

# INTERNATIONAL WEEKLY

**№ 28—32**

*11.09.2012 – 10.10.2012*



Friedrich Naumann  
STIFTUNG  
FÜR DIE FREIHEIT

## UKRAINE – THE EUROPEAN UNION



### **KEY THEME ANALYSIS: Yalta European Strategy Summit (YES) has disclosed the crisis of the relationship between Ukraine and Europe.**

The annual *Yalta European Strategy Summit (YES)* took place in Yalta at the Livadia Palace **on September 13-16 2012**. About 200 representatives of political and business circles from more than 20 countries from all over the world took part in it. The Summit is famous for bringing together the world's top opinion leaders, who present their visions of current and future trends that impact all spheres of society life.

Quite a few important theses and ideas were introduced within the framework of the Summit and most of these concerned the future of Ukraine. As usual the issue regarding the foreign policy orientation of Ukraine (European or Russian) arose on the agenda. Despite the tough requirements of Western European countries, their attitude towards Ukraine remains positive. The argument for this thesis was that Ukraine is an important strategic achievement for Europe, and the latter should not "turn away" from it. A striking instance of this could be the fact that Mr. Füle still came to Yalta. Nevertheless, he mentioned that this motion does not imply any improvement in relations with Kyiv.

Stefan Füle's observation that «*Ukraine needs Europe and Europe needs Ukraine*» can be considered the main quotation of the forum. However, unfortunately the YES Summit has not improved relations between the EU and Ukraine. The main problem of the Summit was that Ukraine and Western partners were talking but not listening to each other. The main point to consider within the framework of this forum is ***the consequences and results to which it will lead.***

**Firstly**, Ukraine has been brought to bay in relations with the EU. Although an official isolation of Ukraine has not been announced, it is already, in fact, isolated. The countries' EU representatives are imposing their requirements clearly and concretely: the issue of the upcoming elections being fair; settling Yulia Tymoshenko's problem; economic reforms, etc. But Ukraine does not take these demands into consideration.

**Secondly**, Ukraine has found itself in a deadlock in its relations with Russia. Even so, Ukraine's political elite still realizes the losses it will suffer if it becomes a part of Russia again. Incorrect comparisons between Ukraine and Russia were heard at the Summit. During the conversation like, dislike and other categories of personal relations were mentioned. Such pronouncements are proof that the Summit was informal.

**In conclusion**, Ukraine has found itself at a crossroads again. There are practically no improvements in any direction. In comparison to this year's summit speech, in 2011 there at least existed the desire of Ukraine to improve its situation. Thus, the last Summit turned out to be ineffective. During this meeting the representatives of Western European countries underlined the necessity, importance and topicality of the upcoming elections. Ukrainian representatives were in conformity with this too. Taking everything into account, Europe as well as Russia are waiting for changes in the Ukrainian establishment after the elections in October.

## UKRAINE – NATO



**KEY THEME ANALYSIS: *The lack of effective instruments of ensuring the national security of Ukraine under the conditions of non-aligned status, raises debate about NATO***

The last ten days of September were marked by two important events in Ukraine, in both cases relating to NATO. One of these was the international « NATO - Partners: new challenges for security» conference, which took place in Kyiv September 27-28, 2012. It was dedicated to identifying common interests between Ukraine and the North Atlantic Alliance, and also searching for fields where both sides can advantageously collaborate within the framework of cooperative security. More specifically these fields included: energy security, counteracting terrorism and the development of cybernetic defense strategies.

The participants of the conference were interested in Ukraine's approaches to ensuring energy security, and in what way can NATO assist in this domain and what contribution can it make in ensuring energy security of the European Community. The representatives of the NATO countries were more interested in counteracting terrorism. They were interested mostly in threats and risks of using dual-purpose materials or hardware used by terrorists while organizing cyber-attacks.

Having summarized the discussion, it has become obvious that along with realizing common problems, different awareness of topicality of national security threats remains, both by NATO and Ukraine representatives. Thus, the discussion showed that Ukraine will take part in NATO measures to counteract the global and regional challenges for international security, but its own national security problems remain beyond the limits of the Alliance's strategy.

The second event was the International Forum: «Non-aligned policy of Ukraine in the European context». It was held by the Institute of Global Politics, the Foreign Policy Research Institute and the embassy of Norway under the patronage of the Foreign Ministry of Ukraine, and drew a much wider reaction, since it was related to determining the role of non-aligned status in ensuring the national security of Ukraine. The biggest dissonance at the Forum was the opposition in the assessment opinions of the representatives of official power and the experts. While officials delivered exaggeratedly positive conclusions and declaratory announcements, not supported by any arguments, the experts based themselves upon the estimations and objective threatening tendencies in the national security issues of Ukraine. The experts came to the conclusion that the non-aligned status does not solve the problem of Ukraine's security. It is rather its delay for the future. It was no coincidence that this status was considered as transitive. According to the foreign minister K. Hryshenko's definition "It would be more reasonable to keep all the options open. This thesis should not be interpreted as making advances to the apologists of Ukraine's membership in NATO, but as a sound judgment of prospective changes

in the security situation in the area, which can require modifying the foreign policy of Ukraine in the medium- or long-term perspective".

