HiP Historia i Polityka
No. 14 (21)/2015, pp. 9–24
ISSN 1899-5160
www.hip.umk.pl
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/HiP.2015.016

Oleksandr GOLOVAN
World History Institute, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Ukraine under the Consideration of US–EU Bilateral Relations

Abstract: The article describes the primary US and EU foreign policy regarding Ukraine. The basic interests of both the United States and the European Union have been inspected. The Ukrainian drift to the Western institutions has been defined as the natural and predictable trend. The potential temporary losses because of the geopolitical integration with transatlantic counterparts have been foreseen.

Keywords: USA, European Union, Ukraine, Russia, interests, security, economics, foreign policy, relations, world politics

The global processes in the Euro-Atlantic region affect the environment all around the world. But the comprehensive analysis of the United States foreign policy towards Ukraine in the context of cooperation with the EU so far has not yet been fully reflected in the scientific research. This circumstance subsequently transmits insufficient degree of exploration of the mentioned phenomenon and, eventually, requires further study on American foreign policy covering the Ukrainian region in the background of US–EU relations. The object of the current article is the US foreign policy strategy in the context of the above, and the subject of the issue is qualified as the US and the EU positions relative to Ukraine interests, including the directions of their implementation. The purpose and target of the article are identified as joint tasks realized by the US and the EU regarding Ukraine on the basis of their content highlight.

There are only a few special publications in American political literature on international political activity of the EU, whose role in the world-system, meanwhile, increases. In overwhelming majority, the researches appear mostly as a simple "case studies", where the specific processes and events are analyzed, rather than presenting a comprehensive study of the phenomenon. In the current complicated

conditions of the Ukrainian South–East standoff, many analysts frequently do suppose that Ukraine has become a victim of political confrontation between the three world superpowers – Russia, the EU, and the US. For instance, the Ukrainian journalist Lilia Shevtsova writes that "Ukraine is a victim of both the Russian System's struggle for survival and the West's inability to protect the international legal space"[1]. In her opinion, for the Western countries, ending of this confrontation may prove to be even more agonizing than ending the Cold War.

Indeed, the US and the EU obviously represent one side of the conflict, and the Russian Federation – the opposite. Let's envisage the following issues and verify the mentioned supposition. It is obvious that many factors – historical, economic, and cultural distinguish the different political systems – Western and Russian, both of which desire to include Ukraine in their sphere of influence. Europe and the US have a common historical and cultural heritage. The European Union and the United States of America established diplomatic relations as early as in 1953, but it was only in November 1990 that the cooperation was formalized for the first time in the Transatlantic Declaration. Since December 1995, the New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA) has provided a foundation for the relationship[2]. They are characterized by similar political values and democratic principles. Since the end of the Second World War, the United States resorted to contribution to the Western democracies' survival, their political and economic recovery. That evidently occurred in terms of their opposition to the military power of the Eastern European bloc led by the Soviet Union, which targeted to continue dealing with the rest of the world by means of power. That issue has considerably brought the US and the countries of the future European Union closer together. European countries needed support in the field of the post-war rebuilding and the new anti-democratic impact from the Eastern communist regime. They finally become dependent on the US, as they still have been split into separate state actors, small distinctive units, who could not compete with a great modern country, which almost had not suffered from the World War in comparison to Europe.

The European vector remains a priority of United States foreign policy. After the USSR failed, the European countries obtained new opportunities, while the single competitor of the US had lost. To strengthen its capabilities, the leading majority of Europe decided to create the most effective world organization, integrating in the spheres of the common market, currency, defense system, and

[1] L. Shevtsova, *The Kremlin Is Winning*, The American Interest, 12 February 2015, http://www.the-american-interest.com/2015/02/12/the-kremlin-is-winning/ (accessed 29.04.2015).

[2] *European Union External Relations*, EEAS Europa, http://eeas.europa.eu/us/index_en.htm (accessed 29.04.2015).

borders. The US could not position itself as the only superstate since the European Union gathered its scopes to exert a strong influence on the rest of the world. Its American counterpart immediately understood that Europe will not hold out as the familiar "younger partner". The process of the US–EU relations deepening have been suspended because of the national security first class danger. After almost a decade of security reframe, the new President could not accelerate the integration of the US–EU policy immediately because of the global economic crisis. The second reason is the complicated decision-making process when dealing with EU countries, who have lost their foreign policy sovereignty still just partly. The EU as a political and legal institution for considering individual actors of the international system is still imperfect, for instance in terms of absence of specialized representation in the international organizations such as UN and more. On the other hand, so far there are no proper grounds to consider EU as a special actor of international relations. The current US–EU issues to consider are: engagement with major emerging economies and their development cooperation activities; post-2015 Millennium Development Goals and Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation; the division of labor between the US and the EU in terms of country and sectoral development priorities; and the resiliency agenda and the civil society space[3].

