

## **Report on the Project:**

# ***Dimensions, Opportunities and Benefits of Ukraine - NATO Relations. Impact of NATO Enlargement on Ukraine's Foreign Policy Process***

NATO - EAPC Research Fellowship Programme, 1999 – 2001

By Dr. **Sergiy Tolstov**,  
Supervisory Research Fellow,  
Institute of World Economy and International Relations,  
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, and  
Director of the Institute for Political Analysis  
and International Studies

**28 June 2001,  
Kyiv (Ukraine)**

**Conents:****1. Introduction****2. Dimensions of European and Euro-Atlantic Security Cooperation (concepts and scenarios)****2.1. The New World Order****2.2. Strategic Approaches and Perceptions****2.3. Towards the New European Security Architecture****3. The Internal Factors and Features of Ukraine's Development in the Context of European Transformation Processes****3.1. General Trends****3.2. Constitutional Referendum 2000 and Political Opposition****3.3. The Tapegate Affair****3.4. Situation in the System of Power****4. Monitoring of Domestic Debates on Foreign Policy Matters.****4.1. The Foreign Policy Concept****4.2. Peculiarities of the National Foreign Policy Process****4.3. Parliamentary Debates and the 1999 Presidential Elections****4.4. Security Issues in the Domestic Political Discussion****5. Impact of Ukraine - NATO Cooperation on Ukraine's Foreign Policy.****5.1. Developing Ukraine – NATO Partnership****5.2. Ukraine's Security Prospects in the Context of NATO Enlargement****5.3. State Programme for Cooperation of Ukraine with NATO, 1998 - 2001****5.4. State Programme for Cooperation of Ukraine with NATO, 2001-2004****6. Tendencies of International Relations in Central Eastern Europe****6.1. Results of Transformations in the Central Eastern Europe and the Post-Soviet Space****6.2. International Security outlooks in the Subregion of Central Eastern Europe****6.3. Ukrainian-Russian Relations in the Context of NATO Enlargement****6.4. The Black Sea Subregional Dimension****7. Conclusion**

## 1. Introduction

From 1994 till 1999, the problem of NATO enlargement being a question of general discussion transformed into the working plan of actions. There is no doubt that the process of NATO (and the WEU) extension represented the main trend of evolution in the Central Eastern European (CEE) regional security relations. Cooperation has become an imperative for all countries in the CEE subregion.

At this stage the main benefits (as well as subsequent expenses) in the form of stabilising their security positions were enjoyed by the three CEE states admitted as full NATO members in 1999. The first post-Cold War phase of NATO extension did not seriously influence bilateral and multilateral relations of the CEE countries: its impact was less obvious in relations of the CEE states with Turkey but had a more evident influence on the situation in the Balkans and mostly affected relations between NATO and Russia, including redefinition of Russia's Foreign Policy Concept and Military Doctrine.

It is still hardly possible to consider changes in Ukrainian-Russian relations as a direct consequence of NATO enlargement. This aspect, however, was clearly present in the pretext of political and economic interests of Russia's executive authorities.

As far as Ukraine is concerned, its intermediary position between NATO-integrated Central Europe and Russia dictates maximum precautions in determination of its geopolitical orientations and options. Considering specific conditions of Ukraine, unilateral declarations of a clear pro-Western orientation made without sufficient preparations and lack of consent for its joining NATO on behalf of Western communities would have looked like a venture, which might cause excess material losses. On the other hand, the necessity for more accurate coordination of efforts between Ukraine and NATO as well as between Ukraine and its particular Central European neighbours will become more and more acute.

During 1990s', the transformation processes in Central Eastern Europe were developing under the direct impact of the increasing roles of NATO and the EU. Such events as NATO enlargement, implementation of PfP, and emergence of the EAPC created favourable preconditions for the establishment of a new European security system on the basis of the existing Euro-Atlantic international security institutions.

However, two lines are more and more distinctively traced and, consequently, two interrelated institutional components are legibly visible in the process of forming the new European security architecture:

### **1. NATO/EAPC/PfP;**

### **2. NATO/EU/WEU/ERRF**

Expansion of multidimensional impact on all spheres of political and social life and extending responsibility of these two interaction trends in the Central Eastern Europe determines to a considerable extent the political background against which foreign policy efforts of particular states including Ukraine are shaped and implemented.

Contemporary situation as well as the main trends in European and transatlantic security relations proves the importance of development of strong cooperative relations between Ukraine and NATO, as well as their usefulness and significance for general European security and stability. Taking into account an unexpected development of processes in Russia, the factor of Ukraine-NATO relations took on special significance for Central Eastern Europe ensuring irreversibility of the processes that dominated in the 1990s'.

Development of security and defence initiatives within the EU, including the ESDI, CFSP and the creation of Common Rapid Reaction Force, became a new component of European security as a whole.

These developments posed some orientation problems for the Ukrainian political elite, and in particular, for the Kyiv's foreign policy community. It caused some non-emphatic polemics concerning NATO's role in future Ukraine's prospects of involvement into the European integration processes. The main dilemma for Ukraine's decision-making and related circles was, in what extent its advanced cooperation or even future membership in NATO should support its joining the EU, or otherwise Ukraine-NATO relations will have its own particular significance not dependent on the new EU's increasing role in European and Euro-Atlantic security relations. At the same time it was still unclear if Ukraine has prospects for the EU membership in the foreseeable future.

The experience of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland supports the argument that their joining NATO was a successful step that increased their perspectives for the EU membership. It is likely that NATO enlargement will go much ahead the enlargement of the EU. Insofar, to an effective date of joining the EU many of the Central Eastern European states will already be NATO members [1].

Without doubt, it will influence the redistribution of functions, roles and responsibility between NATO and the EU in the so-called European security architecture.

Ukraine's position in this context looks rather specific. Primarily, by signing the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership with NATO in July 1997 Ukraine established the highest ever possible level of cooperation with the North-Atlantic Alliance within the framework of Ukraine's actually 'non-bloc' or military non-aligned status. Secondly, since Ukraine was officially not considered as a candidate in the first or the imagined second wave of entry into NATO, it seemed reasonable to evaluate what benefits and what losses the processes of NATO/EAPC/PfP and EU/WEU eastward extension would bring the country.

On the other hand, such aspect as an increasing lag behind its western neighbours in integration to the Euro-Atlantic and European institutions does not correspond with the Ukrainian interests. It definitely means substantial reduction of its chances for successful economic and social development within the context of globalisation processes. Thus, the main task while determining Ukraine's attitude towards changing CEE political, economic and security landscape should be formulated as ensuring and strengthening of its European connection.

In Ukrainian political life the issues related to the international status and the future cooperation with the West were interpreted in a specific way. Beginning in 1995, first in subtexts and later more openly, the Presidential Administration proclaimed Ukraine's "comprehensive future integration" into "European and Euro-Atlantic structures." In 1998-99 the executive branch practically demanded from the EU, in vain, that Ukraine be granted "associate membership", although representatives of the Ukrainian power elite were fully aware of the nation's objective variance from the criteria for integration into Europe. Moreover, the deepening of the economic crisis in Ukraine in 1998 and 1999 increased Ukraine's economic lag behind the countries of Central Europe, which were officially recognised as candidates for EU membership. Ukraine's stance with regard to the processes of NATO and EU expansion primarily is a problem of defining the major guidelines, direction and pace of its internal economic and political evolution. Complete involvement in European and Euro-Atlantic integration processes can be regarded as identical with accession to the community of developed democracies, which have set up a system maintaining economic stability and high living standards. Insisting on Ukraine's future integration into Europe without

adequate measures of bringing its own economic, social and political conditions up to the European standards only would result in disorienting society and foreign partners.

The problem of Ukraine's integration into European and Euro-Atlantic structures is connected first of all with its overall development prospects (and indirectly reflects the attitude of representatives of various political and social groups toward the problem). Within this context, Ukraine's prospects for NATO membership had all the hallmarks of "deferred demand" since even those politicians who in principle supported the idea of Ukraine's membership of the alliance shared the opinion that the country's accession to the Alliance in the immediate future was in practice not feasible.

Given the critical state of Ukraine's economy, one can conclude that the gap between the proclaimed strategic foreign policy goals and objective trends in the country's development is widening. This can be interpreted as a real sign of a crisis in the orientation of foreign policy. The foreign policy objectives proclaimed by Ukraine's are unattainable as a result of Ukraine's lagging behind Central Eastern Europe in its pace and level of development. In turn, this gap might mean that Ukraine could lose its historic chance for full-fledged integration into European and Euro-Atlantic communities. There are some grounds for maintaining that for a portion of Ukrainian bureaucracy the proclaimed European (Euro-Atlantic) orientation is of a politically conditioned character, i. e. it can be reviewed should relationships with European institutions not develop in a satisfactory way.

The major lesson of the 1990s to be drawn is that most of the countries of Central Eastern Europe have secured from the ruin of the bipolar world the opportunity to join the community of advanced democracies, while Ukraine has lost its chance to bridge, together with these countries, the gap separating it from Western Europe and conditioned by the historical realities of the twentieth century. If Ukraine's economic depression continues, it may be threatened with irreversible consequences in the form of de-industrialisation and backsliding into the group of underdeveloped countries. After Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary acceded to NATO in 1999, Ukraine's lag behind the countries of Central Eastern Europe became even more evident. But most negative consequences for Ukraine's prospects for European integration could come after its western neighbours join the EU.

Also, expansion of the EU and establishment of the common zone of the EU and countries of the Central European Free Trade Area (CEFTA) could occur without Ukraine's participation. In this sense the prospective expansion of the European Union after 2003/2004 may have a clearly negative effect on Ukraine. If at the initial stage of the EU expansion this process had an almost identical purport both for Central Eastern European states and Ukraine. In the future most states of CEE subregion will join the inner circle of European and Euro-Atlantic integration (that is, for them interrelation of the processes of expansion of NATO and the EU/WEU will remain unchanged), while Ukraine will be associated with these processes only in an asymmetrical fashion through its distinctive partnership with NATO and Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with the EU. In practice, this could imply Ukraine's *de facto* severance from the group of CEE states.

The factors which impede Ukraine's economic growth will hinder its integration in Euro-Atlantic structures. It is precisely the internal socio-economic situation that separates Ukraine from more successful CEE states, which have already solved or will in the nearest future solve the problem of full-scale participation in the new system of European political, economic and security cooperation. At the same time, it is still not expedient to discard Ukraine's capability of developing along the lines of rapid transformation parallel to its intensified inclusion into the European and Euro-Atlantic integration processes.

After the forthcoming phases of the EU enlargement are completed the most part of Europe will be economically and politically associated with the European Union. Specific

position will be possessed by the Balkans, the zone of Eastern Europe (Ukraine, Moldova, Russia and Belarus) and the Black Sea subregion (including the Caucasus). It seems that Ukraine's abilities to develop practical cooperation and integration with the European and Euro-Atlantic institutions will be closely connected with the project of Caspian oil transit via Georgia, Ukraine and Poland, as well as with the further development of strategic partnership relations with Poland.

Among the states of the former Soviet sphere of influence there are three countries which possess a specific position within their typical groups. These countries are Slovakia in the Central European group, Croatia in the Balkans, and Ukraine in the Eastern Europe. Their successful development in the context of European and Euro-Atlantic integration is determined by particular efforts of national governments and practical abilities to escalate internal transformations and economic development.

This notion makes it even more urgent to develop a working model of Ukraine's relations with the CEE states, which are recognised as prospective candidates for the EU membership.

The contemporary position of Ukraine presumes expediency to increase practical interlink, cooperation, and possibly foreign policy coordination with the new NATO members and applicants which are closest Ukraine's western neighbours (i.e. Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Bulgaria and Romania). It may also at least indirectly lessen negative impacts of the expected EU and NATO enlargement on Ukraine's relations with Russia and Belarus (both separately and as parts of a bilateral inter-state union).

The main hypothesis of this research project lies in the following notions:

As a result of a particular confluence of internal and external factors Ukraine has lost an opportunity to enter the European and Euro-Atlantic structures simultaneously and on the common basis with the Central European states.

At the current stage of Ukraine's political development the decision-making process on both domestic and foreign policy matters is strictly determined by relations and attitudes within a narrow circle of bureaucratic and political elite. It is inevitable that the main directions of development of the country will be corrected and specified within a certain transitional period. During this term several external factors such as Ukraine's participation in the Euro-Atlantic cooperation can play the most important positive role.

In this respect the author put forward a task to define those factors and dimensions, which can play the greatest positive or negative roles concerning Ukraine's integration with the European and Euro-Atlantic institutions and influence on the domestic situation and political processes in the country. Under present circumstances the factor of cooperation with NATO can play a very important role. Continuation of such cooperation despite the unwillingness of some executive power institutions and high state officials to implement democratic standards sooner or later will intensify internal changes and substantially assist democratic processes in Ukraine. That will give adequate opportunities to accelerate its integration into the Euro-Atlantic community, which will be a step towards Ukraine's fullest participation in the European and Euro-Atlantic integration processes and increase its chances to achieve a higher status within the scope of programmes leading to the extension of presence and participation in the European integration processes.

## **2. Dimensions of European and Euro-Atlantic Security Cooperation (concepts and scenarios)**

## 2.1. The New World Order

The period of the 1990s was marked by the prompt development of multi-dimensional processes of the so-called globalisation, which have found an embodiment at least in three basic directions:

- Economic globalisation, which was based on liberalisation and accelerated internationalisation of the terms of trade, movement of capitals, prompt growth of international communication and financial market transactions;
- Expansion and functional redistribution of roles of intergovernmental institutions, created by the advanced industrialised democracies (first of all, the Council of Europe, NATO and EU / WEU);
- Democratic globalisation, including the spreading of politically determined norms of international law, distribution of the standards of political democracy and responsible government administration.

These factors more and more convincingly directed vectors of the global developments, concerning which the particular changes at the regional and national levels had a character of partial and not always mirror-like projections. It may be fully applied to the Balkan crisis of 1999, which has become the loudest event of the European politics in the 1990s.

Sometimes it was suggested that the Balkan crisis of 1999 had broken down the evolutionary way of development of European and to a lesser degree, Euro-Atlantic model of security relations. It is likely that such considerations were mostly influenced by purely psychological perception of events. But they look erroneous or at least not fully adequate in the terms of political analysis.

Recent attempts of many Russian and Serbian politicians to consider the European relations of the 1990s as a spontaneous imbalance system, which eventually arose on the ruins of the bipolar confrontational model and should serve as its successor in the forthcoming power competition of the most principal parties cause serious doubts.

Concerning the definition of the current international order (as a category, which defines the basic and most principal characteristics of the existing international system), there are three various approaches. Taking into account a definite simplification, they vary in the attitude towards the role of the US evident and unprecedented leadership, and the probability of further modifications within the system of international relations. For the contemporary American political thought as well as for the US governmental policy the new international order is more or less considered as a constant and basic factor, as the existing alignment of forces makes its revision practically unrealistic.

From Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski's point of view, the new world order has a wholly determined nature and, within at least 25-30 years, will be based on US "unprecedented global hegemony". According to Brzezinski, the establishment of this new order was a global expansion of the system, which was in a large scale created by the US efforts during the Cold War period for the sake of deterrence of the Soviet Union [1]. Thus, the basis of a new international system is constituted by the US/NATO global responsibility. In the terms of Brzezinski's geopolitical outlook, the assumption that post-bipolar international relations in Europe could have any prospect of 'natural' or spontaneous evolution, which could suit all participants of these relations, or at least the actors of a state level, seem doubtful. Nevertheless, in many details this concept reflected the notions and spirit of political realism and the concept of a balance of forces. In this aspect it is some conscious simplification with regard to complex and multidimensional Euro-Atlantic relations [2].

The overall political opinion of Western and Central Europe is characterised by ideas that the formation of a new international order has not yet finished and allows corrections in interaction between basic international institutions. Primarily it concerns competence and responsibility of the European and Euro-Atlantic multilateral structures. However, it is considered that international relations outside the borders of the Euro-Atlantic zone may be also due to further changes.

If the new international system could be nothing else but a projection of continuous domination of western communities in the post-bipolar world, then what do the factors, which predetermine a different modality of the scripts of construction of a new system or "architecture" of relations, consist in? In particular, in Western Europe the concept of construction of a post-bipolar security system on the basis "of pluralistic interaction" of the basic international institutes has wide circulation. The existing forms of such institutions, however, are mostly considered as original voluntary "coalitions of participating states, which jointly desire to settle problems arising in Europe, to prevent appearance of threats and to eradicate their reasons" (2). It is clear, that such approach provides a significant space for conscious perfecting of relations and ties, first of all, within the European system, as against the more rigid pattern offered by Zbigniew Brzezinski [3].

Unlike Western Europe and the US, in the political thought of Russia, China and some developing countries the submissions prevail, that the present international order may appear and continue only as a provisional and unstable phenomenon at the stage of transition from an eventual, casual unipolarity towards polycentrism. Thus, "multi-polarity" was often considered as direct and desirable alternative to globalisation [4].

Different understanding of the nature of the new international system concerning the ratio of regulative (caused by conscious strong-willed efforts) and anarchist pulses in it is also traced. It is necessary to mention that for many analysts, first of all in Russia, the post-bipolar European system was a prologue to a more natural and balanced polycentric system (4). This conceptual notion was followed by a mistaken treatment of NATO's military interference in the Balkan affairs as an action, which interrupted "natural" evolutionary and extensive processes [5].

The streamline of Russian public reaction to NATO's military operation against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1999 was an emotional expression of one political commentator: "The world has changed after the Kosovo!" It is not surprising, that almost in full accordance with the geostrategic forecasts of Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel Huntington, Russia's foreign policy comes more and more close to practical coordination of positions on principal international issues with China (5). Reflections of this tendency may be found in the signing of the Russian-Chinese declaration (1997) and creation of a five-lateral Shanghai forum (2000) which includes the Russian Federation, the Peoples Republic of China and a number of post-Soviet republics in Central Asia [6].