Thus, delayed problems of security are related to three significant aspects of Ukraine's future: *firstly*, geopolitical and civilization choice of Ukraine; *secondly*, ensuring their own national security, which has a constant tendency to decrease and marginalisation; *thirdly*, determining the best model development of Ukrainian state organization, since the existing one results in degradation of the its political institutions.

The non-aligned status has not only failed to solve the first problem, it has conversely complicated the geopolitical stature of Ukraine, having fortified it in the state of a "buffer zone", throwing the country back into being outside European politics and intensifying claims made by Russia. Russia's logical reaction to the non-aligned status of Ukraine was signing the Croatian agreement with further prolongation of the Russian Black Sea Fleet on Ukrainian territory until 2042. Such an agreement intensified the vacuum of security and fortified the state of Ukraine as a buffer zone in the sphere of Russian influence.

What are the consequences of such a state? According to Kollings' definition, a geopolitical scholar, the countries which find themselves in a buffer zone sooner or later lose their sovereignty and territorial integrity. As a result, both the East and the West intend to seize or share geopolitical space of a middle country. Such geopolitics is proven by expert evaluations of the state of national security. The change of the national security has been for the worse since the moment Ukraine acquired the non-aligned status. Thus, according to evaluations, the threat of losing state sovereignty has increased from 35% to 75%; conversion of Ukraine into "buffer zone" from 62% to 76%; weakening of the capacity of military forces, responsible for ensuring the national security, from 68% to 83%.

The problem of determining the model of ensuring national security under conditions of the non-aligned status also remains unsolved. If we refuse the collective defense, we must develop our own individual defense. However, nothing is being done regarding this. On the contrary - we are selling everything, and are definitely killing the Military Forces. We are under certain threats, and must ensure the country's security - but instead we are thrust into a discussion about the correlation of diplomatic and force means to ensure security. Still, when guns fire diplomats are silent and nobody listens to them then.

It has been popular recently to refer to the experiences of neutral countries - Austria, Finland and Sweden. But Sweden, for example, spends \$6.3 billion on the defence, accounting for the population of 9 million people, which is five times less than that of Ukraine. At the same time it is fully integrated with Europe. For this reason, if we are going to copy Sweden's neutrality, let us spend on defence to the same extent. In accordance with the investments the neutral Swedes make in their national defence and security, Ukraine should have a defense budget of approximately \$32 billion – that is the price of a non-aligned status. For the present, the Verhovna Rada is passing a defence budget of approximately \$2 billion, which is 1% GDP. That is what real Ukrainian politics is made of.

Besides, as the State Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland, Pertti Torstila, pointed out: "Finland is not a neutral country anymore". It stopped being neutral after it had entered the European Union. The Swedes say practically the same thing. As a matter of fact, Sweden was one of the most popular countries at the forum: a number of speakers wished that Ukraine became as "non-aligned" in the collaboration with NATO as Sweden is "neutral" in the dialogue with the Alliance. The representatives of some Central-Eastern European countries confessed: Sweden is much more integrated with NATO activity than some members of the Alliance - for example Hungary or the Czech Republic.

Nowadays, certain politicians appeal to the declaration of 90s, which mentioned the neutrality of Ukraine. Recollecting the reality at that time, Ukraine had one of the largest military groupings - but chose the way of non-alignment, declaring its intention of becoming neutral. We

should understand the reason why it was done - because Ukraine was part of the USSR and this position was a condition of secession and prevention of becoming part of the USSR once more.

At the present moment, conditions and realities are totally different from those at the beginning of 90s. The neutrality which Ukraine intended to acquire in 1990 would be a good idea to set up on 2019 – because in that case we would have to demand the withdrawal of the Russian Black Sea Fleet from our territory. The authority was afraid of Russia and resorted to verbal tightrope walking, and made up the term "non-aligned status", which envisages no obligations, since such a status does not exist in international law. That is to say, the non-alignment was established to please Russia and to that effect, Ukraine was prevented from entry into NATO. Consequently, Ukraine found itself in a situation where having a non-aligned status forces it to create a new vision of the national security system and the strategy of its construction, and a program of developing the Military Forces and armaments. If Ukraine continues walking the same tightrope, it will confuse its partners as well as itself once and for all, and will only waste resources.

There are two ways out of this complicated situation with the state of national security of Ukraine, caused by its non-aligned status. **First** – Ukraine must fortify its non-aligned status by introducing a model its own defense, increasing the budget up to \$30 billion and introducing real common military conscription for all citizens. **Second** – a consensus of elites must be reached regarding Ukraine joining NATO.