Due to the already mentioned, US–EU relations were cooling down, some political science experts started to talk about the "transatlantic break"[4]. Yes, during that period President Bush's administration resorted to the actions to render the security decisions separately from the EU and sometimes even without consultations and mutual approval. The US foreign policy was established in that manner due to the principal US prejudice against terrorism, which lasted for almost 8 years during both G. Bush's presidential terms. According to the *National Security Strategy* of the US, presented by the White House in 2006, the US found itself at the condition of war, so the national government was eager to engage all of the enemies of the US in the name of freedom and liberty, even if it meant neglecting the world opinion. "The ideals that have inspired our history – freedom, democracy, and human dignity – are increasingly inspiring individuals and nations throughout the world. And because free nations tend toward peace, the advantage of liberty will make America more secure. We fight our enemies abroad

[3] D. Steinberg, *US-European Union Cooperation for Critical Global Issues*, http://www.worldlearning.org/pressroom/speeches/us-european-union-cooperation-for-critical-global-issues/ (accessed 29.04.2015).

[4] Г.Ю. Панченко, *"Трансатлантична тріщина" у відносинах між США та ЄС на початку XXI ст.*, Вісн. Луган. нац. ун-ту ім. Т. Шевченка. Іст. Науки 2012, no. 6, p. 65.

instead of waiting for them to arrive in our country. We seek to shape the world, not merely be shaped by it", wrote G. Bush, whose foreign policy was criticized by Americans and the rest of the world as non-appropriate[5]. Carlo Bastasin in his book *Saving Europe* highlights that one of the reasons was also the definite fall of the trust in the American financial system, which fatally affected European economies by bringing the collapse, while "European governments behaved as if the problem was not of their concern. The mess was American-made, and it was up to Washington to clean it up", which caused the cooling of the transatlantic ties[6]. On the other hand, Europeans have always thought of US presidents as either naive, as they did with Jimmy Carter, or as cowboys, as they did with Lyndon Johnson, and held them in contempt in either case, says George Friedman, political analyst from Stratfor. "Transatlantic relationship is not gone, nor even frayed. But the connection is thin", he wrote[7]. However, after the switch to the new Democratic presidential administration of Barack Obama, the transatlantic relations are now being at the supreme stage of renewal. So far, the strong relationship of the EU and the United States, preserving today American security and American presence in Europe unconditionally remains a vital element devoted to guarantee security of the European Union. That is crucial because the geopolitical situation in Europe nowadays is definitely vulnerable and can become even more hazardous due to the further progress of negative trends and challenges of global and regional importance. The EU today has direct borders with the Islamic and Orthodox civilizations, which, moreover, are the zones of potential conflict, progressing according also to the concept of the "rich North and the Global South", where the growing wealthy countries in Europe are surrounded by the poor (North Africa, Russia, and some Middle East countries) that may resort to military confrontation. There is a growing danger of a gradual dissolution of civilized Europe nations as a result of increasingly uncontrolled migration flows which also cause the conflict risks. There is also a noticeable number of "explosive" potential conflict zones, which are able at any moment to become hot in certain circumstances. Finding itself in the following complex geopolitical conditions, the EU now does not have the necessary means, especially military, to adequately respond to the above threats without the US support. Therefore Russia's annexation of Crimea, destabilization

[5] *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, March 2006, Washington D.C. 2006.

[6] C. Bastasin, *Saving Europe*, Washington D.C. 2015, p. 14.

[7] G. Friedman, *Geopolitical Journey the U.S.–European Relationship, Then and Now*, https://www.stratfor.com/weekly/geopolitical-journey-us-european-relationship-then-and-now (accessed 29.04.2015).

of eastern Ukraine, and provocations of EU Member States' maritime and air defenses have delivered a blow to the post-Cold War security order and have revived awareness about the possibility of a military attack and occupation in Europe, said ex-secretary-general of NATO (1995–1999) Javier Solana[8]. Taking into account the abovementioned, this new trend of defining the current US–EU relations is referred to as a stage of "transatlantic renaissance"[9].