If, taking into account the experience of the last decade, we allocate the main systemic sign of mutual relations between the states in the Euro-Atlantic area, it can be defined as branched asymmetric dependence (and considerably by smaller measure - interdependence) of the periphery countries from the institutional nucleus, which is organised and integrated in different directions. There is a basis to confirm that this tendency will be hardly weakened in a foreseeable prospect. Though the systemic causal relationships both inside the nucleus and in the sphere of relations between the nucleus and the periphery can be exposed to a definite correction. In this sense the concept of globalisation of democracy (i.e. the export of democracy and stability) has a clearly expressed external direction, because the relations inside the Euro-Atlantic community (the so-called "democratic unipolarity") are already recognised for those, which are based on the principles of conscious and constructive self-regulation. From this point of view, the conditions of contemporary Europe exclude a

possibility which may open room for the emergency of a chaos or a vacuum of force, because the overwhelming majority of the European countries have made a conscious choice in the form of joining the Euro-Atlantic intergovernmental institutions, integration communities and security structures. In the European space, the Euro-Atlantic community borders on the two peripheral subregions - the post-conflict and still unquiet Balkans, and with the depressed and actually still unstable Eastern Europe. The majority of countries of this new periphery (except for the Russian Federation), are not capable to play significant or independent role in international and security relations.

It is also expedient to emphasise that during the 1990s political and economic transformation processes in the post-Communist countries indirectly assisted the consolidation within the Euro-Atlantic community. The changes, which were traced at a "micro-level", reflected adaptation of the international system as a whole as well as its particular components and participants to the new pattern of relations developed after the global crisis of the previous international system in 1989 - 1991.

At the same time, the impact of political and diplomatic factors dominated in international relations of the last decade. These factors in a large scale preserved a traditional relative autonomy concerning the socio-economic processes. It is possible to consider these factors both as a display of an evolutionary tendency and a usual symptom of the "anarchical" nature of multidimensional international dialogue. In a number of cases their action at least partially can explain the slowed down character of institutional changes in the widened scene of all-European relations, which with a definite delay and not always consistently embodied the new qualitative features emerging in international relations after the destruction of a bipolar world model.

## 2.2. Strategic Approaches and Perceptions

International transformations of the 1990s were followed by discussion of different ideas, theories and conceptual approaches concerning the development of security system in Europe and Euro-Atlantic region.

According to the latest US transatlantic security concept of December 2000, the success of strengthening transatlantic security will depend in large measure on the approach of the US relations with NATO Allies and Partners. At the same time, NATO's unity ultimately rests on the enlightened self-interest of each participating nation, but sovereign and democratic states do not necessarily have identical interests in every security domain. The United States, which has contributed far more resources and capabilities to NATO than any other single Ally, cannot be expected to act as if the differences between the NATO member states did not exist and did not influence their policies. The concept contains recognition, that "the Alliance has proved so strong precisely because its members have not allowed their differences ever to rival, in scope or in depth, their shared interests". A second explanation is less self-evident: in far too many instances, the *substance* of our transatlantic cooperation is overshadowed or even impeded by differences in *tone*.

It was also taken into account, that "for many Europeans, who in recent years have made important commitments on the ground to crisis response operations in the Balkans and have every reason to be proud of their strong, expanding economic and political links (as well as their rich cultures), "American leadership" has come to be understood, at best, as a somewhat outdated notion from the Cold War era or, at worst, a grating expression of a "dominating" or "overbearing" superpower [7].

The December 2000 conceptual doctrine contained the vision of the future security relations, based on the US decisive role in the foreseeable future. It considered that "if

America does not demonstrate the political will and devote the resources necessary to sustain” joint common efforts in the international security sphere, “it will be harder for Allies and Partners to do so.” It was considered that the watchwords of transatlantic security relations must remain “inclusion” and “cooperation,” not “competition” or “confrontation.” Historically, there have been very few instances when the United States has been at odds with Europe *as a whole* over a significant security policy issue. More often, the US have disagreed with certain Allies or Partners over aspects of a particular policy and received either full or qualified support from others. In short, there are no grounds for portraying US - European relations as an “**us against them**” dynamic.

As NATO and the EU enlarge, their internal decision-making processes will become more complex and possibly slower. While this should not be a problem in normal circumstances, it cannot be allowed to lead to paralysis in a crisis [8].

The US strategy was more or less based on the criteria of recognition America’s unique political, economic, and military strengths will continue to ensure a preponderant role for our country within the transatlantic community. At the same time, the establishment of the ERRF brought to a conclusion on the possible sharing of responsibility and leadership. It was underlined, that “the US seek to encourage greater leadership by Allies in areas — such as improvements in defence capabilities, outreach to Partners, and support for democratic values beyond the transatlantic community—that reinforce common transatlantic security” [9].

The transatlantic security concept of the Clinton’s Administration concluded, that in the 21st century, America can best achieve its long-term goals by doing more of what it does so well: acting resolutely—and always in a spirit of true partnership—as a catalyst, builder, symbol and defender of an ever-growing coalition of democratic, prosperous, and secure Euro-Atlantic states and peoples [10].

The George Bush-junior Administration reaffirmed its intent to work with all NATO Allies — and, where appropriate, Partners — to ensure that they have the fullest access to the means necessary to participate in transatlantic security deliberations and to take effective and timely collective action.

Before the US – EU Summit Meeting in Goteborg on 14 – 15 June 2001 the international security strategy of the current US Republican Administration was not yet clearly developed. Since then, the U.S.-European relationship were recognised as important both for Europe and the US, and although that the real problems in these relationship will remain.

The new US approach was based on some principal conclusions. First, that the previous decade have seen fundamental change in the nature of the US–European relationship as a result of the Soviet Union no longer representing the unifying threat to the United States and Europe. As a result of the profound transformation of Europe and of the European Union in particular from what was a collection of independent nation-states to increasingly becoming an international political actor in its own right, with increasing political weight and foreign policy. Second, that these fundamental changes have led to differences on the priority that the US and the EU have in terms of regional issues, the issue agenda that the two sides of the Atlantic have in their foreign engagements, and the approach that they take to foreign engagement. On the priorities, for Europe, for the remainder of this decade, the number one issue for every European government, foreign ministry, interior and justice ministry, is Europe. It is the consolidation of the EU and its enlargement. Therefore this is going to be the focus of its attention, not the US-European relationship. “It is possible that for the US, Europe is not going to be the regional priority. The regional priority is Asia from a security perspective, and it is the Western Hemisphere from a democratic and economic perspective, for the consolidation of democracy in this hemisphere is a top priority in

particular of this administration, but also, I think, of an American foreign policy more generally" [11].

Several experts expected further reprioritisation of the US foreign policy from Europe towards Asia. These changes resulted from the fact that Europe became more secure, peaceful and democratic. This change of priorities was followed by a decision of the Goteborg Summit to increase the European connection of Russia and Ukraine. Otherwise the EU will play a more principal role in the European area.

At the same time, the fact is that the US remains the most influential power in the contemporary world, and that the EU enlargement process will definitely not complete in this decade. Some particular corrections seem inevitable, but they will mostly affect subregional and less important dimensions of international relations. Ukraine's international security interests are mostly focussed at several neighbouring subregions of the wider transatlantic zone. They are the Eastern Europe as a whole space, which covers the European territory of the former Soviet Union, the area of Central Eastern Europe, which means the territory of a number of post-Communist countries between Germany and Russia including Ukraine. Other subregional dimensions which seem strategic priority to Ukraine are the Black Sea and Caucasus/Caspian Sea area, the South Eastern Europe and the Baltic Sea area. Ukraine's executive authority including the Ministry of Foreign Affairs applied considerable efforts intended to obtain direct participation or presence in the institutions and international organisations acting in the neighbouring areas [12].

Ukraine's presence in the Central Eastern European relations is guaranteed by the direct membership in the Central European Initiative (since 1996). In the Baltic area Ukraine has a status of observer in the Cooperation Council of the Baltic Sea Countries. The processes in Black Sea area, however, pose the mostly concerned matter of subregional security outlooks of Ukrainian Executive Branch. The countries of the area participate in several multilateral mechanisms, such as the Organisation of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (institutionalised in 1998) and several defence and security initiatives, including the NATO's Southeastern Europe Initiative (SEEI), the Southeastern Europe Defence Ministerial (SEDM) [13].

Another important dimension of Ukraine's subregional policy is the emergency and formation of the GUUAM contact group. In June 2001 the summit meeting of the presidents of Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Moldova and Azerbaijan approved a long-expected decision on the institutionalisation of this informal consultative mechanism into an international organisation.

The presence of NATO and involvement of its leading members in subregional security cooperation mechanisms seem most intensive in the Baltic Sea area. In this connection, Olav F. Knudsen suggested that the most important external players in the Baltic Sea region were the US and the EU, within which Germany's central role should not be overlooked [14].

In the 1990s the US global position often made 'counterbalancing' and 'extended deterrence' concepts of practical diplomatic relevance. The concepts refer to possible responses by a remote great power in favour of a threatened state. In this context, counterbalancing may be defined as any move by the remote great power to support the threatened state, from the most innocuous verbal declarations up to and including military measures. Extended deterrence is a specific type of counterbalancing, and refers to the use of explicit threats and military posturing on behalf of the threatened state, such as US policy in defence of Berlin during the Cold War. Counterbalancing is usually perceived as the problem posed by the Baltic states for United States policy. The research findings cited on extended deterrence are mixed and seem not to be easily translatable into policy practice.

The United States has been a mainstay of politico-diplomatic support for the Baltic states ever since the Cold War, and continues to play this role. Nevertheless, it has long been evident that the US government sets limits as to how far it is willing to go in support of the security of the Baltic states. NATO membership has been deferred. The Baltic Charter has been agreed between the three Baltic states and the United States as a substitute, but this is a political document which does not involve a security guarantee, only the possibility of consultation in crises. This equivocating combination of US support and US reserve has been visible since the George Bush-senior administration. A more active phase in US Baltic policy stance was signalled in 1996. Behind the scenes, the US government applied some pressure on the Nordic states to assume more responsibility for the three Baltic republics. To express the new logic, the US State Department renamed its Nordic Desk the 'Nordic-Baltic' Desk. But the Nordic countries have not, either individually or collectively, been willing even to consider security guarantees for Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The debate between the United States and the Nordics has, moreover, been cluttered by misunderstandings, in particular as the United States apparently has not asked the Nordic countries to offer security guarantees to the Baltics, but merely to strengthen their efforts to integrate Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania into the pattern of regional security cooperation.

In late 1997, the US State Department redoubled its efforts on the northern front by launching what it called the 'Nordic Initiative', to accelerate the integration of the Baltic states in the West, strengthen North European cooperation with north-west Russia, and reinforce the ties between the United States and the Nordic countries so as to enable them to play a more sustained part in international relations around the Baltic Sea. The Baltic Charter was developed as part of this new US policy profile.

In this connection, neither Germany, as a Baltic Sea state, nor any other EU great power, has defined its own or common EU interests in the area sufficiently clearly to mark out a European political agenda for the future of the region [15].

No forms of security cooperation similar to the US–Baltics or Nordic–Baltics communicative mechanisms exist in the Black Sea area. It is expedient to conclude that the attention to this subregion will increase after the 2002 decision on the NATO enlargement and will in a large scale depend on what candidates will receive subsequent invitations for membership. For several particular reasons, the Baltic dimension of the further stage of NATO enlargement would more comply with the security interests of Ukraine.

### **2.3. Towards the New European Security Architecture**

Despite loud rhetoric in the press, the crash of bipolar international system was followed by devaluation of theoretical theses of the political realist school, which insisted on the priority of mostly elementary materialistic factors in the formation of international system. That can be considered as a serious attempt to overcome the archaic (rigid?) geopolitical thinking in international relations theory dominated in the 20th century. However, it does not mean full victory of "idealistic" (Idealpolitik) theories. According to some competent American analysts, the (neo)liberal doctrine of "enlargement", which was proclaimed by the second William Clinton Administration, combined both elements - pragmatic realism and idealism - under some priority of modern realist school ideas and geoeconomics approaches. Hints of neo-Wilsonian idealism always remained at a "close second place" and were primarily referred to political interpretations and technologies rather than the essence of the policy course [16].

On the other hand, the polemics between "realism" and "idealism" in the international relations theory as a sphere of political science, have in some sense another nature, than in

philosophy. Idealism in the international relations theory means an acknowledgement of constructive intervention of ideas as a factor of multilateral international communication processes. According to the Yale University Prof. Alexander Wendt, an idealistic social theory “does not cause idealism in international relations.” It is not a normative view on “what the world has to be”. In this regard, an idealistic theory “is a scientific view on what the world really is”, and aims to be as realistic as materialism is itself [17].

In the other words, idealism in international relations disclaims absolute domination of anarchy in the inter-state interaction. However, it stands on the recognition of ideal causality of these international processes (in the sense that political process at least partially can be considered a process of materialisation of ideas). Such approach explains how the factors of informal or hidden influence in international relations provide impact on the way of events. The effectiveness of such influence directly relies upon conscious efforts aimed at achieving approval of suitable decisions on the nation-state level and creates a combination of international factors capable to turn the situation in a desirable direction.

The period of 1990s is marked by diffusion of neo-liberal and liberal internationalism conceptions, cosmopolitan by aspiration, which entailed further revision of the state functions and role, as well as the factors of motivation in international relations. According to deductions of Prof. Peter Govan (University of North London), during the 1990s adherents of ‘global liberalisation’ have developed argumentation in the sense of utilising the resources of “liberal-democratic heartland” to achieve several global aims, including:

- Guaranteeing the survival of peaceful population in zones of military conflicts using humanitarian interventions;
- Human rights protection in the countries where people suffer from repression and exposed to genocide;
- Application of international police functions to governments that make crimes against humanity and military crimes;
- Intervention in cases of destruction of state formations to establish temporal international protectorates aimed at encouraging the population to perceive the liberal values and self-government.

Peter Govan mentioned that the realisation methods of these aims are not systematised. They do not regulate clearly the use of some methods and provide for application of UNO where possible, USA potential where necessary, peaceful political pressure if effective and also full economic blockade, air war or ground intervention if there is no other solution [18].

Vagueness of the reacting methods on different challenges and threats is accounted by the fact that on the European and Euro-Atlantic level simultaneous actions of different system factors is traced. To them belong:

- Asymmetric bilateral relations between system participants and states outside its boundaries including traditional allied and renewed partner connections.
- International, supra-national and created with their participation institutions and suitable institutional relations of various aspiration, that have different diffusion degrees and functional loading;
- The multidimensional functional regime of multilateral relations, voluntary or forcible (including imposition of sanctions), built on the principles of being:

- obligatory only for immediate participants of a special international agreement;
  - obligatory for all members of multilateral institutions;
  - obligatory for all countries irrespective of whether they are participants of an internationally-legal agreement or not. Regimes of such type can be established under the maintenance of an internationally-legal agreement by the majority of states of the world or a region, or in case of imposing by the minority of the most influential and powerful countries of the world (for example, by "G 7") or a region its will to the rest, that is to the actual majority of states;
  - obligatory only for the states disposed in separate regions (subregions) or bound by some sphere of action.
- Relations built on the traditional principles of power-balance regulation, arms control, regional power balance and mutual deterrence.

Such relations generated the regime of control over conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe built on 1990 CFE Treaty and 1999 CFE Adaptation Treaty.

Factors of strategic parity and force balance was in full measure incarnated in START-1 and START-2 agreements. It is possible that the criteria of parity and proportional reduction of strategic nuclear arms will prevail in the planned START-3 agreement as well.

Analysing the structure of the present European system of international relations we can pick out several most important components:

1. The relations within the EU are based on the principles of neo-institutionalism and integral federalism. These relations are marked by formal preservation by participants of functionally brief nation-state status, redistribution of functions and authorities of the existing institutions and by dynamic development of supra-national integration mechanisms (including diversification of integration).
2. The formation and perfection, within the frames of continuous process, of the common political-legal principles and norms is going on. They regulate the general rules on intergovernmental and supra-national levels and are the frames for new regimes of relations within the 'narrow' European (Council of Europe, OSCE, EAPC), extended European (EU/ERRF, European Parliament), and transatlantic (OSCE, EAPC) sphere.
3. Military-political consolidation of North American countries and integrated European commonwealth under the preservation or adaptation of "virtuous US preponderant role" and branching of the military-political functions between NATO/EAPC and EU/WEU continues. In this combination NATO comes forward as a system of collective security for direct participants and spread the functions of military-political control to the zone of traditional responsibility as for "crisis response operations" like that of Yugoslavia in 1992-1995 (Bosnia-Herzegovina) and 1999 (Kosovo). At the same time in other regions (for example, in the Persian Gulf, Asia-Pacific region, etc.) in the event of aggravation of the situation a definite area the NATO countries collaborate with local military alliances and subregional organisations or engage regional states supporting their actions in temporary coalitions. Participation of the NATO countries in military operations in the former "third world" regions is modelled according to the formula "Consensus minus N" where 'N' means certain amount of NATO-member countries which do not participate in the military operations although officially do not object to their conduct for some particular reasons. However, in response to security threats and challenges outside the Atlantic and Europe the military force still remains the main instrument of influence and crisis response.

Officially such approach is explained by inefficiency of softer forms of reaction and unwillingness of separate regional actors for peaceful resolution of disputes, resistance to the extension of global liberalisation of trade and economic activity, blocking the regional integration processes and by hostility as far as democracy and human rights are concerned.

4. Relationships within the CIS are characterised by continuation of economic disintegration of the former Soviet states. At the same time from mid- 1999 one could observe strengthening of the executive power regime in Russia. With regard to other post-Soviet states Russia pursued the course of reinforcing formal and informal dependence in neo-colonialism "spirit " built on the traditional force and geopolitical factors. Reinforcing militarily-bureaucratic tendencies in Russia's policy after completion of the military operation in Chechnya on the background of decline in the output of fossil energy resources allows to expect extension of power methods in relations with other post-Soviet states which potentially threatens to destabilise and split the European security space into two principally different zones.