## FOREIGN POLICY OF UKRAINE



### **KEY THEME ANALYSIS: Is it possible that the USA's constant warnings will turn into real sanctions against Ukraine?**

On the eve of parliamentary elections in Ukraine should show the state's alleged "democracy", and finally elucidate the questions of the essence of its internal regime. The international community's attention has been drawn for months to the foreign- and domestic political actions of Kyiv. Thus, even despite the tense atmosphere inside their own country, on the eve of the elections of the USA president, *September 22, 2012 (after the acceptance of the document by the Senate Committee of Foreign Affairs) the members of the Supreme Congressional House of the USA passed Resolution № 466, in which they urged for discharge of the former prime-minister of Ukraine Yulia Tymoshenko, and also to hold parliamentary elections «fairly and transparently in accordance with the standards of OSCE».*

According to the text of the document, «The Senate dispraises the actions of the administration of the President of Ukraine, Viktor Yanukovych, which are aimed at the politically motivated sentence of the former Premier Yulia Tymoshenko», and also urges to discharge her and other political prisoners immediately. For this reason, the Senate asks the State Department and the OSCE «to exert collective versatile diplomatic pressure on President Yanukovych». It is accentuated in the document that it «is an addition to the international analysis and protests concerning the infringements which are now happening in Ukraine».

According to American officials, the Resolution was being prepared «quite a long period of time, so it is no wonder that it has passed». In fact, apart from this Resolution by James Inhofe and Dick Durbin (registered in May 2012), there was a similar Resolution registered by republican senator Christopher Smith in July 2012 at the Senate, in which sanctions against Ukrainian officials who were involved in human rights violations were proposed. On the other hand, this document, that was conclusively approved by the Senate, was placed among the block of 11 other regulations in the USA parliament. Consequently, it was possible to avoid excessive harshness of the Resolution text, from which some issues were removed, namely ones about introducing sanctions against Ukrainian leadership, in particular President Viktor Yanukovych, an appeal to OSCE to refuse Ukraine chairmanship in the organization in 2013, an appeal to the Department of State to recall the ambassador in Kyiv, and also an appeal to refuse Viktor Yanukovych and the Chief Prosecutor of Ukraine Viktor Pshonka visas.

However, the document is by no means merely declaratory. It just belongs to the category of so called «simple resolutions», which each Congressional House (the Senate and the House of Representatives) can decree separately, and that is why it does not require neither the approval of another House, nor the signature of the President. Thus, this document does not have the power of the law. Moreover, on the eve of its passing, Yulia Tymoshenko's appeal to parliaments and leaders of state reached the US Senate, in which the ex-Premier urged the international community to intervene in the situation in Ukraine. So, in spite of all the nuances, the document is a signal for the Ukrainian government, because it does not only reveal to



everyone the official position of the USA concerning the situation in Ukraine, but also urges the latter to take decisive measures.

However, the Head of Ukrainian State, declared the importance of having a serious attitude to such documents, and accentuated that the «outcome» of this situation will be known only after the parliamentary elections in 2012. He is convinced that relations with many countries of the European Union and the USA will be re-established October 28, because Ukraine will pass another maturity test - implying that no complaints will be made concerning adherence to democratic standards. However, ***two scenarios are possible regarding October 28.***

***The first*** – democratic forces will win the parliamentary elections and will form the majority in the Parliament. It will mean that a policy for the European and Euro-Atlantic integration will be re-established, and the «democratic thaw» will come. At the same time the confrontation between the democratic majority in the Parliament and the President will be quite real.

***The second*** – the election will take place with massive falsifications that will inevitably lead to massive protests by the citizens, which the government might employ force to suppress. In other words, the «Belorussian scenario» will be put into practice in Ukraine. At present this scenario is seems increasingly real.

Passing the Resolution turned out to be in many aspects concordant with quite a concrete in form but very tough in content statement made on September 21 by the President of Poland, after the end of negotiations with Viktor Yanukovych in Ukraine's capital. In Bronislav Komorovsky's statement he pointed out that though the case of Yulia Tymoshenko is in-house, it is a significant obstacle in the way of Ukraine's drawing together with the countries of the European Union, and also can prevent it from signing the Association Treaty.

Angela Merkel, the Federal Chancellor of Germany, made a similar observation on May 10, 2012, where she directly stated that a dictatorship had been established in Ukraine, and its people were suffering from repression and a lack of freedom. The conclusion can be made that the present Resolution of the Senate is definitely not just a simple expression of «support» of the Ukrainian opposition on the side of its foreign adherents. In fact, not only are common power and trade relations with the USA “aimed at”: at present even the collaboration of Ukraine with the member states of NATO, and the entire foreign policy of our state is under threat. Thus, at the moment domestic leadership is clearly forced to understand that the popularized «multilateralism» of the foreign policy should draw Kyiv nearer toward either the West or toward the Russian Federation once and for all.

*So if the Resolution of the US Congress will result in the resolution of the State Department, American warnings can immediately turn into real sanctions not only against the separate representatives of the Ukrainian elite, but also against the state of Ukraine as a political player and partner in the international arena.*