On the other hand, since President Obama obtained the leading position in the country, he performed three trips to Europe during his first six months in office. In Munich he officially announced that the US had to advance a vision for Europe that "has long enjoyed bipartisan support, but over which many things, including some in the administration, have cooled"[10]. The analysts say that nowadays the transatlantic relations are still being shaped by the US as a leading partner, but the EU is able now to strive for equal relations. In November 2010 the White House Office of the Press Secretary published the *Fact Sheet on the United States' Relationship with the European Union*, which commented on the enduring partnership between the two regions. That document reminded that the US and the EU relations coincide and have the same goals since "we share fundamental values of freedom, democracy, respect for the rule of law, and human rights. We work jointly and through international organizations to preserve basic rights and freedoms throughout the world"[11]. As for the American partner, the US foreign policy is primarily concentrated on the two directions: the Asia-Pacific region and the European Union. The potential economic growth of a united Europe is beneficial to the United States, first, because the EU is the main US ally in the field of world trade financial and market cooperation. The US and leading EU countries represented jointly by the Group of Seven industrialized nations (after Russia has been excluded from the community in 2014) and often share similar strategic positions in the WTO negotiations. They are coordinating their monetary policies, and since a significant proportion of imported energy resources they acquire from

[8] J. Solana, S. Blockmans, *Europe Needs More Union to Defend Itself*, Wall Street Journal, 10 March 2015, http://www.wsj.com/articles/javier-solana-and-steven-blockmans-europe-needs-more-union-to-defend-itself-1426016839 (accessed 29.04.2015).

[9] K.J. David, *What Transatlantic Renaissance? US–EU Relations Falling Apart at the Seams*, http://www.sott.net/article/294681-What-transatlantic-renaissance-US-EU-relations-falling-apart-at-the-seams (accessed 29.04.2015).

[10] J. Wolf, *The Obama Administration's Engagement of Europe*, Atlantic Review, 13 August 2009, http://atlanticreview.org/archives/1317-The-Obama-Administrations-Engagement-of-Europe.html (accessed 7.03.2015).

[11] *Fact Sheet on the United States' Relationship with the European Union: An Enduring Partnership*, White House, https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2010/11/20/fact-sheet-united-states-relationship-with-european-union-enduring-partn (accessed 29.04.2015).

the same regions of the world, their stability is in the EU and the US common interest. Close cooperation between the US and the European countries appears as the remarkable success in the following issues: economic manufacture and common markets, financial regulation, nuclear proliferation prevention, peacekeeping, environmental issues, etc. Otherwise, in terms of Ukrainian–Russia crisis, in February 2015 President Obama said that "Russian aggression has only reinforced the unity between the United States, Germany and other European allies. There's going to continue to be a strong, unified response between the United States and Europe; that's not going to change"[12]. After Russia has occupied the Ukrainian region of Crimea in March 2014, President Barack Obama came to Brussels to focus on transatlantic relations in the field of the new threat for the Western democracy while he attended the EU–US summit on 26 March, together with Commission President Barroso and European Council President Van Rompuy. It was his first ever visit to the EU institutions[13]. The political analysts say that since 2014, when Russia started its foreign invasion, US and European relations with Russia have become more adversarial in the context of Russia's annexation of Crimea and its actions in destabilizing Ukraine[14]. So the bilateral relations between the two counterparts recently have only increased their priority. In *National Security Strategy* of 2015, Barack Obama has mentioned that during his years at the White House, the US have "renewed their alliances from Europe to Asia" in the background of the Russian aggression. "Russia's aggression in Ukraine makes clear that European security and the international rules and norms against territorial aggression cannot be taken for granted", wrote President Barack Obama in NSS–2015[15].

Actually, the US and EU foreign policies regarding Ukraine appear as a constituent element of the US national strategy in the entire European zone and separate in the EU's regional policy. The first issue is the US approach to Ukraine in terms of foreign cooperation. When dealing with Ukraine, the US implements five priorities: assisting Ukraine in the short term agreement with the IMF in terms to award a contract which will exert reforms in the energy sector; strengthening the business component of the US–Ukrainian relations; cooperation in nuclear safety;

[12] M.D. Shear, A. Higgins, *Obama Awaits Outcome of Ukraine Peace Talks Before Deciding on Arms*, NY Times, 9 February 2015, http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/10/world/europe/european-foreign-ministers-postpone-russia-sanctions-to-allow-talks.html?_r=0 (accessed 7.03.2015).

[13] *EU–US Relations Today – Still Good Friends*, Epthinktank, http://epthinktank.eu/2014/03/24/eu-us-relations-today-still-good-friends/ (accessed 29.04.2015).

[14] D.E. Mix, *The United States and Europe: Current Issues*, FAS, https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22163.pdf (accessed 29.04.2015).