Contemporary European concepts of international security often refer to the principle of flexibility in interpretation of cooperative security. Under the absence of a clear external enemy, post-modernistic approach to security increasingly resembles an agreement on mutual insurance of its participants. Such approach envisages that multilateral system of mutual insurance against external threats and challenges in military, political, economic and ecological character will succeed from the increase in the number of its participants. However, the effectiveness of such system depends on the homogeneity of the participating countries, their conformity to the criteria of developed market economy and stable political democracy [19].

### **3. The Internal Factors and Features of Ukraine's Development in the Context of European Transformation Processes**

#### **3.1. General Trends**

Ukraine's development in 1990s can be considered in two aspects:

- In comparison with common experience of transformation processes in Central Europe, which consists in gradual approaching to the standards of developed democracies and strengthening of market economy principles.
- As a realisation of a specific development variant which corresponds to the transformation type residing in most post-Soviet countries.

Today, it can be asserted that to the greater or lesser extent both of the above mentioned trends were present in the development of Ukraine. At the same time, quite expressive domination of pro-Western and pro-European tendencies could be traced in its external politics. This was reflected in Ukraine's consistent efforts to overcome chiefly political dependence on Russia. Equally, one should take into consideration that political influence of Russia is predominantly based on economic factors. It is, first of all, energy dependence (absence of alternative delivery oil and gas sources), insolvency factor of Ukrainian economy in relation to the use of energy carriers resulting from irrationally high level of natural gas consumption and disuse of energy conservation technologies as well as structural peculiarities of the industry. Among other factors on which Russian influence is based there is a low level of entrepreneurial culture and management in economic relations, informal administrative and bureaucratic ascendancy in economy as well as corruption in which both

governmental groups and gas trading and energy producing companies related to them are involved.

In the first half of the 1990s, Russian influence factor found its expression in the efforts to use military and economic superiority of Russia aiming to impose on the Ukrainian government the decisions corresponding to the Russian tactic and strategic interests. In this sense, it would be appropriate to mention the problems with creating Ukraine's own armed forces, the status of Crimea and the Black Sea Fleet, debts and assets of the former USSR, conversion of the debt for Russian energy carriers, nuclear disarmament, defining the status of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and form of cooperation within this multilayer structure.

It can be asserted that during the first years after the proclamation of independence the Ukrainian government adhered to the idealistic approaches to the quickly changing system of international relations. This "idealism" was reflected in a certain kind of a tendency to make pronouncements on the aims and principles of the Ukrainian external politics, which, in the most general form, had been proclaimed in the Declaration of State Sovereignty in 1990.

Only in the course of the gradual extending of Ukraine's participation in the processes of international cooperation in post-bipolar Europe, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine has step by step corrected the primary idealistic approach having modelled situation that allowed providing concrete advantages for achieving pragmatic aims of external politics.

From the middle 1993, the "realistic" approach has been gradually developing. Within its framework, Ukraine managed to attract the USA as a third party in the settlement of contradictions between Russia and Ukraine on the nuclear disarmament issue. Formal assurances (guarantees) were also made as to the security of Ukraine on behalf of the Great Powers. This promoted negotiation with Ukraine's neighbouring countries as to its state borders and their refusal from the territorial claims on Ukraine.

Within this direction, a system of more developed and institutionalised relations with a number of countries, including the USA, Germany, Poland, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Georgia, which were called "strategic partnerships" has been established in the second half of 1990s.

There are also some specific factors of socio-cultural character in the internal developments that influence essentially the nature of political processes. They include the following aspects:

(1) Tendencies, which determine political and socio-cultural perceptions and attitudes within the Ukrainian society or reflect contradictions determining political behaviour, mass popular orientations, and trends of political processes in the country. The aspects of socio-cultural differentiation play an important role in Ukraine's political development, determining specific two-component composition within the political system of the state. Coexistence and unstable balance of the two main socio-cultural communities on the whole territory of the state is usually treated as a criterion for conditional division of all regions of the country into two types, i.e. the Ukrainian-speaking and the Russian-speaking ones. This phenomenon has little in common with the traditional ethnic tensions of the Belgian or the Swiss type. However, this circumstance influenced without exceptions all political campaigns held in the country in the 1990s and reflected specific features of the Ukrainian political mind. These specific details determining attitudes of the Ukrainians to foreign policy problems, including relations with the Euro-Atlantic institutions and Russia should be considered in the context of promotion of the European and Euro-Atlantic values and principles.

(2) Trends, which reflect development of the political system. This aspect includes changes in the composition and influence of several main groupings of political,

administrative and business elite and the largest political parties exercising direct influence on the policy of the executive power authorities.

(3) Changes in the ratio of influences and real power competence between executive and legislative authorities after the 1999 Presidential elections and Constitutional referendum held in April 2000;

(4) Changes in the structure, competence, and senior staff composition of the executive branch and the Parliament reflecting the main directions of political development of the country and influencing the foreign policy formation.

The present political situation in Ukraine may be characterised as a new form of unstable balance between the dominating political and business groups. Essentially, the country is still in a situation of approximation of its decisive political choice. The alternative scenarios of the further development vary between the establishment of authoritarian regime (like that of Belarus, Azerbaijan or Kazakhstan) or more decisive implementation of economic reforms on the model of Central European states accompanied with subsequent intensification of democratic processes in the political sphere.

### **3.2. Constitutional Referendum 2000 and Political Opposition**

In 2000, for the first time since 1989 Ukraine's economy had a positive dynamics. The real GDP increased by 6 %. The amount of foreign trade has grown by 21.8 %, while Ukraine's export increased by almost 25 %. However, the rate of inflation comprised nearly 26 %. The greatest success of the government has been the restructuring of Ukraine's external debts to international financial institutions and private creditors in February 2000. This measure allowed Ukraine to avoid inevitable default. The other impressive result was reduction of the total volume of external debts by \$ 2.5 billion (from \$ 12.4 billion in December 1999 to \$ 9.9 billion in November 2000) [20].

Apart from controversy between the oligarchic circles and Victor Yushchenko's government, attempt of the presidential administration to conduct redistribution of constitutional competence in favour of the president was the main aspect of power struggle.

On January 15, 2000 president Kuchma announced his decree appointing a referendum on the constitutional reform. The original scenario of the national referendum envisaged an increase of presidential competence to dissolve the parliament and finally, the abolition of the existing constitution with consequent imposition of a 1996 presidential draft that substantially increased the presidential powers.

After the previous parliamentary campaign in March 1998, the Parliament (Verkhovna Rada) was managed by the leftist presiding officer, Oleksandr Tkachenko, who was reasonably blamed for making obstacles to legislative process. However, in January 2000 after Kuchma announced a date and questions of the April constitutional referendum, a centre-right parliamentary majority was formed in the parliament. It consisted of different groups, including 'pro-presidential' factions often headed by politicians with oligarchic image, and 'pro-governmental' ones, including national democrats, market reformers and Julia Timoshenko's (then a vice-prime-minister on energy sector) supporters from "Batkivshchina" ("Fatherland") party. Some pro-presidential circles considered it a beginning of the Ukrainian "velvet revolution" aimed at rapid reforming of economic sphere.

On February 2 the newly established parliamentary majority (255 of 439 MPs) dismissed the leftists from all presiding positions in the parliament. These events, however,

did not stop the presidential administration's eagerness to complete its undertakings with the referendum.

The referendum initiative faced sharp criticism both on behalf of the political opposition in Ukraine and the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly. The European Commission for Democracy through Law ("the Venice Commission") and the PACE Monitoring Committee, agreeing (with certain reservations) with constitutionality of the four questions of the referendum, demanded from Ukraine's authorities to ensure that all provisions of the 1996 Constitution are thoroughly respected in the implementation of the referendum results in Ukraine, and in any procedure aimed at amending the Constitution in particular.

This consistent pressure influenced the Constitutional Court of Ukraine, which decision of 29 March abolished two of the six questions on the ballot. These included the confidence vote in the parliament and the possibility to adopt Constitution via a referendum.

The referendum of April 16, 2000 has shown an implicit victory of the pro-presidential groups, which initiated this poll and broadly used the administrative resources of the executive pyramid to achieve desirable figures. Collisions around the referendum demonstrated essential viability of Ukrainian democracy upon external factors, as well as the weakness of its democratic institutions. The official results went on, that 81.15 % of registered electors participated in the constitutional referendum, and each of the four questions gained support from between 84.78 % to 89.97 % of those voters who participated in the ballot.

According political analysts, the referendum brought about a unique situation in the relationship between the executive branch and the people. "Never before had there been such an outrageous incongruity, perfectly obvious to all, between the official interpretation of events and reality." The press blamed the executive with violation of democratic standards corroborated by the PACE and the Venice Commission, neglect of democratic standards, and absolute disrespect for citizens" [21 ].

Since summer 2000 the presidential administration has made numerous efforts to push amendments to the Constitution through the parliament. The subsequent law gained support of 251 against 22 MPs on July 13, but it was absolutely unrealistic to expect the adoption of amendments by a Constitutional majority (301 votes) in the next parliamentary session.

### **3.3. The Tapeagate Affair**

The following events in the country were turned into a protracted political crisis which started with the disappearance of an opposition journalist, Georgiy Gongadze, on September 16. The publication of audio tapes on November 28, 2000 denounced Ukraine's president and his close surrounding in illegal plans and activities including direct administrative intervention in the conduct of 1999 presidential elections and falsification of April 2000 constitutional referendum results.

After Oleksandr Moroz (an opposition MP and Socialist party leader) published an audio tape that linked Kuchma and other top officials to Gongadze's disappearance, the affair was widely discussed in the world press and debated in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. Audiotapes purportedly captured Kuchma and his law enforcement ministers expressing hostility against Gongadze. Kuchma has fiercely denied he issued orders to silence the journalist.

However, the Tapeagate is still full of vague details. It is impossible to give a clear explanation of its intrigue. Many Ukrainian politicians openly expressed a suspicion that the probable assassination of Gongadze and some other undisclosed political crimes were ordered by the Minister of the Interior, Yuri Kravchenko [22].

The parliament established an ad hoc "Provisional Investigation Commission" to follow up details of the Gongadze affair. This body had to undertake expertise of cassette tapes and other arguments. Nevertheless, the Ukrainian legislation still doesn't determine cases when the parliament may appoint a special prosecutor to investigate such issues. Thus, transition of the political crisis into judicial investigation, resulting in the determination of responsibility of the officials involved seems unrealistic. Otherwise, only such outcome may restore Ukraine's image as a predictable and reliable partner.

On February 5, 2001 Sergiy Holovaty, MP and a member of the Venice Commission, announced that president Kuchma confessed to him that unauthorised recording actually happened in his office. The president's press service denied these claims. Although the Chair of Ukraine's Security Service and the head of presidential guard unable to prevent recording in the presidential office lost their posts. The recordings comprised estimated 300 hours worth of conversations between the president and his top aides. After listening to relevant parts of the released recordings, two people's deputies, Taras Chornovil, a son of the previous Rukh leader Vyacheslav Chornovil, and Oleksandr Turchinov, the leader of the "Batkivshchina" faction in parliament, said that they recognised their own voices on the tapes [23].

From December 2000 to April 2001 the opposition activists kept a tent camp in central Kyiv which was destroyed by police under a decision of a Kyiv district court. Protesters demanded resignation of president Kuchma and decrying rampant corruption. The peak of the new opposition campaign were demonstrations in Kyiv on February 6 and March 9, 2001. After some period of reluctance, the executive authorities applied force against street manifestations.

Formation of a coalition based on formal democratic standards appeared a principally new element of 2001 Ukrainian politics. After 1998 parliamentary election the right and centrist groups avoided to express opposition claims and were unable to compete with the presidential/executive authority. The new opposition movement has an overall representation of 110-120 MPs from the total nominal quantity of 450. All of them belonged to Yushchenko's supporters, while the Prime Minister himself escaped any ties with the opposition movements. Nevertheless, the opposition appeared unable to attract immediate support of the wide circles of population. Its campaign was almost ignored in the eastern and southern parts of Ukraine. On his part, president Kuchma rejected any form of dialogue with the opposition, while Yushchenko signed a joint statement condemning protest campaign [24].

The tapeagate posed a lot of sharp problems in the Ukrainian politics. Law-making process and reforms in the system of state administration were actually blocked. The parliamentary majority established in January 2000 suffered a split. The working linkage between the government and the parliament was destroyed. The tapeagate affair reflected the increasing contradictions between the pro-governmental and pro-presidential factions. The resolution of non-confidence to Yushchenko's government voted by the Parliament in April 2001 put an end both to the political crisis and stalemate in the contacts with the West. During winter 2000 - 2001 the public perception of the tapeagate was a mixture of contradictory aspirations. Many politicians suggested that internal chaos might create advantages for some external actors or bring to power a newly designed oligarchy regime. In this respect, some Russian state bureaucratic and business circles possessed the highest opportunities for external influence on Ukraine.

### 3.4. Situation in the System of Power

In 1991-1994, there functioned several groups of political elite competing with each other for the influence in formation of state politics. They included:

- former Communist Party and Soviet administrative bureaucracy and economic elite;
- national democrats;
- senior staff of the newly created Communist Party of Ukraine which officially came into existence in 1993;
- new regional administrative bureaucracy (regional bureaucratic *nomenclatura*) a considerable part of which was related to the administrative and bureaucratic circles and in the course of the years that followed created the basis of the so-called business and oligarch groupings.

Soon, business elite also started forming from the representatives of big trade and industry companies.

After 1994, however, the Presidential Administration of Ukraine has gradually become the main power institution forming the political course of the country. At the same time, in the political sphere different influence groupings and political parties controlled by them, including opposition ones, have appeared, subjugated to different extent to control on behalf of the Presidential Administration. In its turn, manipulating practice applied on behalf of the Presidential Administration to different groups has been implemented with the help of broad application of a so-called “administrative resource” which is the practice of using different influence levers including force structures and tax administration apparatus as well as pledging benefits and privileges in the sphere of business.

There can be distinguished several pressing groups which possess relative independence and are able to exercise considerable influence on the development of political processes in Ukraine. They include:

- Higher administrative bureaucracy concentrated in the Administration of the President. Leaders of this group are Head of the Presidential Administration Volodymyr Lytvyn, Deputy Heads of the Presidential Administration Oleg Dyomin and Anatoliy Orel, Head of Staff Yuri Dagayev, former Prime Minister Valeriy Pustovoytenko, Volodymyr Yatsyuba (appointed as a permanent State Secretary of the Cabinet of Ministers in May 2001), etc.
- Chiefs of Defense and Law Enforcement Ministries and related bodies. After resignation of the former Minister of Internal Affairs Yuriy Kravchenko in the course of the “Tapegate”, there have happened some essential staff changes in this group. The overall influence of the chiefs of law enforcement departments on the politics of the Presidential Administration has been weakened considerably.
- Leaders of the main political and business (oligarchic) groupings that have their own spheres of economic influence and private economic interests conditioned by this. In the Parliament they are represented by such factions and deputy groups as “Labor Ukraine” (with Sergiy Tyhytko, Victor Pinchuk, Igor Sharov, and Andriy Derkach being its leaders), faction of the “Democratic Union” Party (Olexandr Volkov), faction of the Social Democratic Party of Ukraine (united) (Victor Medvedchuk, Grygoriy Surkis, and Olexandr Zinchenko), and faction of the People’s Democratic Party (Olexandr Karpov). They are

joined by less influential groupings such as the Green Party faction (Vitaliy Kononov) and the “Yabloko” Party faction (Mykhailo Brodsky).

- New regional elites proceeding along the path of forming their own political structures. One of such formations is a newly formed Party of the Regions of Ukraine (with Head of the State Tax Administration Mykola Azarov as its leader).
- Parties and groupings united to support the government of Victor Yushchenko.

The position of this group requires certain explanations. Formation specificity of the pro-governmental coalition consisted in different levels of opposition of the comprising parties and movements. At the same time, within the framework of pro-governmental part of the centrist and moderate right wing Parliamentary majority there were different political and ideological orientations. These contradictions were visible between the different groupings of national democrats and the “Batkivshchyna” (“Fatherland”) party faction founded on the basis of the considerable part of the “Gromada” movement which participated in the 1998 Parliamentary elections and split in 1999 after the escape and arrest of Pavlo Lazarenko.

In the course of the “Tapegate”, many representatives of the pro-governmental coalition parties constituted the National Salvation Forum, which was assigned the role of coordination structure of non-leftist opposition. One of the outcomes of this process was actual destruction of the parliamentary majority, which from December 1999 till January 2001 comprised all non-leftist factions and deputy groups of the Ukrainian Parliament.

Opposition parties and groups, which did not support the Cabinet of Victor Yushchenko. These include:

- the Communist Party of Ukraine claiming to play the role of the “official opposition,” and
- the left-centrist Socialist Party of Ukraine which representatives also participated in the National Salvation Forum.

As a result of regrouping of the political forces in the first half of 2001, the Administration of the President temporally weakened its influence on the positions and behaviour of certain political groupings. On the initiative of Yulia Tymoshenko, the National Salvation Forum even put forward somewhat amusing idea of conducting a referendum for support of voluntary resignation of President Leonid Kuchma, which could provide grounds for intense political campaign aiming at the 2002 Parliamentary elections.

After the ouster of the government of Victor Yushchenko and creation of the new Cabinet headed by Anatoliy Kinakh (29 May 2001), the political crisis symptoms were practically fully overcome. As a result of the new alignment of political forces in the country, the influence of the Presidential Administration on the internal political processes has increases again. This new situation in the internal political life has been manifested in the issuance of the Presidential Decree “On the introduction of the Posts of State Secretaries of the Cabinet of Ministers (the government) of Ukraine” (No. 377/2001, signed on 30 May 2001) as well as functional and branch ministries appointed by the President of Ukraine.

