужинців про Україну за десять століть* [Strangers about Ukraine: Excerpts from the descriptions of trips around Ukraine and other writings of foreigners on Ukraine for a period of ten centuries]. Київ: Довіра.
11. Хониат Н. (1862) *История со времени царствования Иоанна Комнина* [The history since the reign of John Comnenus]: *Volume 2 (1186-1206)*. Санкт-Петербург: Тип. Григория Трусова.