[15] *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, February 2015, Washington D.C. 2015.

and strengthening bilateral relations in the field of security and defense. These critical tasks were announced by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs D. Russell at a meeting of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe on 16 March 2010[16]:

1. After Ukraine obtained the new government in February 2014, the previous contracts with Russia in the field of credit have been demolished. The rollback of the IMF mission to Ukraine was achieved by the Ukrainian government of A. Yatsenyuk. In April, the IMF predicted that Ukraine will be able to acquire additional 15 billion dollars of international financial assistance due to the implementation of the program of cooperation with the IMF during the years 2014–2016. This programme provides a loan to Ukraine of about 17 billion dollars. But recently IMF has announced that Ukraine succeeded in attracting 40 billion dollars issued for 2015–2019 if Ukraine will execute the demands of government employees number reduction, male and female retirement age raise, and an increase of housing and public utilities fees, which will guarantee the Ukraine's opportunities of loan reimbursement in the future[17].
2. Ukraine is a transit route for Europe, which receives up to 1/4 of the total capacity of the Russian gas imported from the East, and that is why this region is so significant to Western partners. The discovery of Ukraine's own energy resources is vital to the American business. The US declared the development of the non-traditional gas output on the large portion of the Ukrainian territory, which is going to be followed by a general technology modernization of energy infrastructure. For example, Ukraine now is three times less energy efficient compared to the average EU countries: the state consumes 50–60% more gas than it should have.

   Reforming the energy sector implies diversification of sources and routes of energy supply to ensure independence of Ukraine from Russia. The US may receive a favorable ally similar to Poland in the East Europe – in the region, where the post-Soviet influence is now in the receding stage. The new agreement of 15 August 2014 which licenses gas transit infrastructure and storage leasing, applying to the US and EU energy corps, will guaran-

[16] D. Russell, *Ukraine and Its Relations with the United States*, Testimony Before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, 16 March 2010, Washington DC, http://www.state.gov/p/eur/rls/rm/2010/140325.htm (accessed 7.03.2015).

[17] *МВФ готов дать Украине $40 млрд, но на очень жестких условиях*, Сегодня, 12 February 2015, http://www.segodnya.ua/ukraine/chem-naroduukrainy-pridetsya-zalatit-za-finansovuyu-pomoshch-mvf-nashemu-pravitelstvu-591838.html (accessed 7.03.2015).

tee Ukraine sovereign policy in relations with its European and American counterparts in energy issues. Eventually, Ukraine shall be fully integrated into the European energy structure.

3. The activation of investment activity of US companies in Ukraine not only in the energy sector but also in numerous economy projects may increase US exports to Ukraine. Many US companies, who operate in Europe, have already established tight economic relations with Ukraine. For instance, in 2013 the share of exports from Ukraine to EU countries increased by 1,6 percentage points – up to 26,5% of total Ukraine exports. Otherwise, the share of imports from the EU to Ukraine increased by 4,1 percentage points – up to 35,1%. The main partners of Ukraine in trade exchange are Poland, which accounts for 15,2% of exports and 15% of imports from the EU countries, Italy – 14,1% and 7,7%, Germany – 9,6% and 25%, Hungary – 9,3% and 5,2%, respectively[18].

   Besides, the US, which has ceased to actively interfere in the Ukrainian policy during past years, still holds the eighth position on the list of the biggest investors in Ukraine. Such steps as creating incentives for investors, like tax cuts and debt reduction, can make Ukraine more attractive for American investors. The issues vary from the reform of the tax code to greater transparency, protection of the rule of law to serious measures to combat corruption. Attracting foreign investment is associated with the prosperity of Ukraine. This statement has become one of the key theses during Hillary Clinton visit to Kiev on 2 July 2010[19]. The Ukrainian government acknowledges now that the key to the ability of Ukraine to attract foreign investment is economic reform in this direction.

4. The US highly respects Ukrainian's contribution to the world nuclear safety enhancement and anti-terrorist foreign missions. Over the past 24 years, Ukraine has been a responsive partner of the United States. In the early 1990s, largely at the US behest, Ukraine rid itself of the world's third largest nuclear arsenal, including some 1900 strategic nuclear warheads targeted or targetable on the American homeland. By 1996, Ukraine had transferred all the warheads to Russia for elimination. By 2001, it had eliminated the missile silos, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and heavy bombers on its territory. In

[18] *Доля экспорта украинских товаров в страны ЕС в 2013 году выросла до 26,5%*, Капитал, http://www.capital.ua/ru/news/15484-dolya-eksporta-ukrainskikh-tovarov-v-strany-es-v-2013-godu-vyrosla-do-26-5 (accessed 7.03.2015).