## **4. Monitoring of Domestic Debates on Foreign Policy Matters.**

### **4.1. The Foreign Policy Concept**

The first attempts of Ukraine’s governmental institutions to establish direct contacts with international organisations and institutions date back to the last years of the USSR. On

16 July 1990, the Supreme Council (the Parliament) of Ukraine adopted the Declaration of State Sovereignty, which proclaimed the general foreign policy principles of the state.

Ukraine was pronounced “a subject of international law”, which “maintains direct relations with other states, enters into treaties with them, exchanges diplomatic, consular, and trade representatives, participates in the activities of international organisations to the extent required for adequate assurance of national interests of the Republic (...).” The closest tasks of Ukraine were determined as achieving full membership in the international community and strengthening universal peace and international security as well as participation in “the all-European processes and European structures” [25].

Before the Ukrainian Independence Referendum of 1 December 1991 and the official break-up of the USSR, Ukraine’s aspiration to become a full member of international community did not meet support on behalf of the majority of NATO and the EU member states. Even following the official abolition of the USSR as a result of Minsk accords on the dismissal of the USSR and creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States on 8 December 1991, Ukraine was not automatically recognised as a successor of international obligations of the former USSR.

The shortcomings of Ukrainian international situation in 1992-94 caused by complications in the nuclear disarmament process, the Ukrainian-Russian dispute over the Black Sea Fleet of the former Soviet Union and uncertainty of its relations with Russia because of the Crimean and Sevastopol issues highlighted vital importance of Ukraine’s presence in multilateral organisations such as the OSCE and the UN. Ukraine’s participation in the multilateral diplomatic communication allowed forestalling a threat of international isolation of the state. This experience was decisive in the traditionally high evaluation of CSCE/OSCE activities by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine and its strive for maximum application of multilateral diplomacy to protect the fundamental interests of the state. Consequently, Ukraine’s experience of participation in multilateral diplomacy has played an important role in the formation of its foreign policy.

According to the 1996 Ukrainian Constitution, establishment of the conceptual basis of its domestic and foreign policy lies under the jurisdiction of the national Parliament. The resolution of the Supreme Council “On the Main Guidelines of the Foreign Policy of Ukraine”, adopted on 2 July 1993 and still valid, played an essential role in establishing Ukraine’s foreign policy principles. This conceptual document stated that “Ukraine speaks in favour of further extension of the scope of CSCE activities, strengthening and increasing the efficiency of the activities of this international forum’s structures and organisations, establishment within its framework of new mechanisms to facilitate creation of an efficient international system of regional security, operational resolution of problems related to the maintenance of military and political stability on the European continent, and extension of the constructive and fruitful inter-state cooperation in economy, science, technology, culture, and humanities.” It also determined the CSCE as “the main regional direction” of the Ukrainian foreign policy [26].

At the same time, the conceptual provisions of the parliamentary resolution “On the Main Guidelines of the foreign policy of Ukraine” reflected the objective features and vulnerability of the Ukrainian position in foreign affairs as the state with an intermediary role in the European international security set-up: Ukraine is not and in the near future will not be a member of the leading Western institutions like NATO, the EU/WEU. However, through persistent efforts, that frequently were not very beneficial from the economic point of view, Ukraine has to a considerable extent managed to leave Russia’s zone of military and political influence. In particular, because Ukraine is not a full CIS statutory member and its status within the Commonwealth of Independent States can be described rather as that of a partial or associated member. National legislation of Ukraine forbids executive authorities from

participation in supra-national CIS institutions and military or politico-military structures created within its framework.

After the break-up of the USSR, Russia continued military presence in Ukraine in the form of a long-term deployment of the Russian Black Sea Fleet in Crimea, while Ukraine has been cooperating more and more actively with NATO since 1995 taking part in different exercises within and outside the Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme.

In the early 1990s, the CSCE/OSCE was the only European international organisation where Ukraine enjoyed full membership, and so it was not surprising that its 1993 foreign policy concept emphasised the upgrade of the OSCE's status in the European security system where it had to turn into one of the key elements of its architecture. The concept also underlined that "Ukraine will extend its participation in the North Atlantic Cooperation Council and the North Atlantic Assembly. Ukraine will promote gradual transformation of these institutions into elements of the new European security system in conjunction with the Helsinki process" [27].

Further extension of Ukraine's participation in the European security system was made dependent upon realisation of the current tasks and was linked to the prospective aim of becoming a member of "European Communities and other Western European and all-European structures provided that this does not affect its national interests". From this a rather important conclusion was drawn that it was necessary to adapt the foreign policy principles and orientations of Ukraine to the changing conditions based on full-fledged participation in the new pan-European security system:

"In view of the disappearance of bloc confrontation in Europe, establishment of an all-European security system based on the existing international institutions such as the OSCE, NACC, NATO, and WEU acquires priority importance."

The concept contained an evidently idealistic notion that "direct and full membership" of Ukraine in this structure would provide the country with aspired external security guarantees.

"Taking account of the fundamental changes that occurred during the break-up of the USSR which determined the present geopolitical position of Ukraine, its previously declared intention to become a neutral and a non-bloc state in the future should be adapted to the new realities and cannot be considered as an obstacle to its full-scale participation in the all-European security structure (...). The military doctrine of Ukraine is defensive in character and envisages (...) establishment of politico-military cooperation with other, first of all, neighbouring states and international organisations, in particular, with NATO and the WEU (...). Creating its national armed forces, Ukraine will make its best efforts to (...) coordinate its practical steps in realisation of its defence doctrine with the dynamics of the process reflecting the formation of European and universal security structures" [28].

The position of Ukraine was strongly influenced by the general development of European transformation processes after the Cold War. The official Ukrainian position was aimed at developing the Helsinki process into a strong and effective organisation that could play a central role in European security cooperation and would be able to defend and represent the common and particular interests of all participating states. The status of Ukraine in the European security architecture could be defined as that of a non-nuclear state, which does not participate in military alliances and joint defence arrangements. Its position within the context of multilateral security cooperation, however, cannot be described as a classical "non-alignment". Since the 1990 Declaration of State Sovereignty, the governments and the Parliament of Ukraine have never overestimated the option of neutrality often

regarding this principle as an anachronism in the post-Cold War European and transatlantic affairs.

The 1993 concept, mentioned above, influenced the development of tasks and principles of foreign policy of the state up to the end of the decade. At the same time, many declarations by high state officials on European and transatlantic affairs frequently reflected exaggerated expectations regarding the creation of a collective security system on the basis of existing international institutions, in particular, the OSCE.

As compared with its Central European neighbours, Ukraine's political elite is too tardy to adequately understand the deterioration of the real state of the nation. All in all, the 1998-1999 economic crisis in Ukraine resulted in the state's greater foreign policy vulnerability in contrast to the previous quite successful period (spring 1997–summer 1998), which was characterised by the fact that relative equidistant and freedom of manoeuvre were achieved due to the settlement of many thorny problems with neighbouring countries and other foreign policy successes in 1996-1997. Beginning in the fall of 1998, government found itself on the brink of financial bankruptcy. In January 1999, Ukraine's foreign debt alone amounted to \$11.470 billion [29].

At the exchange rate of the beginning of 1999 this accounted for 40% of GDP, compared with 20% in 1998. This index is considered a direct challenge to the national security of any country. Traditional sentiments of National independence made it difficult for the public to realise that the preposterous policy of the Ukrainian government has already brought the nation to the brink of informal dependence, although unmarked with any attributes of imperial or colonial domination, which may prove to be not less hazardous than direct pressure or external control.

On the other hand, it became ever more obvious that the overwhelming majority of Ukrainian administrative-bureaucratic, political, and even academic elite failed to realise the depth and possible consequences of the country's long-term economic fall. Overly optimistic official statements that there were no objective reasons for further economic decline in Ukraine only testified to the irresponsibility of top officials. This attitude toward the economic position of the country can be accounted for by a unique mix of contradictory factors of political consciousness and behaviour, which are rooted in residual great power arrogance ("the country's resources are inexhaustible"), traditions of state dependence (inability to make responsible decisions), and authoritarianism (lack of experience that power structures bear political responsibility for the consequences of their actions).

On November 14, 1999 President Leonid Kuchma has won the second round of presidential elections with 56.31 % of the votes. In his inauguration address on November 30, 1999, Kuchma notified the top priorities of his political program. It included a pledge to start radical reforms in order to promote economic growth and vowed to pursue a foreign policy aimed at developing ties with both Russia and the United States. The diversity of vectors, the predictability and the 'non-bloc' (in the sense of non-participation in defence alliances) status were named as the key guidelines. Kuchma reaffirmed Ukraine's strategic striving for membership in the European Union. The aforesaid strategic priorities should have been "combined with the cooperation in other directions," primarily with the close neighbour states. Kuchma suggested, that "Ukraine has all grounds to become a regional power and to play an important geostrategic role in the new world of the next century" [30].

In 1999-2000 the new accents of Kuchma's Administration in the context of international politics have found display in a search for the levers of influence capable of limiting external influences - both on the part of Russia and on the part of European institutions (Council of Europe, OSCE) and Euro-Atlantic cooperation mechanisms (NATO, EAPC). In ideology this position was accompanied by search of arguments for defence and

consolidation of the "state sovereignty" as a means of restricting external criticism which is treated as an intervention into internal affairs of the state. In a context of international relations such approach was accompanied by search of opportunities capable to ensure a conduct of multi-vector foreign policy and to avoid an unequivocal binding both to Russia (and a scope of Russia headed alliances within the framework of the CIS), and to NATO. As a whole this approach corresponds with the framework of a 'non-bloc' status of Ukraine in the system of European security. Its essence consists in the maintenance of opportunities to continue the politics of asymmetric balancing in view of uncontested domination of the US, NATO and the EU in modern world, on the one hand, and also of vital importance of fuel supplies from Russia, accompanied by existing Russian economic, political, and, in some cases, military influence on Ukraine.

This trend of foreign policy balancing was hardly new, as well as encouraging in a long-term perspective. On the other hand, the state of Ukrainian economy and the absence of clearness concerning a direction of evolution of its political regime mean that the country has no real opportunities to activate its participation in the processes of Euro-Atlantic and European integration.

Ukraine's leadership often faced sharp criticism for its inability to achieve success in economic reforms, unwillingness to establish civilian control over the military, etc. Manifestations of a newly formed Ukrainian isolationism became more observant. The latter gradually absorbs the elite's psychological unavailability for open competition, fear for losing its national identity, manifestations of disillusionment with the West, and, generally, with the results of international cooperation so far. Though, dosed isolationism reserves as a tool for protection from 'dangerous' external interference into authority establishment's internal affairs. This trend was fully reflected in the events provoked by the "ambassadors' letter" to president Kuchma in September 2000. Then a letter, signed by the ambassadors of US, Canada and heads of local missions of the World Bank and the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development, "seriously advised" Kuchma to continue reforms in inter-budgetary relations intended to increase financial autonomy of local government and make inter-budgetary relations visible. However this intervention indirectly caused a dismissal of the Minister of Foreign Affairs Borys Tarasyuk, a supporter of Euro-Atlantic integration [31].

In the absence of significant structural changes in economy, Ukraine's diplomacy was unable to achieve even a promise of future "associate membership" from the EU. However on 23 January 2001, the new foreign minister Anatoly Zlenko, at least, rejected dubious multi-vectored rhetoric in the explanation of Ukraine's foreign policy orientation. The "choice and aim" of Ukraine's foreign policy was clearly announced as "the European integration of Ukraine" [32].

## **4.2. Peculiarities of the National Foreign Policy Process**

It's worth noting a tardy and gradual comprehension of continuous complexity and vulnerability of Ukraine's unstable role in contemporary Europe in the structures of executive power. This comprehension is caused by practical unreality of the fast and easy decisions of the several interconnected tasks, including:

- acceleration of market reforms with the purpose of optimisation of relations in national economy, reduction of energy consumption and maintenance of duly payment for the import of crude fuel, primarily for natural gas from Russia;

- achievement of a favourable mode of the economic relations and trade conditions with the countries of the EU and Central Europe;

- implementation of the project for transportation of the Caspian oil to Europe through the territories of Georgia, Ukraine and Poland.

Considering the whole set of relations of Ukraine with various countries, international organisations, alliances, and institutions in 1998-1999, one can argue that, on the whole, as compared with 1997, their intensity was lower. One of the few exceptions was the Black Sea region in which, largely due to efforts of Ukrainian diplomats, in 1998 the Organisation for Black Sea Economic Cooperation was finally formally institutionalised.

In characterising the state of Ukraine's relations with Russia and other post-Soviet states, we can say that there are grounds to describe them as in a state of gradual disintegration. The signing of the bilateral Agreement on Economic Cooperation and international programs for developing economic ties for 1998-2007 all but influenced the climate of Ukrainian-Russian relationships, and the level of their intensity continues to wane. The ambivalence and inconsistency of the relations was evidenced by the scandalous way in which the Treaty on Friendship, Partnership, and Cooperation of May 31, 1997 was ratified by both chambers of the Russian Parliament. An outrageously hostile stance with regard to Ukraine was adopted by the leadership of Vladimir Zhirinovskiy's Liberal Democratic Party of Russia and Moscow Mayor Yuri Luzhkov, leader of the "Otechestvo" ("Fatherland") Movement. In 1998-1999 the perception of the CIS as a subregional international organisation was increasingly characterised by its interpretation as a short-lived, temporary structure without any prospects. At the same time, it was mentioned more and more often in Ukraine that under the CIS Charter Ukraine was not a member-state. Ukraine's relations with post-Soviet republics differentiated all the more visibly. In 1997-1998, talks about a profound crisis of the CIS were not infrequent in political circles and mass media. Given this, the CIS more and more often was regarded in political quarters as an inadequately effective institutional form of interaction for the political leadership of the post-Soviet republics, rather than an international organisation or a grouping to be consolidated by integration. However, in analysing the attitude of major groups influencing Ukraine's policy concerning relations with the West and Russia, one should bear in mind that in Ukraine's political life both foreign policy orientations are observed in two planes: in the real world and the propaganda one. Unlike the speculative propaganda campaigns of Right and Left political parties, the thorny problems of real politics are very rarely covered or discussed openly.

Taking into account real groups of influence proclaiming their support for the idea of reintegration with Russia, only the group "Communists for the restoration of the USSR" (25-30 lawmakers led by Volodymyr Moiseyenko), which existed within the faction of the Communist Party of Ukraine in Verkhovna Rada (the Parliament of Ukraine) openly spoke for the reunification of Ukraine and Russia within a single state. This slogan was also backed by some tiny extra-parliamentary movements like the All-Union Party of Communists (Bolsheviks), the Russo-Ukrainian League, etc. If one scrutinises the programmatic documents and public speeches of parliamentary party leaders of the Left, one can see that integration with Russia in the form of a "fraternal union of Ukraine, Russia, and Belarus" is mentioned only in the programs of Ukraine's Communist Party and the radical Progressive Socialist Party of Ukraine. The former Chairman of Verkhovna Rada (1998 – 2000) and deputy chairman of the Peasant Party of Ukraine Oleksandr Tkachenko has repeatedly voiced his support for this idea. His insistent efforts to have Ukraine join the CIS Inter-parliamentary Assembly in March 1999 and his statements about the possibility that in the immediate future Ukraine might accede the Russian-Belarusian Union were interpreted by observers as the beginning of a propaganda campaign with a view to the coming Presidential election. But after the Yugoslav Parliament had adopted a formal decision to accede to the Russo-Belarus Union on April 12, 1999, support for Ukraine's non-aligned status and its neutrality in the Yugoslav Crisis became more widespread among Ukraine's Left, including some lawmakers from the Communist Party, specifically, the former Chairmen of the

Standing Committee on Defence and National Security Heorhy Kriuchkov and of the Standing Committee for International Relations and the CIS Borys Oliynyk.

The idea of a “union of three fraternal Slavic peoples” has been used by the Left primarily in order to amplify social dissatisfaction and related feelings of humiliated national and human dignity, which in people’s minds are a sort of sublimation of the breakdown of a great power, the USSR, whose population enjoyed at least some minimum social guarantees. In Ukraine’s political life, discussions about reintegration with Russia have primarily been of a, so to speak, virtual reality character, and the idea was consciously backed only by Left-wing and Right-wing movements for the purpose of politically polarising voters and mobilising their supporters, largely to win votes.

In Ukrainian political life the theme of the status and future of cooperation with the West was interpreted in a specific way. Beginning in 1995, first in subtexts and later more openly the Presidential Administration proclaimed Ukraine’s “comprehensive future integration” into “European and Euro-Atlantic structures.” In 1998 the executive branch practically demanded from the EU, in vain, that Ukraine be granted associate membership, although representatives of the Ukrainian power elite were fully aware of the nation’s objective variance from the criteria for integration into Europe. Moreover, the deepening of the economic crisis in Ukraine 1998 and early 1999 only increased Ukraine’s economic lag behind the countries of Central Europe, which were recognised as candidates for EU membership. Ukraine’s stance with regard to the processes of NATO and EU expansion primarily is a problem of defining the major guidelines, direction and pace of its internal economic and political evolution. Complete involvement in European and Euro-Atlantic integration processes can be regarded as identical with accession to the community of developed nations, which have set up a system of effectively maintaining economic stability and high living standards. Insisting on Ukraine’s future integration into Europe without adequate measures of bringing its own economic and social conditions up to European standards only would result in disorienting society, foreign partners, and the bodies responsible for foreign relations.

Relationships between Ukraine and NATO have developed more successfully. However, for various geopolitical, domestic, and foreign policy reasons representatives of Ukraine’s executive branch have repeatedly given assurances that under the circumstances of the late 1990s the question of the country’s membership in NATO “was not one of immediate practical concern.” However, the attention attached by Ukraine’s executive branch to the development of intensive cooperation with NATO objectively creates the preconditions for its acquiring member status in the future – in case this will be in line with the interests of the Euro-Atlantic community. Among all political parties in Ukraine only both wings of the People’s Movement of Ukraine (rather persistently and openly), as well as certain factions in the Reforms and Order Party, People’s Democratic Party and some smaller political groupings like Forward, Ukraine! (in a more concealed form) voiced their support for Ukraine’s membership in NATO. The rest of the parties, except for those on the Left, which demand banning military exercises with the participation of NATO troops in Ukraine, took a moderate position regarding Ukraine’s continued non-aligned (or ‘non-bloc’) status.

Because the EU membership was not controversial, the Ukrainian authorities had consistently and openly stated it as a Ukrainian ‘strategic objective’. On 11 June 1998 president Kuchma signed his first Decree (No. 615 /98) approving the Strategy of Ukraine’s integration to the European Union (later it was amended by presidential decree of 12 April 2000, which approved the new programme of relations with the EU).

Public treatment of Ukraine-NATO relations appeared more sensitive and vulnerable. Following the tone of rhetoric of the Presidential Administration the most political parties of centrist orientation repeated general ideas of the executive officials. In their programmes one

can find hints at NATO orientation or possible future NATO membership in the form of general declarations about European and Euro-Atlantic integration of Ukraine.

It is typical for both pro-presidential and opposition parties. The oppositional "Batkivshchina" considers cooperation with NATO in the context of increasing international guarantees for Ukraine's security [33].

Some parties even manage to ignore the existence of both NATO and the EU. The oppositional left-centrists Socialist Party of Ukraine directs its programme at mostly domestic political and social tasks. Its foreign policy position is rather typical in supporting military non-align status. The party programme which was approved in May 2000 considered "the eastward enlargement of 'NATO's military organisation' as a mistake". It went on that Ukraine should participate in multinational peacekeeping forces under the aegis of the UN and OSCE and supports the idea to enhance the status of all-European structures including the purpose of ensuring peace and security. [34].

The moderate-centrist Party of the Regions declares its "support for development and cooperation with NATO to ensure a full-scale beneficial accession of Ukraine to the European security system" [35].

Even the programmes of the parties tending to the centre-right place in the political spectrum do not considerably differ from the terms of the 1993 foreign policy concept (The Main Guidelines of the Foreign Policy of Ukraine). The programme of the Popular Movement of Ukraine approved at its XI Congress on 6 May 2001 contains a notion that "Ukraine should even currently issue an application with an intent to join NATO", and also focus its efforts at obtaining an 'associate member' status in the EU. In 1997 the former leader of "Rukh" Viacheslav Chornovil was the first to demand a clear statement on Ukraine's desire to join NATO from the executive branch [36]

To the parties which express rather definite positive attitude towards the actual role of NATO in international security belong the Popular Movement of Ukraine, the Ukrainian Popular Movement, Reforms and Order Party (among the parties of the right centrists or national democratic group), and also the Popular Democratic Party and the Party of the Regions in the so-called loyal centre.

The more or less constant support for the necessity of the future membership of Ukraine in NATO was expressed by the Popular Movement of Ukraine, or Rukh (leader - Hennadiy Udovenko) and "Reforms and order" party (leader - Victor Pensennyk), which together with a Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists form a nucleus of the so-called national-democratic coalition. Otherwise this coalition is unable to change the political trend because it dominates only a limited segment of society.

It will not be correct to say that in there are no changes in the perception of NATO enlargement and European Security developments among the Ukrainian politicians. However, these changes go on too slowly. Much will depend on the party composition in the Parliament after the March 2002 elections.

#### **4.3. Parliamentary Debates and the 1999 Presidential Elections**

In the last years the NATO related problems attracted permanent attention of the Ukrainian media, both in the news-briefs and in political comments. However, NATO enlargement did not belong to the foreign policy issues, which were frequently discussed in the Parliament or developed in the political parties' programme documents. Since 1997 there were not more than six parliamentary session sittings where NATO enlargement and related

aspects became a matter of panel discussion in the Ukraine's legislative body. These debates were mostly devoted to the military exercises conducted on the territory of Ukraine, NATO's military operation in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1999, or were related to the approval of laws, regulating the status of foreign troops on the territory of Ukraine, or sending abroad the Ukraine's military personnel to take part in multilateral peacekeeping operations.

It was rather difficult to make an adequate evaluation of the influence of NATO's operation against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) in 1999 on the perception of Ukrainian society in general and of the political elite in particular. Certain difficulties were caused by the absence of clear and evident attitudes towards the processes of European security cooperation on behalf of the senior officials of the state, as well as by unclear and in some sense hidden positions concerning Ukrainian-Russian relations and prospects for cooperation between Ukraine and NATO. If the primary reaction to NATO's operation against FRY was substantially emotional and reflective, real impact of NATO's humanitarian intervention on the Ukrainian foreign policy process became clearer only at the end of 1999 and in 2000. It was caused by some delays in comprehension of changes in international system after the Cold War and also by reassessment of the originally overestimated expectations and tasks related to the integration into the European and Euro-Atlantic structures. In this respect the gradual comprehension of impossibility to achieve essential shifts in relations between Ukraine and the EU was observed. At the same time it is worth reminding that President Leonid Kuchma as the main foreign policy priority of Ukraine announced orientation at the future membership in the EU.

The Parliamentary resolution "On relations between Ukraine and NATO" approved on 23 April 1999 was a rear event which reflected attitude and policy perceptions in the Parliament of Ukraine (the Verkhovna Rada). The resolution required from the President of Ukraine to oppose the expected NATO's land operation in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Out of 318 deputies, who were registered at the session sitting, 226 (the minimum required by the Constitution) voted for the adoption of the resolution, 42 voted against, and 6 abstained from voting [37].

The resolution put forward a demand for the Parliamentary Committees, the Cabinet of Ministers and all state executive bodies to uphold, consistently and firmly, the state interests of Ukraine in accordance with the Constitution. It also confirmed the terms of the 'non-bloc' status of Ukraine proceeding from the intention proclaimed by the Declaration on State Sovereignty of Ukraine. The parliamentary resolution insisted on a demand to follow the terms of "The Main Guidelines of the Foreign Policy of Ukraine," which was approved by the Parliament in 1993.

The Parliament did not call to break relations with NATO, but recommended their freezing. The Ukrainian Parliament condemned "NATO's attack against Yugoslavia" and expressed condemnation to any ethnic cleansing wherever it might take place.

The Parliament regarded NATO's intention to expand the sphere of application of force beyond the territory of its member-states and the conduct of any force actions without a mandate of the UN Security Council as "extremely dangerous." The resolution required from the President to submit the State Programme of cooperation with NATO for the period until 2001 to the Verkhovna Rada for consideration. The same demand was related to all international acts and agreements establishing the normative basis of Ukraine's cooperation with international organisations.

The President has also been recommended to enhance Ukraine's mediation peace-making efforts aimed at the Balkan conflict resolution, to initiate a UN-sponsored peace conference in Kyiv on the problems of Yugoslavia and to initiate a world conference on

collective security issues. The Verkhovna Rada deemed it necessary to revert to the issue on the nature of the entire Ukraine-NATO relationship with account of the new ideas of humanitarian intervention expressed in the new doctrine and practical military operations of the Alliance.

The Cabinet of Ministers was required to prepare draft laws on basic principles of Ukraine's national security. They should be referred to the issues of the structure, quantity and functions of national military formations and other related units which activities were not regulated by legislation, and on the procedure of admittance and conditions of deployment or stay of the foreign military units on the territory of Ukraine. The Government has also been instructed to take immediate measures to stop dismantling the remainder strategic aircraft systems and silos of ballistic missiles.

The corresponding ministries had been recommended to provide calculation of economic damage, which Ukraine suffered as a result of NATO operation against Yugoslavia. The Government had been instructed to consider temporary exemption (from 1 April 1999 until the complete renewal of navigation on the Danube river) of Ukrainian maritime and river transport enterprises in the Danube basin from regular taxes and other charges to the special state funds.

Compared to the previously discussed draft which failed to collect the required support, the resolution contained neither the provision on suspending the State Programme for Cooperation with NATO, nor the item proposing the President to dismiss from office "the adherents of NATO-oriented foreign policy course." These were Borys Tarasyuk, then-Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Volodymyr Horbulin, then-Secretary of the National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine. Boris Tarasyuk, on his part, considered the Verkhovna Rada resolution to be of advisory nature, and believed that since the document was not a law it was not mandatory, whereas foreign policy and security issues, pursuant to the Constitution, are the prerogative of the executive branch.

During the 1999 presidential elections campaign NATO enlargement was not in the focus of public debates. Programmes of the most presidential candidates who represented influential political movements escaped to develop this issue. Among the figures represented in the voting list there were several politicians who had a more or less noticeable support of the population.

The 1994 Leonid Kuchma's pre-election programme declared "a priority to restore mutually beneficial economic ties with Russia and countries of the former Soviet Union". At the same time, he promised "further development of similar ties with the Western European countries and the US". The real policy of the incumbent President has been more pretentious and, however, still balanced. Activity in the western trend became the reason for the leftists to accuse Kuchma of deviation from electoral promises and shift to the West [38].

The 1999 programme of President Kuchma contained similar notions. It went on, that "Ukraine has become a full-fledged member of the international community, a member of the Council of Europe, a key state of the system of the European and regional security. It concluded a comprehensive treaty of friendship and cooperation with Russia, resolved the problem of the Black Sea Fleet and Sevastopol."

These statements were not fully adequate with real position of the state. Ukraine's political and economic weight was constantly decreasing, and its voice in the dialogue on major international issues had a secondary role.

"Non-accession to any blocs as well as stable partnership with all world democracies" was a calling card of the 1999 Kuchma's programme. The latter had no references of integration into the European and Euro-Atlantic structures or multi-vectored policy in general.

Russia was the only country mentioned among the strategic partners of Ukraine. Balanced policy should be ensured by "active participation in establishing an effective system of the European security; adjustment of national legislation to the world and European standards". The stand on major issues of the European politics and relations between the CIS countries remained unclear. In fact, serious problems facing Ukraine have been ignored: a growing dependence on Russia and the West, a loss positions in the international division of labour, a lagging behind the all-European processes.

Evidently, inaccuracy of the programme was a reflection of the electoral attitudes and, at the same time, a demonstration of absence of real prospects for achieving the previously declared goals. The President attempted to guard his foreign policy against attacks of the opponents and, like in 1994, desired to attract votes of electorate in the eastern and southern regions.

Upholding the priority of the European vector was a feature of low-rating candidates from the parties which represented two factions of the split "Rukh" – The People's Movement of Ukraine, headed by Hennadiy Udovenko, and the Ukrainian People's Movement, headed by Yuriy Kostenko. Kostenko's programme declared that "Ukraine will pursue the policy of integration into the European and global structures, including the European Union and North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. At the same time, Ukraine will develop equal and mutually beneficial relations with Russia and other neighbouring states".

Hennadiy Udovenko embodied a more moderate concept of Europeanism. He considered it necessary "to consistently follow the policy aimed at integration into the European and Euro-Atlantic structures that will ensure economic growth, democratic development and security of Ukraine". The programme envisaged efforts "... to ensure alternative sources of oil and gas supplies; and to strengthen the frontiers of Ukraine."

The "priority of Ukraine's integration into the European structures" is also included into the programme of Vasil Onopenko, Chairman of a small Ukrainian social-democratic party.

Yevhen Marchuk's programme declared a pragmatic course within the framework of a balanced multi-vectored orientation: "I will do away with squandering in foreign economic activities: stand up for development of mutually beneficial relations with neighbouring countries. The atmosphere of confidence and strategic partnership with Russia will be established. Constructive cooperation with Western countries will be developed. In the shortest terms, Ukraine will become a transit transport corridor between Europe and Asia, that will significantly increase the national wealth" [39].

Against the all-Ukrainian background, all the above-mentioned candidates seemed to be advocates of further development of cooperation with the western nations. However, the level of support of the pro-western orientation among the Ukrainian population had somewhat declined after NATO's military operation in Kosovo.

Representatives of the left-wing parties, being hostile to the West, followed rigid rhetoric, dividing the international surrounding into friends and enemies. The programme of Petro Symonenko, the Communist Party leader, declared that "the foreign policy is becoming increasingly subordinate to dictates by the West and involvement into the orbit of NATO". At the same time, the communist leader proposed "pragmatism in protection of the state interests" as a basis of foreign policy provided that non-participation in military blocs is preserved. "Ukraine will not be a member of NATO. The state will pursue active peaceful policy. It will support and develop the European and global initiatives aimed at preventing the formation of a unipolar world. Ukraine will seek accession to all world and European associations, if this contributes to the authority of the state and strengthening its economic potential". He also declared intention to insistently activities aimed at "establishing a Union of

sovereign states of fraternal peoples on mutually beneficial contractual basis." The top priority was determined as a dynamic development of relations with Russia, Belarus, and their recognition as strategic allies, establishing a unified economic space".

Natalia Vitrenko, the Head of the radical left Progressive Socialist Party, proposed "to consider Russia and Belarus as strategic partners. Her main idea was to create a collective security system between the three Slavic nations: Russia, Ukraine and Belarus, and renounce the non-nuclear status of Ukraine. Vitrenko suggested that "denunciation of agreements with the International Monetary Fund is a major precondition for recovery of the national industry" and that servicing of external debts should be "frozen".

The notion envisaging renunciation of the non-nuclear status of Ukraine was also included into the programmes of Yuriy Karmazin (Defenders of the Motherland Party) and Oleksandr Rzhavsky (the All-Ukrainian political association "A Single Family").

The election programme of Oleksandr Tkachenko, then-Chairman of the Supreme Council, did not dwell on the foreign policy issues. Nevertheless, as a top state official he had rather clearly demonstrated the peculiarities of his personal views on foreign policy. They included the anti-Western attitude and ideas of reintegration within the Eastern Slavic trilateral union.

The programme of Oleksandr Moroz, the Chairman of the Socialist Party of Ukraine, underlined importance of relations with Russia, Belarus and other neighbouring countries, which "should be fraternal, equal and mutually beneficial" and that the foreign policy should be "civilised and predictable". He also intended to support efforts towards "creation of an effective mechanism of security and cooperation in Europe and the world".

In the presidential campaign of 1999 the appeals to self-reliance on Ukraine's own potential and hindering to increase protectionism were included in election programmes of the most candidates. The left-wingers speculated on various modifications of reintegration of the post-Soviet space and suggested distancing from the West. For instance, renunciation of "predatory foreign credits" was declared by the Cherkassy Mayor Volodymyr Oliynyk (a member of the "Kaniv Four Group," which was created during the 1999 campaign by several anti-Kuchma candidates including Oleksandr Moroz, Yevhen Marchuk, and Oleksandr Tkachenko). Oleksandr Rzhavsky also called "to revise international obligations" and withdraw "from international agreements which were unfavourable for Ukraine".

In general, foreign policy was on the periphery of societal attention. Real foreign policy debates usually remain beyond the public domain and fail to become a subject for open discussion. Mass public consciousness still perceives the external world schematically, in a simplified and, at the same time, distorted manner. The 'far abroad' remains unfamiliar, snobbery and frequently hostile. Phenomenon of a 'crisis isolationism' complicates the development of a long-term international strategy and reduces limits of its possible public support by the population. Essential strata of the society feel neither the direct benefits of international cooperation, nor the necessity of its activation. Under such circumstances Ukraine runs the risk of eventually turning into a vulnerable and marginal international actor.

The three main tendencies, or paradigms, are present in Ukraine's political behaviour.

- The leftists support the orientation at the establishment of a "fraternal union" with Russia.
- The second might be characterised as "a specific path of Ukraine presuming equidistant position both from the Euro-Atlantic community and Russia. It is pertaining to enhancement of "indivisibility" and independence, unity and integrity of Ukraine as an independent state, and represents an isolationist tendency to a large extent. This paradigm is also noticeable in the programmes of national-democratic and right wing

political parties, and often dominates in the political course of the official executive authorities. Following this paradigm, Ukraine's foreign policy often used a practise of tactical balancing between NATO, the EU and Russia, attempting to combine the reduced principle of neutrality with orientation at the European integration.

- The third orientation foresees a clear desire to achieve a full-scale participation in the European integration processes and comprehensive joining the transatlantic security structures. It is important that this orientation which may be conditionally defined as pro-Western, has an evident support among the staff of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine.

The principal contradiction is that the foreign policy expectations by the most of population are still hopeless and inadequate to the actual trends of international development. The impact of international environment, determination of the long-term national interests, as well as the consequent and adequate policy priorities require constructive domestic transformations, accompanied by a focussed propaganda of contemporary European political and social values and principles. It is evident that under such circumstances the domestic politics will exert a more profound and long-term influence on the international situation of Ukraine than the factors of its external relations.

#### **4.4. Security Issues in the Domestic Political Discussion**

Joining in future the European integration space was officially proclaimed as the main stream of Ukraine's development. For the first time the European vector of the foreign-policy orientation was outlined in the conceptual document "The Main Guidelines of the Foreign Policy of Ukraine" (Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine of 2 July 1993) and the Agreement on Partnership and Cooperation between Ukraine and the EU of 14 June 1994. Later, in the annual report of the Verkhovna Rada of 2 April 1996 President Kuchma reinforced this accent declaring: "Integration into Europe is our conscious and strategic choice".

After Kuchma's re-election for the second presidential term in 1999 the priority of Ukraine's course for integration into Europe as its orientation to join the European Union in the future was reaffirmed in clear and doubtless wording. However, poor results of the Ukrainian economy as well as uncertain position of the executive power in the foreign policy issues cast doubt on the reality of the European prospects for Ukraine at least in the next decade.

By 2004 Ukraine may not obtain a status of the EU associated member remaining for the countries of integrated Europe a part of the external Eastern European space which access to the sphere of integration relations in the intermediate-term is not envisaged.