[19] H. Rodham Clinton, *Remarks at the Closing of the Strategic Partnership Commission*, Kyiv (Ukraine), 2 July 2010, http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/07/143934.htm (accessed 7.03.2015).

2003, following the fall of Baghdad, Ukraine at the US request contributed three battalions to the Iraq stabilization force. For a period, the Ukrainian contingent was the fourth largest in Iraq after the forces deployed by the United States, Britain, and Poland[20]. Russia, the EU, and the US have concluded an agreement of guarantee of Ukrainian security in addition to this point, which was broken by Russia in 2014 due to the annexation of Crimea.

5. On the list of "vital" USA interests usually the protection of the United States closest allies from direct military attack is mentioned. In general, the list of countries and regions whose safety the United States should protect includes Western Europe, Middle East, and Japan. Ukraine belongs to the number of countries who guarantee security at the east EU borders. If EU security fails, the US will lose. Many experts have been expressing concerns about Ukraine's risks of internal conflict and post-Soviet Russia hazard. That is why President V. Yushchenko accepted the proposition of the Western partners in the field of defense and security (NATO structures integration) since he had assumed the leading post in the country. The US took part in layout formulation of consistent Ukraine's integration into NATO. That occurred in annual national programs, NATO exercises in Ukraine, and Ukraine's participation in the exercises conducted in other states participating in peacekeeping operations abroad. After V. Yanukovich regime redemption, the Ukraine–NATO programmes were brought down. The additional reason of integration process interruption was the suspension of Bush's administration global security distribution, desire to freeze the US–Russia competition in "reset policy", and the global financial crisis. At the end of 2014 Ukrainian parliament abolished the non-bloc status of Ukraine and declared the intention of joining NATO. Unfortunately, since Ukraine has lost control over the Crimea region, Ukraine can not join the community until the region will be reintegrated due to NATO regulations. For some reasons, there is a probability of making an exception for Ukraine in this issue. In February 2015 NATO officially acknowledged for the first time ever that Russia supports pro-Russian separatists in the East Ukraine with weapons[21]. Taking into consideration the complicated

[20] S. Pifer, *Russian Aggression against Ukraine and the West's Policy Response*, The Brookings Institution, http://www.brookings.edu/research/testimony/2015/03/04-russian-aggression-against-ukraine-policy-response-pifer (accessed 29.04.2015).

[21] *НАТО и ОБСЕ признали российское вторжение в Украину*, Дело, 13 November 2014, http://delo.ua/ukraine/nato-i-obse-priznali-rossijskoe-vtorzhenie-v-ukrainu-the-guardi-283255/ (accessed 7.03.2015).

situation in terms of security in Europe nowadays, such a decision can be perhaps approved.

The US strategy towards Ukraine is represented by the means and approaches for targeting national interests defined in the region. Obama's administration foreign policy has pledged the Clinton's administration and George W. Bush's approach to Ukraine. The changes have been introduced only in connection with the recent international climate. While Bush's administration selected the key method in acceleration of Euro–Atlantic integration of Ukraine to NATO and deepening of personal political impact, Obama much more prefers to work in various spheres simultaneously. In the regions of American interests Obama resorts to entrusting the local policy to the most reliable partner, who will execute a role of regional leader in the process of fulfilling US interests. That can be evidenced by Turkey's regional leadership in the Middle East. Turkey takes the leading role in resolving local conflicts, which is approved by the US. A similar role can be played by Ukraine in the EU–Ukraine relations, which is in line with US interests.

One of the significant ways is the cooperation at the non-political level – the involvement of different groups of Ukrainian residents, chiefly young people, in communication. That is embodied in the intensification of cooperation between US citizens and Ukraine in development of contacts in business, enhancing cultural exchanges, and the development of new educational programs. Thus, the main aim is to change the public opinion in Ukraine in favor of choosing membership in the Euro-Atlantic structures, which is expected to be achieved via mental transformation. This phenomenon can be identified as one of the features of the contemporary system of international relations, where the opposition shifts from the sphere of the struggle for territory and resources to the spiritual and civilization level – the competition of the traditional people's values, their religion, cultural codes, morality, behavior archetypes, etc. with globalization, represented by American culture standards. These tasks are directly correlated with the US foreign policy approaches in the East Europe region, which is focused on inner transformation in all domains of society that is aimed at compliance with the Euro-Atlantic structures and a gradual integration into them.