Another important factor is Ukraine's vulnerability in the terms of its economic relations with Russia. On the background of power deficit and debt burden Ukraine's position is objectively weakened by the bureaucracy corruption, oligarchic methods of management in the economy, backwardness of the production base, weakness of small business, lack of internal conditions for the national capital formation. These circumstances call forth not only disparities of the state to the standards of European integration but disarm its executive bodies in the face of Russia's policy of "encouragement towards integration". If elementary order was not made in the Ukrainian economy regarding timely payment for raw materials and energy resources by all economic entities on the equal terms, functioning of the inefficient economic system of Ukraine as an independent state will directly be dependent on

Russia's consent to supply natural gas to Ukraine and on the receipt of western financial aid to cover debts for the supply of energy resources.

According to political analysts present-a-day situation in Ukraine allows to foresee three alternative scenarios:

- collaboration with democratic countries on the basis of western liberal values and engagement in the processes of "democratic globalisation";
- imitation of similar collaboration allowing domestic evolution to quasi-democratic oligarchic regime;
- going into confrontation with the West, making image of its enemy (as it was practised in Russia in 1999-2000) [40].

From the point of view of stability only the first option can be considered self-sufficient and perspective, because the other two will logically end in Ukraine's entering Russia's sphere of influence.

As for the functional aspects of the country's participation in international relations only three circumstances could either remove or weaken contradictions between western (EU/NATO) and eastern (Russia, the CIS countries) vectors of the foreign policy of Ukraine, i.e.: re-orientation of Ukraine's economy for the market self-regulation mechanisms, establishment of a free trade zone within the CIS and achieving associated membership in the EU. By the way the European Commission proceeding from the economic aspects of globalisation and WTO requirements supports the idea of setting up a free trade zone in the post-Soviet space, between Ukraine and Russia [41].

As for the issue of Ukraine's introduction in NATO, this problem is appeared to be the most complicated from the point of view of Ukraine-Russia relations and indirect dependence on the state of relations between NATO and Russia. Outwardly, relations with NATO may be considered the most successful sphere of Ukraine's ties with western institutions. A series of visits to Kyiv of the highest officials of the Alliance as well as holding in Kyiv of the sitting of the Joint Ukraine - NATO Commission on the level of ambassadors (1-2 March 2000) symbolised the Alliance's interest in further development of relations, especially after a short pause and a period of uncertainty caused by the conduct of NATO military operation in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1999.

At the same time possible development of relations between Ukraine and NATO has a number of objective and subjective restrictions. Among the objective restrictions one can mention Ukraine's disparity to at least three of the four basic membership criteria. This concerns such requirements as availability of a developed and well functioning democratic system, effective market economy and civil and parliamentary control over the military and related structures.

As for the subjective factors, the specific influence on Ukraine-NATO relations can be made by long-term deployment in Sevastopol of the Black Sea Fleet of the Russian Federation. As some researchers state, at the end of 90's Ukraine and Russia found themselves in the field "of stronger mutual political influence" [42].

It is clear that this influence looks asymmetrically uneven and far stronger on the part of Russia. One can distinguish a number of trends of influence in the bilateral Russia-Ukraine relations among which are: political, military, economic, cultural, etc.

According to president of the Atlantic Council of Ukraine General Vadym Grechaninov, the foreign and defence policy of Ukraine is greatly influenced by some aspects of the

political interstate Treaty of 1997. In particular, Article 6 which “restricts actions of the parties concerning making agreements with the third party if such actions run counter to the interests of one of the parties”. Grechaninov made a conclusion that since the Treaty mentioned was concluded for the first term of not less than 10 years, during this period Ukraine is not entitled to conclude similar agreements on the entry to the Alliance because this conflicts with Russia's policy [43].

Among the aspects of Ukraine's orientation dependence in the spheres of foreign policy and European security upon NATO-Russia relations the Russian military presence on the territory of Ukraine (in Crimea) is the most indicative. The latter was confirmed by Ukrainian-Russian Agreements on the Black Sea Fleet (1997) and also taken into account in the CFE Adaptation Treaty signed at the Istanbul OSCE Summit in November 1999.

Another factor of general Ukraine's dependence upon Russia during the 1990s was its inability to pay for energy consumption insofar energy supplies were being delivered from Russia. Here, the main factor of Russia's influence was not so much the lack of alternative gas delivery sources or shortage of alternative delivery channels of petroleum and petrochemical as general insolvency of economic entities in the Ukrainian economy. Under such circumstances gas supplies were provided in a form of complicated commodity loan schemes including barter agreements. It was followed by further restructuring of the part of value of consumed fuel resources as Ukraine's state debt to the Russian Federation or Russia's gas producing monopoly RAO “Gazprom.” These non-market relations evidently influenced Ukraine's executive authority position hampering the intensity of its contacts with NATO.

At the same time the governmental circles of Russia strive to build relations with the European integration structures, NATO and the CIS on separate strategies and priorities. The content of relations between Russia and NATO was determined by certain form of compromise. The latter envisaged creation of some consultative mechanism, which took account of Russia's position on the European security, on one hand, and restrained Russia's military and political influence on the CEE and CIS countries, including the Baltic republics, Ukraine and Transcaucasia, on the other hand.

On the contrary the essence of Ukraine's foreign policy orientation consisted in broad expectation that the Alliance would be turned into the Euro-Atlantic system of collective security through reinforcing of political components in its activity. In this case Ukraine, without looking back at Russia's position, could become NATO member, at first, participating in its political structures, alike France in the 1970-1980s, and later gradually entering the structures of military planning.

Ukraine's position inevitably takes into account the superior position of the US, NATO and the EU in the contemporary world. The opportunities for direct positive impact on the situation and processes in Ukraine could be essentially increased by economic recovery and strengthening of democratic trends in the domestic development.

It is possible to foresee four variants of further development of NATO-Ukraine relations in the medium-term perspective (or, within the next 15 - 20 years).

(1) Continuation of the balancing policy between NATO and Russia in a multivector form. Creation of an international NATO/PfP training facilities on the Yavoriv polygon (in the Lviv region) will become factor counterbalancing the presence of the Russian Black Sea Fleet base in Sevastopol and increasing further possibilities for manoeuvre.

(2) Joining NATO simultaneously with Russia if relations between Russia and the West are essentially improved on the background of aggravation in relations of USA and

Russia with China. In this case the presence of Russia's naval base in Crimea will lose its current significance.

(3) Joining NATO separately from Russia (probably within a group of GUUAM countries). It may be caused or followed by aggravation of principal contradictions in relations between the West and Russia in the Black Sea area. This way of events may put forward a question on denouncing the 1997 Black Sea Fleet Agreements and probably the Ukrainian-Russian general treaty of 1997

(4) Freezing relations with NATO as a result of joining a scope of international structures created under Russia's domination. These are the Union of Russia and Belarus, the Eurasian Economic Community and the Tashkent Pact.

For the ruling circles of Ukraine its asymmetric political and economic dependence on the so-called Western and Russian vectors was acceptable unless it allowed ensuring stability of the political regime and enjoying full sovereignty in domestic affairs. At the same time there is a feeling within the political establishment that the shift towards one of the above-mentioned vectors will decrease the limits of this sovereignty. In this sense position of Ukraine's Ministry of Defence looks the most indicative.

The senior staff of the Ministry of Defence silently resisted to the establishment of civil control over the military department. The General Staff of the Armed Forces objecting to cooperation within the framework of PfP program always gave preference to the principle of military non-alignment. Some statements of the top military officials caused a diplomatic confuse. For example, on 10 May 2000 the Defence Minister Oleksandr Kuzmuk during his visit to Russia made a demonstrative statement that "Ukraine does not have an aim to join NATO. Kuzmuk's statement was made simultaneously with the meeting of the Joint Ukraine-NATO Commission in Brussels, which was attended by General-Colonel Volodymyr Shkidchenko, Head of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of Ukraine.

Speaking in Great Novgorod (Russia), Oleksandr Kuzmuk emphasised that "any speculations of the so-called 'politicians' on that issue were their own personal thoughts. ... There is a state policy, according to which Ukraine never declared its readiness to join NATO". At the same time the Minister positively assessed the level of military cooperation between Ukraine and Russia. "Our cooperation is effective, dynamic and develops in the line of ascent". He commented that "we have a joint vision on all of the questions of mutual interest. It is also related to the problem of co-existence of the two fleets in Sevastopol. Both fleets emerged from a common root, they keep fraternal relations which nobody is able to hamper" [44].

After the right-centrists Parliamentary majority was formed in the Verkhovna Rada on 21 January 2000, the profile Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs made attempts to clarify contemporary conceptual approach towards European Security and Ukraine-NATO relations. It was partly caused by the consequences of NATO operation against FRY in 1999. Debates in the Committee reflected a relative decline of support for the idea of Ukraine's rapprochement with NATO among the politicians. In 2000 - 2001 the idea of joining NATO was rarely expressed, at least in the public.

In the perception of European security problems by the centrist-oriented politicians, the issues of cooperation with NATO are often not considered urgent. According to the First Vice-Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee Oleksandr Pukhkal, inexpedience to raise an issue of joining NATO has a geopolitical background, especially because of negative attitude on the part of Russia. "Since Russia is a priority factor for Ukraine, at least, in the nearby space, it is purposeless for Ukraine to hurry into NATO at any price. In Pukhkal's view,

NATO's crisis response operation in Kosovo has a relatively negative impact on the internal transformation processes freezing development of its political components.

It is also advisable to remind the arguments which are used to prove the tactics of the foreign policy balancing. Putin's advent (rise) to power in 1999 evoked a sense of anxiety among the Ukrainian politicians who expected increasing pressure on behalf of Russia. As several Ukrainian politicians state Putin's factor accelerated Ukraine's rapprochement with NATO in autumn 1999 - spring 2000. However, after Putin's visit to Ukraine on 17 - 18 April 2000 these sentiments declined. As to Oleksandr Pukhkal, "a more quiet vision of evolutionary development in Ukraine-NATO relations within the framework of PfP is a dominant position. Although it is not expedient to underestimate an opportunity of signing a new extended document with NATO after the terms and tasks of the existing Charter performed. This new document may determine further directions of relations with the Alliance [45].

It is expedient that prospects for cooperation with NATO should rely not only on perceptions and policy considerations of executive authorities but also on the development of democratic institutions within the Ukrainian society and public support of the population.

## **5. Impact of Ukraine - NATO Cooperation on Ukraine's Foreign Policy.**

### **5.1. Developing Ukraine – NATO Partnership**

In 1994-98 Ukraine's foreign policy was officially explained as a multi-vector or two-vector oriented. Relations with NATO and EU as well as with the states of Central Eastern Europe and the CIS were considered as the most important foreign policy dimensions.

Unlike the majority of Russian politicians, the Ukrainian leaders actually have never opposed NATO enlargement. Starting from 8 June 1992, when the first Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk first visited NATO Headquarters in Brussels, Ukraine's executive authorities have been taking more or less successful steps in developing cooperation with the Alliance. Collaboration with the transatlantic security structures was initially recognised as a matter of principal importance.

Ukraine was the first CIS country, which signed the PfP framework document in February 1994. Later, Ukraine has become an active participant in NATO's PfP programme. Its Individual Partnership Programme (IPP), approved on 1 June 1995, envisaged Ukraine's participation in all 19 spheres of activities listed in the PfP. They include cooperation in different fields: from combat readiness and interoperability to the activities in civil emergency situations and crisis management. Ukraine attached greater importance to the PfP consulting facilities. Practical military cooperation between Ukraine, the NATO member states and other active participants in the PfP programme was also developed.

Ukraine showed considerable interest towards the activities of the NACC. Since summer 1994, it has taken part in a number of field exercises within the PfP. Ukraine-NATO agreements provided an opportunity for appointment of representatives to the Coordination Partnership Centre and an officer for communications at the NATO Headquarters in Brussels.

Recognising Ukraine's significance and role in the European security, in September 1995 NATO and Ukraine negotiated the strengthening of mutual cooperation. These decisions included the establishment of a consultative mechanism between NATO and Ukraine at different levels, especially in the "16+1" format to cover the following spheres of activity:

- European security architecture and other political problems and questions of security;
- Cooperation regarding conflict prevention and crisis response;
- Operations to maintain peace as well as humanitarian and other similar actions;
- Nuclear security;
- Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction;
- Disarmament and arms control;
- Developing, in cooperation with the Ukrainian government, NATO's information activity in Ukraine, etc. [46].

Since that, high consideration was given to development of the principles of special partnership between Ukraine and NATO. Political and diplomatic contacts of Central and Eastern European governments activated on the eve of the first stage of post-Cold War NATO enlargement were followed by an accelerated correction of foreign policy outlooks. This trend involved Ukraine as well. Addressing the senior staff meeting of Ukraine's Foreign Ministry on 15 July 1996, President Leonid Kuchma stated that "integration into European structures and development of the transatlantic cooperation" was "the conscious choice and the strategic aim of Ukraine". Although, cooperation with the CIS states was also mentioned as traditionally important [47].

In 1996, among the foreign policy priorities of the state, President Kuchma emphasised the strategic aims of Ukraine's integration into the European Union and participation in the transatlantic security cooperation. Other important goals and dimensions included full membership in the Central European Initiative, creation of a free trade zone with the European Union, establishment of "a special partnership" with NATO, obtaining associated partnership status in the Western European Union, and creation of the Central European nuclear free zone.

There were several circumstances, which determined the idea content of Ukraine's domestic debates prior to the first wave of NATO enlargement. Firstly, Ukraine's specific aims consisted in the prevention of its isolation from the European security cooperation processes. This could happen in case if NATO states made a choice to keep non-conflict relationship with Russia at the expense of security interests of Ukraine and several other states in the post-Soviet space.

Secondly, some experts in Kyiv expressed fears that Ukraine might lose its "strategic significance" and "critically important role" in the European security system after the first stage of NATO enlargement was complete. This threatened Ukraine with aggravation of Russia's pressure and could leave it alone in unresolved disputed issues in Ukrainian-Russian relations.

Thirdly, most Ukrainian politicians expected increase of both great-power and imperial aspirations in the Russian internal political affairs and reflections of this spirit in foreign policy, which permanently claimed recognition of Russia's domination in the post-Soviet space.

That's why despite of the eventual 'non-bloc' status of the state Ukraine's Executive Branch expected to establish a more formal and lasting relationship with NATO. At the press conference held on 26 July 1996 in the Polish Parliament, President Kuchma mentioned Ukraine's striving for "broader cooperation with NATO than it was envisaged by '16+1' format" [48].

According to Volodymyr Horbulin, Secretary of the National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine in 1994-99, this question was discussed at the negotiations with the US Administration on 15-20 September 1996. Later, on 22 November 1996, Anton Buteiko, then a special representative of the President of Ukraine and First Deputy Foreign Minister, handed NATO Secretary General Javier Solana a draft Ukraine's proposal for the formalisation of relations between Ukraine and NATO on the basis of a Distinctive Partnership [49].

Ukraine's foreign policy officials managed to find modifications for a 'non-bloc' or 'military non-aligned' status that could prevent Ukraine's exclusion from Euro-Atlantic integration in the spheres of security and defence. There were even some considerations that Ukraine may expect to obtain 'associated membership' in political establishments within NATO and achieve associated partnership status within the WEU [50].

Ukraine's governmental circles remained anxious for possible troubles in relations with Russia which was reflected in President Kuchma's reminding that NATO enlargement should consider interests of neutral and non-aligned states. At the Lisbon OSCE Summit of 2 December 1996 Leonid Kuchma defined geopolitical position of Ukraine more exactly: "Ukraine is a state which desires but for certain reasons is unable to join the EU, WEU, and NATO" [51].

The adherents to the Euro-Atlantic orientation of Ukraine suggested that the non-bloc status of Ukraine would be of transitional character and should be altered and changed in the context of progress in transatlantic cooperation and its development into a collective security system. At the North Atlantic Cooperation Council meeting in Brussels on 4 June 1996, Hennadiy Udoenko stated that "Ukraine's future status will not necessarily be non-aligned". Abstaining from NATO membership should not be considered as a barrier to cooperation with the countries having mutual interests with Ukraine.

Peculiarities of Ukrainian international security position and foreign policy formation determined proposals to proclaim Central Europe a nuclear free zone. Although this idea had something in common with the non-nuclear Aleksandr Lukashenko's initiative, the official Kyiv considered non-deployment of nuclear weapons in the Central Eastern European countries as naturally proceeding from nuclear disarmament of Ukraine. The Kyiv executive authorities took into consideration that during January 1992 - June 1996 Ukraine had agreed to destroy and do away with the third largest nuclear arsenal in the world. The second principal option was that the recognition of Central Eastern Europe a nuclear free zone would prohibit deployment of Russian nuclear weapons in the Russia's part of the Black Sea Fleet and prevent re-targeting of NATO missiles at the military aims on the Ukrainian territory.

At the same time, deployment of nuclear weapons in the new NATO member states, the neighbours of Ukraine, will inevitably result in the aggravation of military and political tensions, primarily, in NATO-Russia relations. It was also clear that there were no possible targets for NATO's nuclear missiles on Ukraine's territory, except for the Russia's Black Sea Fleet. On 9 December 1996, the joint declaration of NAC meeting at the ministerial level stated that NATO had no intentions and motives to place nuclear weapons on the territories of its new members.

Ukraine's call for additional security guarantees on behalf of relevant "primary security organisations" for the states not participating in collective defence alliances found no support at the OSCE Lisbon Summit and was not reflected in its decisions. The only concept proposed on behalf of the EU at the preparatory meeting held on the eve of the Summit and included into the text of the Lisbon declaration was the commitment of the OSCE Heads of State or Government to attach importance to security concerns of all participating States irrespective of whether they belong or not to the military structures or agreements.

Ukraine's expectations were mostly reflected in the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine, which specified general dimensions and important aspects of cooperation. The Charter escaped definitions related to Ukraine's non-bloc status. From the official Kyiv point of view, a "distinctive partnership" with NATO could put an end to the country's vague international position caused by the destructive consequences of "geopolitical pluralism".

However, the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine included a provision that NATO member states "will continue to support Ukrainian sovereignty and independence, territorial integrity (...) and the principle of inviolability of frontiers as key factors of stability and security in Central and Eastern Europe and on the continent as a whole". The Charter stipulated that Ukraine and NATO would develop "a crisis consultative mechanism to consult together whenever Ukraine perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence or security" [52].

NATO also declared its support of the fact that Ukraine, as a non-nuclear weapon state, received security assurances from all five of the nuclear-weapon states parties to the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

By signing the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership with NATO on 9 July 1997, Ukraine established the highest ever-possible level of cooperation with the North-Atlantic Alliance within Ukraine's actually 'non-bloc' status. Since Ukraine was officially not even considered as a candidate in the first or second waves of entry into NATO, it seemed reasonable to evaluate what benefits and what losses the processes of NATO/EAPC/PfP and EU/WEU eastward extension would bring to the country.

On the other hand, such aspect as an increasing gap with its western neighbours in integration to the Euro-Atlantic and European institutions doesn't correspond to the Ukrainian security interests. Thus, the main task while determining Ukraine's attitude towards changing CEE security landscape should be formulated as ensuring and strengthening of its European connection. Today's interest of Ukraine's executive authorities requires the necessity to clarify criteria of cooperation and possible formal relations with the EU and its institutions dealing with defence and security cooperation.

During the Kosovo crisis in 1999, the Ukrainian Parliament being sharply critical of NATO's military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, nevertheless did not, in its foreign policy resolutions and statements, vote for the breaking of Ukraine-NATO relations. Recognition of the fact that NATO is the most influential and effective military and security organisation in the OSCE area turned attempts of the leftist factions in the Parliament to initiate debates on anti-NATO principles of foreign policy into a noisy *démarche* rather than a serious and realistic conceptual approach. Thus, the gap between the two possible options of Ukrainian foreign policy in post-Cold War Europe is too narrow. Accordingly, the Ukrainian position may vary between closer cooperation with NATO aimed at future membership, and 'military non-aligned' or 'non-bloc' policy in the sense of non-participation in defence alliances and politico-military arrangements, like that of Sweden, Austria, Finland or the Irish Republic.

In this connection, Ukraine's foreign policy activities and initiatives frequently reflected real contradictions arising out of the specific position of the state in contemporary European geopolitics and international relations.

## **5.2. Ukraine's Security Prospects in the Context of NATO Enlargement**

Observing Ukraine's experience of integration into and interaction within the European political and economic space, it is essential to find out what forms of participation in the reforming transatlantic security system and developing subregional systems of cooperation would have the best effect on a long-term national security position.

Subregional aspects of European security politics have a specific character due to the evident priority of European integration trends. Under such conditions regional cooperation mechanisms execute particular secondary tasks. Their role, however, might be very essential in promotion of interaction between the EU and NATO member states, on the one hand, and the European countries not included to these organisations, on the other hand. Subregional cooperation mechanisms usually cover a limited circle of participants but they might be extremely efficient in resolving their tasks. It might be fully referred to such organisations and mechanisms as the Central European Free Trade Area, the Baltic Sea States Cooperation Council, the Nordic Council, the Central European Initiative, the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organisation, etc.

Considering the level of security assurances from NATO and OSCE, Ukraine could focus not only on creating and maintaining the military efficiency of its own armed forces, but also on participation in multilateral cooperation. Political independence and stability of Ukraine was widely recognised as a positive international factor, which regained better security and steadiness.

From the point of view of today's prospects for Ukraine's participation in the new European security architecture it is possible to foresee an abstract opportunity to implement one of the four options of its status in European and transatlantic security relations. They can be arranged in the form of a hierarchy based on efficiency, security guarantees, and stability criteria with regard to the international position of Ukraine.

*Variant 1.* A status of a purely non-bloc state (or a military non-aligned state) striving to increase its participation in European and transatlantic processes but finding itself in a strong economic and, to the lesser extent, political and military dependence upon Russia. It might be true as soon as a non-bloc status of Ukraine was declared a unilateral initiative, and because the external assurances with regard to its security refer predominantly to the challenge of nuclear threat. (This may be related especially to the 1994 Budapest OSCE Summit Memorandum on Security Assurances to Ukraine on behalf of Russia, the UK and the US). This state of affairs may be characterised as the least stable and transitional.

*Variant 2.* The current position of a state associated with the developing and extending Atlantic Community in a form of an agreement establishing a distinctive partnership and multi-dimensional cooperation with NATO. This form of involving Ukraine into the system of European security envisages mechanism of consultations on all problems posing external threat to the state security or regional stability.

It is, however, difficult to make conclusions on the effectiveness of this form of involvement into the European and Euro-Atlantic security relations. Its effectiveness might actually depend on the scale of economic and political stability of the country possessing such a status.

*Variant 3.* Non-aligned state with an internationally recognised neutrality status. Austria possessed a similar status under the conditions of the four-lateral Treaty on the Restoration of Independent and Democratic Austria (1955) as well as some other states in different times of their history including, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Belgium, Sweden, etc. Although this formula provides a pretty high scale of international security guarantees, it sufficiently restricts prospects for participation in politico-military cooperation.

*Variante 4.* From the point of view of international security full membership in NATO and other associated Euro-Atlantic structures is considered as the most stable position of the state.

Today Ukraine's membership in NATO is not regarded as possible owing to internal and external circumstances. At the same time, a number of Ukrainian political movements even now pose a question of the necessity to declare a striving for participation in the North Atlantic Alliance in the future. Experts' opinion polls (civil service officials, deputies of the Parliament, political scientists, and journalists) suggest great interests in the development of cooperation with Euro-Atlantic structures.

However, there is a definite gap between the foreign policy thought and internal conditions of the country's development. In this aspect, neither interim results of social and economic transformations nor military and financial conditions, to say nothing on the Russia's Naval presence in Crimea, make it possible to raise a question of Ukraine's entry into NATO in the near future.

During the visit of Secretary General of NATO Javier Solana to Ukraine on 7 May 1997, some details concerning NATO-Ukraine relations were clarified. At the summit meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Madrid on 9 July 1997 a Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between Ukraine and NATO was signed. According to Javier Solana, this agreement recognised "international weight and significance of Ukraine and its undoubted potential to play an important role in European security" [13]. There were hopes that Ukraine's membership in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) would ensure its involvement in the new security architecture with open prospects for further integration [53].

The Ukraine-NATO Charter, however, does not contain provisions on extended security assurances from NATO. Thus, contemporary position of Ukraine from the stability criteria point of view will be somewhere between the first and the second models mentioned above. The non-bloc status functions therefore are likely to be gradually reduced to formal non-participation in multilateral military defence alliances. In such a way, the 'non-bloc' status itself may be subject to a considerable change.

In this context Ukraine might follow one of the alternative options:

- Concentrating attention on the experience of an interaction with such states as Sweden, Finland, Austria, etc., which hasn't yet participated in military alliances either, or
- Intensively developing the volume and scale of military and political cooperation with NATO.

During 1997-98 the second option undoubtedly dominated in the security policy of Ukraine's executive power institutions (the Presidential Administration, the National Security and Defence Council, Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defence). On 4 November 1998 President Kuchma in a form of Presidential Decree approved the State Programme of Cooperation of Ukraine with NATO until the year 2001. This detailed and ambitious document was focused on the intensive integration of Ukraine into the Euro-Atlantic multinational security institutions and might be treated as a preparatory step towards Ukraine's entry into NATO in the future.

On the other hand, regional and geopolitical features of Ukraine's position determined interaction and foreign policy coordination with the Central European states such a Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Slovakia. Another prospective trend of cooperation emerged in multilateral contacts with Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Moldova. In the context of NATO enlargement, it was aimed at the localisation of possible destabilising factors and processes in the subregional circumstance.

Distinctions in Ukraine's and Russia's attitudes towards NATO enlargement stipulated the necessity to examine in more detail the so-called "Russian factor" in the Eastern European politics.

Ukraine's position at the end of 1990s supposed the following basic principles:

- Ukraine's executive authority did not ever oppose NATO enlargement, expecting NATO's evolution into a core of the broadened Euro-Atlantic collective security system.
- Relations of NATO with Ukraine and Russia turned into parallel and different rather than mutually inter-linked dimensions since they were supposed to resolve different and not coinciding tasks.

The official joining of NATO by Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in March 1999 completed the first stage of NATO enlargement. In a short-term dimension NATO's enlargement to the East had a positive impact on the international position of Ukraine. It stimulated the Russian Federation to certain, though inconsistent, steps towards normalisation of relations with Ukraine. It included the 1997 "Basic Political Treaty", the Agreements on the Black Sea Fleet, and also the restoration of political contacts between the different-level actors of the two states.

Indirectly NATO enlargement opened opportunity for the settlement of some gravely disputed issues with Romania. It also precipitated the Ukrainian-Polish friendly dialogue. The mutual interests of the two states, which gave birth to the strategic partnership relations, were turned into a form clearly complementary to NATO enlargement process.

In some sense it also pressed upon the Russian Federation to self-limit its interests. Midterm aftermath of the NATO enlargement in political aspect cannot be fully prognosticated at the present moment. However, in our view, the most evident of the consequences result, first of all, from the progress in the field of military and technical as well as purely military cooperation of Ukraine with NATO member states (the details will follow).

Indicative for Ukraine in elucidating the position of the present U.S. administration as regards Ukraine's aspiration to join NATO is the statement by Strobe Talbott (one of the co-authors of the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between Ukraine and NATO) made in spring 1998 at a conference on the issues relating to Ukraine's security. Explaining the definition "distinctive" in the title of the Ukraine-NATO Charter, he emphasised that relations being developed between the Alliance and Ukraine are independent and, at the same time, cognisant of the importance (for the USA, NATO, and Ukraine) of the relations between Russia and the Alliance which are in the making.

The Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine (hereinafter referred to as the "Charter") is to play the role of setting up the construction for the development and expansion of special kind relationship between NATO and Ukraine. According to the Charter, this relationship is to be based on the principle that security of all OSCE member states is invisible, meaning that security of one country depends upon that of the other one. The Charter states that the NATO member states undertake to support Ukraine as regards its sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity, and inviolability of frontiers, to promote its democratic development and economic prosperity that are considered to be the key factors of stability and security of Central and Eastern Europe and the continent at large, as well as to facilitate intensified integration of Ukraine into all-European and Euro-Atlantic structures. NATO welcomes the fact that Ukraine received security assurances from all nuclear weapon states.

Certain agreements signed by NATO with Russia and Ukraine are essentially different in objectives and principles. Differences in the texts result not only from Russia's status of a

“larger major state”, but also from the initial appraisal of Russia’s and Ukraine’s positions as regards NATO enlargement. Whereas Russia and NATO declared in the Founding Act that they will not consider each other as adversaries in the future, the Ukraine – NATO Charter emphasises Alliance’s positive role in promoting peace and stability in Europe as well as enhancing stability and confidence in the Euro-Atlantic area.

NATO and Ukraine expressly rejected Russia’s idea of superior competence and responsibility of a particular state on a part of the OSCE area. The Charter confirmed the right of any state to undertake decisions on its participation in the alliances and security arrangements. This provision was missed in the Act as well.

Under the Charter joint military exercises are to be held on the territory of Ukraine. On the contrary, NATO exercises on the territory of Russia are hardly possible for many reasons.

According to the Charter both parties will take part in consultations on export of armaments and proliferation of weapon technologies, especially exports to the countries ruled by dictatorial and/or aggressive regimes. For Russia this issue is rather painstaking. The Russian leadership regards NATO enlargement as, incidentally, an attempt to prevent exports of Russian weaponry hinting that the major intention of the West is to oust Russia from the international market of armaments.

NATO promised to support Ukraine in the conduct of reforms in civil-military relations in order to enhance civil control over the military and related bodies. This issue was not mentioned in the Russia-NATO Founding Act. On the other hand, the Charter contains no statement on strategic disarmament so far as Ukraine since 1 June 1996 has had no possessions of nuclear weapons.

The differences between the Charter and the Act are of a principal character, besides, they also give an idea of further actions of Ukraine, in particular, as regards involving joint consultative mechanisms: the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC) and NATO-Ukraine Commission.

The mechanism provided by the Act is more detailed and it gives Russia an opportunity to enjoy its international significance and, if not affects, than, at least, expresses its own position as regards NATO’s global strategy and current policy. Thus, the Act envisages that PJC will held meetings on various levels and in various forms. At the level of foreign and Defence ministers, they are to be held twice a year, at the level of ambassadors, monthly; there are also meetings to be held at the level of permanent representatives in the North-Atlantic Council and those at the level of military representatives. PJC will be jointly headed by the NATO Secretary General and a representative of Russia. It is envisaged to create appropriate administrative structures as well as to establish Russia’s mission to NATO headed by a representative in the rank of ambassador.

As regards the mechanism of holding consultations and cooperation between NATO and Ukraine, there is no clearly specified timetable of meetings. Prevailing are the formulas “by mutual consent”. For Ukraine it is also envisaged to elaborate a crisis consultative mechanism in case Ukraine encounters a direct threat to its territory, independence, and security. At the same time, the Funding Act clearly states that in case of a threat to either party on the part of another party PJC will function as a consultative centre.

In other words, comparison of the two documents evidences that in contrast to the NATO-Russia Council envisaged as a permanently functioning independent body, the NATO-Ukraine Commission is a less capable and influential structure.

Nevertheless, the Ukraine-NATO Charter ranks rather high among the Ukrainian foreign policy elite. Ukrainian experts think that the Charter has created the mechanism of

expanding and improving the already existing relations between NATO and Ukraine inside NATO structure whilst the NATO-Russia Act lays relevant relationship between the contracting parties beyond NATO. The difference resembles that between a treaty on partnership and a treaty on non-aggression.

In many dimensions the Charter is of symbolical character. Its significance lies in the fact that it demonstrates importance of security, independence, and sovereignty of Ukraine for Europe and NATO.

It is expedient to review main logical premises, which influenced the formation of Ukraine's foreign policy course. For the majority of Ukrainian politicians and analysts the most significant notion of the Charter was that of recognising Ukraine as an integral part of the Central and Eastern Europe. Starting from this point of view, endless disputes as regards the role and place of Ukraine in Europe, the future European security architecture, and the reasonability of participation in the CIS, in which Russia was dominating, were considered as misfortunes of Ukraine's virtual non-bloc status. It was undoubtedly clear that Ukraine's executive authorities realised the non-compliance of this intermediary position with the post-Cold War international realities. On the other hand, constant attempts to achieve lasting reconciliation with Russia failed. Primarily, it was related to the economic sphere. Political détente caused short-term periods of hampering the unfair competition, which were inevitably changed by imposition of tax and tariff barriers and implementation of other restrictive regulations. Therefore, relations in the NATO-Ukraine and the US-Ukraine format had to be largely considered in the shadow of Russia's international position. Consequently, the tasks of the Ukrainian diplomacy were linked with the emphasising of independence and establishment of direct relations with multilateral international organisations.

However, the model of the future European security system is less evident than the every next stage of NATO enlargement.

It is possible to suggest that NATO's role will depend on its functional capabilities, the terms and area of enlargement, relations with the EU, and the world-wide globalisation processes affecting the North – South dialogue.

There is also a "new generation" of security threats. Certain problems of instability are of non-military origin and cannot be solved by military means. There is an increased demand for the use of peacemaking function and reliable means of enforcing and maintaining peace. NATO is still better accommodated to military rather than civil operations and has no other effective means than the military ones.

Another matter of discussion is an issue of the possible area of NATO enlargement. As many western politicians acknowledge, if the NATO "door" is going to be closed after the first wave, it will create tension, and, instead of stimulus for integration, establish a new line of division in Europe. At the same time, the idea of the "all-European NATO" is less than possible. Transforming the Alliance into another kind of OSCE will make its activities devoid of the present-day effectiveness (due to a large number of members that are at the different levels of economic and political development and their military strength).

Thus, NATO may exist as a partial component within an all-European security system implementing continental tasks. Otherwise, NATO may cease to be a merely defence military alliance and transform into the all-European security system.

However, even under gaining functions of collective security NATO will not necessarily open its door for new members. The Alliance can choose the form of existence that would entwine all European states by a system of reciprocal agreements and commitments. Already now, in the result of the NATO-taken measures in settling the Bosnia crisis and the course toward adaptation to the present-day international surrounding, NATO has developed

mechanisms and established structures that provide essentially broad possibilities for NATO non-member states to take part in NATO operations under the UN or OSCE mandate (IFOR/SFOR, Combined Joint Task Force, PfP, and others).

Thus, for instance the Stabilisation Force (SFOR) involved 20 countries, including Ukraine. It should be stated that the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between Ukraine and NATO has become, in its essence, the official international recognition and approval of Ukraine's right to take part in operations, including the military ones, in which the above-mentioned NATO structures are involved.

Under any scenario, until the military force remains the only reliable guarantor of international security, Ukraine is interested in the existence of NATO, in preserving Atlantic solidarity, and in the American presence in Europe. Another inclination to that is the factor of unpredictability of the Russian foreign policy.

Ukrainian chances to join NATO belong to the issues of long-term policy, though, the most tough US critics of the decision on NATO enlargement considered that in case of the "worst scenario" of developments in Russia Ukraine should receive an invitation to join NATO. The most real aspect of acknowledging the key role of Ukraine for the European security is the widespread assumption: the West cannot afford turning Ukraine into another Belarus. At the same time it is hardly possible to expect that the US and many other Allies will welcome Ukraine's application to be included into the next round of NATO enlargement. Although, under the existing European security composition Ukraine's political and strategic significance will remain unchanged in the foreseeable future notwithstanding its domestic political and economic misfortunes.