In general, since 2004 Ukrainian–American relations have considerably grown in their quality and quantity. Therefore, cooperation has not only intensified significantly, but, according to the parties, has acquired its meaningful strategic content. Despite the accusations of the Russian media of the US and the EU intervention in the internal affairs of Ukraine, research workers have noted that Ukraine exists at the periphery of US national interest. In particular, during previous years Ukraine mostly desired to take up with the US, not vice versa.

Basically, the European Union is sometimes defined as the community of political officials, who represent the US's interests in Europe. That can be partly confirmed, because EU has strong democratic institutions, which exclude the possibility of decision-making for the profit of one in spite of the rest. EU institutions have the priority of veto, which may block any gainless or destructive enterprise. The EU and US strategies seem to be similar due to other reason – the consistency of aims and methods. The EU and the US chose mainly an identical format of foreign policy architecture. Their actions on the international area are often precisely negotiated at the bilateral level. There is an obvious need for these two to share their experience and opportunities in solving global problems. Despite some differences in trade policy, for instance, in the agricultural products and services exchange, the EU and the US do share the concept of "one world", which largely contributes to their prosperity. The EU and the US both support regular reciprocal consultations. Since 1981, the level of their political dialogue has increased due to the transition to the annual exchange of official delegations headed by high-ranking officials, such as the US Secretary of State and the President of the EU Commission. The realization of the interests of each co-participant determines the stability of other. So it is wrong to say that the interest of the American side lies in weakening the European Union. On the other hand, the East European policy becomes a complex of multiple interests, shared by the Western world, without any concessions, because there is nothing to argue about.

The EU strategy is sometimes defined as the "soft" power of a united Europe instead of the US severity. This can be demonstrated in how the EU officials and EU countries' leaders comment on the events occurring in Ukraine. If the European politicians act moderate and careful, their transatlantic partners – the US and Canada let loose indignation without any diplomatic embarrassment. For instance, in February 2015 Obama said he is considering arms supply to Ukrainian forces defending their country against Russian-backed separatists if diplomacy fails. At the same time, the leader of Germany A. Merkel declared against forced Western involvement in the conflict. The objective side of the issue is that Europe still depends on the Russian energy support, so the stability in their relations will take priority for some years to come. Another example is the announcement of the war on Syria by the US in 2013 and the EU's criticism and disapproval. So it is obvious that the EU is not performing at the US request while covering its Eastern neighbors with integration. EU pursues the pragmatic and transparent individual interest. The countries, who were integrated during the several years after the Union was established, had to undergo a few steps to deserve the invitation. For nearly a decade of negotiations on EU accession candidate countries faced

strict conditions in Brussels. New Member States and candidates for EU accession had been required to undertake reforms of their economy and judicial system to remove the obstacles to integration.

The US is not trying to integrate other countries under personal federal jurisdiction and not only because of remote geographic location. That deals with the concept of US distant coordination. So far, the US concentrates its actions on particular regions, while others stay aside. But the EU, which includes many sovereign actors, may support boundless relations in every direction of world politics. European leaders have enough scopes to support presence almost everywhere worldwide. Over the past decade, regular meetings between senior officials of the European Union and the governments of leading countries – the US, Russia, China, Canada, Japan, India, etc. – became a regular practice. These meetings are held via visits of heads of states and governments, which gradually brings the supreme leaders of the EU to the highest international political status equal to the status of heads of sovereign states. The EU succeeded to encourage the creation of regional partners' international blocs in the Mediterranean and on the African continent, who became subregional integration groupings loyal to the EU.

In the field of security, both superpowers have acquired the united aim of fighting against international terrorism, where there were almost identical understandings of this threat[22]. But if the US usually resorts to force, Western Europe, taking advantage of the protection of the United States, calls for peaceful resolution of international disputes, non-use of power in international relations, multilateral diplomacy, international law, economic impact, and "absorption". In other words, everything mentioned gives us a reason to call the European Union a "soft" leader in the world politics. In some cases there are exceptions, e.g. in the traditional European regions of impact. France at the end of 2013 sent peacemaker troops to its former colony – the Republic of Mali. In such anti-terrorist operations the Ukrainian armed forces personnel is highly welcomed. Over the past five years of participation in peacekeeping operations Ukrainian military personnel earned 1 trillion of UAH (0.12 trillion USD)[23].

Both the EU and the US expect the Ukrainian crisis to cease immediately. Otherwise, these two Ukrainian partners promise extreme caution in establishing new

[22] М.А. Троицкий, *Трансатлантический союз 1991–2004: модернизация системы американо-европейского партнерства после распада биполярности*, Научно-образоват. форум по междунар. отношениям ; Ин-т США и Канады РАН. – М. 2004, p. 251.

[23] Украина за последние 5 лет участия в миротворческих операциях заработала 1 трлн грн, – ВСУ, РБК Украина, http://www.rbc.ua/rus/news/politics/ukraina-za-poslednie-5-let-uchastiya-v-mirotvorcheskih-operatsiyah-30052014182300 (accessed 7.03.2015).

common points when dealing with Ukraine during the current period of military confrontation in the eastern part of the country – Donbass. The overwhelming majority of Russian mass-media analysts, who transmit the official Moscow's point of view, state that alongside the Ukrainian crisis the US is influencing the EU, forcing it to quit its relations with Russia and to substitute it by the US–EU rapprochement. Robert Bridge, journalist of "Russia Today" said that "America's superpower hubris is destroying European relations with Russia, America's former Cold War nemesis"[24]. That is not strictly true, because the US has just followed the EU's move by announcing sanctions against Russian banks as well as the energy, arms, and shipping sectors. In such a situation, in our opinion, the EU has already made its choice, which appears to be association with Ukraine. Europe, which is strongly connected with Russia trough investments and trade relations, is obviously more worried than the US about the isolation of Russia. For instance, the UK, although a strong supporter of sanctions, was worried that rich Russians and their companies could turn away from the financial center in London; France wanted to protect its contract to deliver two warships worth more than 1,5 billion dollars to Russia; Germany sought to preserve its business selling advanced equipment to Russia's energy sector[25]. The drawbacks of this process are losing tight relations with Russia in return for acquiring greater US support, which is more significant for the EU than the simple energy recourses supply. As we know, together, the EU and the US have the largest bilateral trade and investment relationship in the world, roughly 31% of the world trade and over 49% of the world GDP[26]. The EU as an entity is the largest trading partner of the United States. In 2012, the EU accounted for 265,1 billion USD of total US exports (or 17,1%) and for 380,8 billion USD of total US imports (or 16,7%) with US trade deficit of 115,7 billion USD. The EU is also the largest US trade partner when trade in services is added to trade in goods, accounting for 193,8 billion USD (or 30,7% of the total in US services exports) and 149,7 billion USD (or 35,4% of total US services imports) in 2012[27]. This great integration and dependence could not be compared with the tactical EU–Russia relations, which bring EU countries many times less profit than the US–EU strategic dialogue.

[24] R. Bridge, *EU Cowers to American Power as Relations with Russia Tumble*, Russia Today, 7 October 2014, http://rt.com/op-edge/193936-eu-us-sanctions-economy-ukraine/ (accessed 29.04.2015).

[25] *Europe, U.S. Significantly Expand Sanctions Against Russian Economy*, Wall Street Journal, 29 July 2014, http://www.wsj.com/articles/europe-u-s-significantly-expand-sanctions-against-russian-economy-1406666111 (accessed 29.04.2015).

[26] *European Union External Relations*, EEAS Europa, http://eeas.europa.eu/us/index_en.htm (accessed 29.04.2015).

[27] W.H. Cooper, *EU–U.S. Economic Ties: Framework, Scope and Magnitude*, FAS, https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL30608.pdf (accessed 29.04.2015).

Despite the fact that these two international peacemakers were involved in engaging new terrorist organizations worldwide, Europeans and their US counterparts approach the Donbass conflict very cautiously, rejecting to define the LNR and DNR as terrorists, in view of the fear of instability, which can take place. President B. Obama has confessed that he acknowledges the Russian invasion to Ukraine, but the US will not help Ukraine to fight the Russian troops "I established, I think, an effective working relationship with Mr. Medvedev. And as a consequence, Russia's economy was growing, they had to the opportunity to begin diversifying their economy, their relations across Europe and around the world were sound, they joined the WTO with assistance from us. I don't think that it would be wise for the United States or the world to see an actual military conflict between the United States and Russia"[28]. At the same time Vladimir Putin portrays the invasion of Ukraine as an outcome of Russian "imperialism": "the bear will not even bother to ask permission", he boasted. "Here we consider it master of the taiga, and … it will not let anyone have its taiga". He made it clear that most of Ukraine is part of the "taiga" over which the Kremlin claims dominion — and Ukraine, he warned, "will certainly not be the last"[29]. While explaining the following situation, some EU officials agreed that in some respects there is a lack of effective support from the West in relation to the resolution of the conflict in Donbass. Thus, according to Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania Linas Linkevicius "We seem to have agreed in the past on additional sanctions if the conflict will not cease. But while this is taking place now, some our (Western) colleagues see it necessary that something worse happens to make them react. Then we will only express our concerns, as we usually do. Some people are sick of it. For how long can we express that concerns and do nothing?"[30].

The EU and the US are not only interested in Ukraine as a multi–million consumer market, NATO integration candidate to protect European borders from Russian hazard, and Ukrainian contribution to peacemaking military actions. Ukraine is expected to perform a larger role in geopolitical transformations in the region. The wide range of problems includes control of the flow of migrants as well as fight against transnational organized crime, drug trafficking, and money laundering.

[28] *Transcript of President Obama's Interview on Ukraine Situation*, CNN, 1 February 2015, http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1502/01/fzgps.01.html (accessed 07.03.2015).

[29] *Vladimir Putin Lays out a Menacing Choice for the West*, Washington Post, 27 October 2014, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/vladimir-putin-lays-out-a-menacing-choice-for-the-west/2014/10/27/ca7fc194-5dfd-11e4-8b9e-2ccdac31a031_story.html (accessed 29.04.2015).

[30] *Linas Linkevicius about the President Putin's Aims*, Voice of America, 26 February 2015, http://www.golos-ameriki.ru/content/litvenia-prime-minister-interview/2660856.html (accessed 7.03.2015).

What price Ukraine has to pay for the integration into EU–US projects? A point that should be mentioned is the existence of negative consequences for Ukraine as incidental to EU integration and deepening of US–Ukraine relations. Some projects failed; for example, the joining to the European Energy Community has not brought the modernization of its gas transport system and has not strengthened Ukraine's position in negotiations with Russia on the revision of gas contracts. Since Ukraine has entered the WTO, it is easier now to import goods made with up-to-date technologies and cheap labour from China rather than to produce them in Ukraine. The projects of production and transportation of oil and gas in the Black Sea area and shale gas production are one of the most environmentally hazardous activities. They have not been inspected for ecological risks. At the same time, the Ukrainian legislation has not yet implemented key international legal conventions regarding insurance of environmental risks and responsibility of gas recovery companies. Eventually, while being entirely absorbed to the EU community, Ukraine gets in debt, simultaneously loosing the profitable and welcome markets of the Eurasian union of post-Soviet countries and remains in the everlasting conditions of unguaranteed innovations and welfare level increase.

* * *

Euro-American relations are based on the principles of interdependence. The confusions that arise in specific issues, really take place, but do not have a strategic or decisive character. They are not able to provoke a fundamental conflict taking into consideration objective common values and benchmarks of conducting foreign policy. The architecture of the United States and the European Union foreign policy regarding Ukraine includes the following issues: the reform in accordance with the Western standards in all spheres of development of the Ukrainian state; the activation of cooperation between Ukraine and the EU and NATO and its integration into Euro-Atlantic military institutions; accession to international economic and financial institutions (WTO, IMF) and the European energy structures; transformations of the judicial system to create a convenient climate for foreign investors; resolution of regional conflicts and borders protection; and withdrawal of Russian troops from the Ukrainian territory. The geopolitical pro-Western option will bring innovation, modernization, and fair law to Ukraine. But during the period of transformation Ukraine will face serious losses. The acceleration of integration of Ukraine into the US–EU structures depends also on the Ukrainian gestures. As for the EU and US military and financial support for the stabilization of the Donbass confrontation, both parties will participate in Ukrainian issues for sure, but the main strategy will include the primary diplomacy methods of peace-

making. The key methods will remain to be economic sanctions and financial isolation, which will hit Russia due to currency collapse, higher interest rates, recession and higher inflation, capital outflow, foreign exchange reserves depletion, reduced consumer spending, stock market crash, etc.[31] As for Russia, it will still employ its media propaganda about the US pressure on the EU to change its position on the Ukraine invasion and will not forgive Ukraine its pro-Western attitude, blaming the US secret manipulations abroad[32]. The UN peacekeeping forces in all probability will not be dispatched to the Ukraine's territory. The critical force support may be established likely from the several EU countries without direct involvement of Brussels. The US will not send troops and military equipment because of the low geopolitical priority of Ukraine in the US national interest. So far, neither the EU nor the US will acknowledge the LNR and the DNR staying sure that it would not cause success in the peacemaking imbroglio.

[31] E. Picardo, *How US & European Union Sanctions Impact Russia*, Investopedia, http://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/011515/how-us-european-union-sanctions-impact-russia.asp (accessed 29.04.2015).

[32] F. Hill, *This Is What Putin Really Wants*, National Interest, 24 February 2015, http://nationalinterest.org/feature/what-putin-really-wants-12311 (accessed 29.04.2015).