### **5.3. State Programme for Cooperation of Ukraine with NATO, 1998 - 2001**

A strong effect on Ukraine-NATO cooperation was provided by the State Programme for Cooperation of Ukraine with NATO for the period until the year 2001, approved by the Presidential Decree No.1209/1998 on 4 November 1998. Its was aimed at providing the implementation of the Ukraine-NATO Charter on a Distinctive Partnership. The principal significance of the Programme was recognised by the fact of attacks on the part of the leftist forces, primarily in the Parliament. The leftists claimed allegedly unconstitutional character of the Programme. The accusations were groundless since the Programme was prepared and adopted in accordance with competence of the President and his obligations under the Constitution of Ukraine, the "Main Guidelines of Ukraine's Foreign Policy", the Military Doctrine of Ukraine, and the "Concept (Principles of State Policy) of National Security of Ukraine" approved by the Verkhovna Rada. The real reason of the strong reaction of the leftists to the Programme was that its successful implementation meant establishment of a system of multidimensional Ukraine-NATO interdependence, which would undoubtedly make senseless continuation of any discussion about geopolitical priorities of Ukraine. The review of main provisions of the Programme supports this thesis.

Generally, the Programme mentioned that Ukraine's strategic goal is full-scale integration into the European and Euro-Atlantic security structures. It was contrary to any attempts to revive the search of security within any military-political entity like CIS or "three-lateral union of Slavic states". Moreover, among all existing security structures on the European continent Ukraine "considered NATO as the most effective structure" because of "sizeable contribution of this organisation to safeguarding peace, stability, and the overall climate of confidence in the Euro-Atlantic space, to the creation of a new architecture of security in Europe, to deepening the process of disarmament, control over armaments, and non-proliferation of mass destruction weapons".

Therefore, Ukraine was increasing activities in the EAPC and participation in different measures within the framework of the Partnership for Peace Programme. Developing cooperation with NATO, Ukraine aimed at guaranteeing its independence, democracy, and territorial integrity, strengthening external guarantees of national security, withstanding any emergence of new threats to stability and security in the region of Central and Eastern Europe, of which it is an inalienable part, and using the experience and assistance of the Alliance member states in building their own Armed Forces.

The Programme stipulated that the National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine had to establish the State Inter-Departmental Commission on Ukraine's Cooperation with NATO.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine (MFA), under the Programme, elaborated principles of relations with NATO and gave recommendations to the SIDC concerning cooperation with the Alliance, including improvement of its legal basis; organised the work of ministries and other central executive bodies on the formation of the Working Plan for implementing the Charter and Individual Partnership Programme (IPP); promoted establishment of close working contacts between ministries, other central executive bodies, Ukraine's working groups and respective NATO structural units; agreed with NATO the schedule and topics (according to Paragraphs 6 to 8 of the Charter) of holding joint sessions/seminars with NATO committees in the format "16+1" (including in Ukraine); as well as took part in seminars in accordance with the NATO/EAPC.

The Programme envisaged a crisis consultation mechanism to be developed jointly with NATO in the case of a threat to Ukraine's territorial integrity, sovereignty or security. Its main parameters had to provide for the holding of consultations upon Ukraine's (the President or, on his instruction, the Head of Ukraine's mission to NATO) or NATO initiative, convocation term being 12 hours; establishing direct telephone communications between the President of Ukraine and the NATO Secretary General; providing the NATO liaison office in Kyiv the status of an authorised body to deal with crisis situations.

Consultations on political matters within the mechanism had to be conducted either by the President of Ukraine, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine or the Head of Ukraine's Mission to NATO. The Programme envisaged that the President of Ukraine will held consultations during his meetings with the Secretary General of NATO and participate in summits of the North Atlantic Council/EAPC and in other higher level measures taking place under the NATO aegis or initiated by the member states/partners of this organisation (with subject and terms as mutually agreed). The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine might also held consultations during his participation in the EAPC meetings and in the Ukraine-NATO Commission (twice a year, after each North Atlantic Council meetings) and in the meetings with the NAC in the "16+1" format (not less than twice a year). The topics of the meetings should be (1) estimation of conditions for Ukraine-NATO relations and (2) determination of ways to deepen them. The Head of Ukraine's Mission at NATO might have consultations during his meetings with the NAC and NATO Political Committee in the "16+1" format (before/after the next NAC meetings in turn and those of the Political Committee), topics being the issues specified in paragraphs from 6 to 8 of the Charter or the issues of developing the Ukraine-NATO cooperation.

Consultations on problem issues of arms control were to be carried out on the permanent basis within the NATO Coordination Committee on control over the execution of agreements and aimed at taking Ukraine's position into account at the official negotiations in Vienna concerning adaptation of the CFE Treaty.

The Programme elaborated on the Ukraine-NATO regional cooperation, which was planned to include discussions of regional security issues, study the experience of the

preparation of the CEE countries for joining NATO, Ukraine's participation in subregional and all-European projects and programmes of cooperation which were being opened for future members of the Alliance. The following formats of regional cooperation were suggested:

1. Ukraine - NATO states - new NATO members (Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary);
2. Ukraine - NATO - other CEE states (potential applicants for joining NATO including Romania, Slovenia, Bulgaria, the Baltic states);
3. NATO - GUAM states (Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Moldova).

Coordination of cooperation in civil-military relations had to be conducted by the National Security and Defence Council, the Cabinet of Ministers, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine. In addition, the State Programme foresaw that representatives of the Verkhovna Rada, the Constitutional Court of Ukraine, judicial authorities, social and non-governmental institutions, mass media and independent experts will take part in the national and joint measures to ensure a step-by-step introduction in Ukraine of the system of civil control over the Armed Forces and other related units and democratic control over their activities, and to adapt the processes of defence budget formation and control over its execution in Ukraine to generally recognised mechanisms and procedures of NATO member states.

The Programme provided that Ukraine's cooperation with NATO in the military sphere be based on the principle of mutual openness. In this regard, Ukraine was "looking for the Alliance's assistance in safeguarding Ukraine's national security against external military challenges and threats, establishing Ukraine's defence cooperation with its neighbours, ensuring reform of Ukraine's military structures, especially, the Armed Forces and the defence-industrial complex as well as Ukraine's participation in measures for maintaining peace, security, and stability in Europe, including prevention of military conflicts and crisis management."

The Minister of Defence of Ukraine was charged by the Programme with participation in consultations on military-political issues during meetings of the EAPC and the Ukraine-NATO Commission (twice a year) as well as during negotiations with the military-political officials of NATO member states and partner countries. The topics were to be as follows: estimating the state of military-political relations between Ukraine and NATO, negotiating ways for building confidence and deepening cooperation in ensuring military security on the continent, prevention and resolution of armed conflicts, crisis management, peacekeeping operations, and adapting the CFE Treaty. The Minister of Defence had a competence to participate in negotiations with the Defence Planning Committee and Nuclear Planning Group of NATO at the level of the Ministers of Defence.

The Programme suggested that supporting NATO efforts for the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, Ukraine will take measures aimed at the elaboration of special joint cooperation programmes in the field of non-proliferation and arms control, training of Ukrainian specialists, and participation in the work for observing the Convention on Chemical Weapons.

The document pointed out the following objectives of Ukraine's military cooperation with NATO:

- to use the experience and assistance of NATO member states and partner countries for reforming and building the Armed Forces and other military units of Ukraine;

- to enhance mutual compatibility of administration bodies, units and formation of the Armed Forces of Ukraine with the NATO Allied Military Forces, called upon to ensure their capability to act together for fulfilment of joint tasks, to achieve interoperability within the process of planning and assessment of forces;
- to train military contingents of Ukraine's Armed Forces and the Ukrainian Ministry on Emergency Situations (MES) as well as the state military infrastructure for interaction with the Allied Military Forces when conducting peacekeeping, search/rescue operations, and other missions.

The Military Reform Joint Working Group was created under the aegis of NATO Political-Military Steering Committee to fulfil the Working Plan for implementation of the NATO-Ukraine Charter. Its activities were aimed to support the NATO's contribution to the process of reforming and building in Ukraine the modern Armed Forces, and creating conditions to introduce the mechanisms of democratic and civilian control of their activities in the state.

According to the document, Ukraine and NATO had to:

- intensify the frequency of military exercises and joint training with NATO members and partner countries involving wider use of military infrastructure of the Armed Forces and military units of Ukraine (including on the permanent basis), in particular, the training facilities near Lviv (Javoriv polygon), Shyrokyi Lan Training Ground, air testing ranges of Ukraine's Ministry of Defence, etc.;
- create a system for the use of NATO normative documents in order to achieve interoperability, especially on the issues of troop management and communications as well as standardisation of certain types of arms and equipment designed for the use in joint actions in accordance with NATO regulations;
- launch practical programmes in the field of management and control, logistics, air traffic control, etc.;
- search for "scientific sponsors" among the leading world scientific institutions in NATO member states to render consultative assistance when implementing military reform in Ukraine.

Ukraine's planes to participate in the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) envisaged determination of the quantity of forces and means of Ukraine's Armed Forces to be used in peacekeeping missions under the NATO aegis, in particular, within the CJTF, and their target training (in contact with NATO and with the use of the EAPC capabilities) to achieve their interoperability with relevant NATO forces and means.

The objective of the cooperative measures in the field of armaments had to achieve Ukraine's interoperability with NATO; implement together with NATO member states joint developments and production of armaments and military materials (AMM); introduce the experience of NATO states in the sphere of armaments and military materials development planning, their orders and logistic support and marketing activities in the world market of armaments; improve arms export control regime and related technology transfers. Relevant part of the IPP and the Charter Implementation Working Plan to be realised presumes participation in the work of the Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD); establishment of direct relations with the NATO Directorate of Armaments Planning Programmes and Research, the NATO Policy and Coordination Staff and NATO organisation of research and technologies as well as cooperation between the enterprises of Ukraine's defence-industrial complexes and NATO member states.

The Programme enumerated objectives of cooperation for standardisation and operability in the system of armaments. Such cooperation should provide for:

- creation of the system for bringing NATO standards to users' attention in due time and providing conditions for their renewal, correction and publishing in a revised form;
- introduction of the system of classification, coding and cataloguing of NATO armaments and material;
- establishment of cooperation with the NATO Logistics Directorate to study the possibilities and introduction of the main elements of the NATO codification system;
- familiarisation with and use of standards on armaments and military materials development, production and testing;
- introduction of the system adopted by NATO for metrological support of military formations and units.

The Programme also envisaged the following directions of cooperation in the sphere of military technologies:

- Creation of effective common control mechanism for the transfer of military technologies and their possible dissemination;
- Participation in the sessions of the NATO Science Committee devoted to the issues of high technologies and disarmament technologies.
- Joint research and developments of armaments and material;
- Preparation of normative-methodological documentation which provides for the development of armament systems, interaction of relevant institutions in this sphere and management of this process which would ensure effective prevention of information leakage, especially of that which constitutes state secrets;
- Ensuring the security and readiness of ammunition and explosives;
- Assessment of the value and the marketing of armaments and material;
- Organisation of safe transportation and storage of material and explosives;
- Exchange of the results of military-scientific and scientific-technical research in the field of armaments;
- Foundation of the NATO-Ukraine Joint Working Group on cooperation in the field of armaments (on the Ukrainian part - on the inter-departmental basis);
- Investigation of possibilities to place the commissions of NATO member and partner countries at Ukraine's defence enterprises for the development and production of individual types of the AMM, their repair and service, and training (internship) of experts;
- Holding of joint scientific-research as well as research and development studies on repair and modernisation of the AMM manufactured jointly with Ukraine and stored in the arsenal of partner countries;
- Participation of Ukraine's enterprises in designing and manufacturing armaments within NATO individual projects;

- Assessment and use of the possibilities to expand military-technical cooperation and cooperation with the companies of NATO member states;
- Joint development and production of the AMM types involving state and private investments from NATO member States;
- Preparation of the programme for adaptation of the national system of military research and developments, military production, supply and repair of material to NATO standards;
- Investigation of NATO experience in the renewal of combat capacity, organisation of repair of sophisticated armaments as well as supply of armaments and repair sets;
- Creation of the legal basis in the field of armaments to develop cooperation with NATO, its member states and partner countries.

The next direction of cooperation under the State Programme, specifically, science and technologies, envisaged employment of NATO's potential and possibilities of its member states for resolving Ukraine's problems in the field of science and technologies; exchange of the results of scientific research in the fields of disarmament, ecological security, high technologies and computerisation as well as participation in scientific programmes and projects implemented under the NATO aegis.

The Programme envisaged that the Ministry of Science and Technologies of Ukraine would cooperate with NATO and participate in the PfP Programme measures within the relevant part of the IPP and the Working Plan for Charter Implementation. It established direct links with the NATO Directorate on Science Affairs and conducted joint with NATO measures for exchanging experience. The Ministry of Science and Technologies was also expected to resolve issues of the institutionalisation of relations with NATO by preparing a memorandum on mutual understanding between the Ministry of Science and Technologies of Ukraine and the NATO Directorate on Science Affairs.

Ukraine sought broadest involvement in the NATO Science for Peace Programme as well as exchange of scientific research results related to:

- Disarmament technologies, including limiting the proliferation of nuclear, biological, chemical weapons, conversion of fields within the military industrial complex;
- Environmental protection, reclamation of contaminated military installations, prevention and elimination of the consequences of man-caused disasters;
- Monitoring technologies in sea environment;
- Information technology development, the science of materials, biotechnology, energy supply and saving (in the field of non-nuclear power engineering);
- Human resources problems;
- Computer technologies;
- Exchange of experience in the field of scientific policy, transfer of technologies, innovation activities, and intellectual property rights;
- Conducting scientific research within joint projects;
- Obtaining NATO grants for Ukrainian scientists;

- Involving NATO experts in consultative and other assistance in the implementation of scientific projects in Ukraine, etc.

Provisions of the Programme on cooperation in the field of air traffic control and outer space provided for establishment of direct links between state bodies of Ukraine and the Directorate of NATO anti-aircraft systems, particularly, the NATO Committee on the Arrangement of the Air Traffic (CAAR). Ukraine's representatives are to participate in the CAAR sessions and meetings of the working groups on communications and navigation, the aerial identification "friend-or-foe" system and the secondary radar system, and others.

The National Space Agency of Ukraine (NSAU) was named responsible for joint projects with NATO and its member states in space discovery. Main directions of cooperation included participation in NATO measures concerning implementation of the space industry projects and employment of space technologies in emergency situations; joint use of information that comes from the space vehicles of Ukraine and NATO member countries and data exchange from the satellites that belong to them (including archive data which are related to cartography, environmental situation control, natural resources exploration etc.); establishing of communication operational systems for data exchange of the NSAU with relevant NATO structures, joint establishment of mutually beneficial conditions of space observation complexes; joint use of existing ground space infrastructure of Ukraine and NATO member states; development of programmes and technical means of data processing coming from airspace exploration; cooperation within the "Telemedicine" project of the State Space Programme of Ukraine; and, finally, joint research, scientific and technical developments on the use of space and air space within NATO Advisory Group on Aerospace Research (AGAR) issues.

Cooperation in the field of military economy was viewed as involvement of NATO potential in participation in conversion processes, restructuring and technical re-equipment of Ukraine's military industrial complex enterprises as well as study of the experience of NATO and its member states in the sphere of cost adjustment for defence and formation of military budgets.

Under the Programme, Ukraine intended to cooperate with NATO members in combating organised crime, terrorism, illegal arms transfers, dual use technologies, proliferation of radioactive and drug substances. The mechanism of consultations with NATO in this field had to be set up to prevent illegal traffic of radioactive materials, arms and drug substances, transfer of double purpose technologies, etc. across Ukraine's borders using Western experience in combating organised crime (from the Ukrainian side - on an inter-agency basis, from the NATO side - with the help of the Special Committee), providing interaction with NATO member states and partner countries for guarding state borders.

The Programme imposed responsibility for implementation of information support for cooperation in the military field on the Ministry of Defence of Ukraine. In this regard, it was planned to:

- study the experience of informational support for troops, interaction of military leadership and the media;
- further deploy (with US assistance) the PfP information management system (PIMS) in Ukraine;
- open at the Partnership Coordination Centre (Mons, Belgium) an information office of Ukraine's Armed Forces;

- organise together with the NATO Information and Documentation Centre (IDC) in Ukraine television programmes and media publications for highlighting participation of the Ukrainian military units in NATO measures and NATO transformation processes as well as topical programmes about the Armed Forces of NATO member states with the assistance of the embassies of these states in Ukraine;
- prepare together with the MFA of Ukraine and the National Institute of Strategic Studies the publication of a White Book on NATO-Ukraine relations;
- create an educational programme about NATO for officer personnel of Ukraine's Armed Forces.

The National Institute of Strategic Studies (NISS) of Ukraine had been vested with the responsibility for coordination of cooperative measures in the sphere of scientific research on military-political issues. Cooperation on scientific research in the military-political sphere was aimed to develop the principles of the all-European security architecture. It was accomplished by the NISS establishing and maintaining direct links with the NATO Science Directorate and NATO Office of Information and Press as well as with scientific-research institutions of NATO member states and partner countries for holding joint scientific research projects. These projects included study of experience gained in carrying out military reform in Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Romania, and Slovakia as well as development of such topics as "Conceptual basis of Ukraine's cooperation with neighbouring NATO member countries in the military-political and military spheres", "Tendencies of conflicts and crisis situations on the European continent", "Military-political principles of joint peacekeeping training of the armed forces of Ukraine and NATO member countries", and "Prospects and military-political consequences of implementing the advances and enhanced PfP Programme".

The document also envisaged cooperation for the environmental protection, telecommunications and information systems, standardisation, metrology, and certification.

According to the Programme, cooperation in the field of civil emergency situations had the objectives to adapt the corresponding world experience; attract additional financial and technological resources for improving the activities of the MES as well as formations and units of the Civil Defence Troops; use the forces and means of the MES for search and rescue operations and other international programmes; create legal bases for developing cooperation with NATO, its member states and partner countries as to the prevention of emergency situations at the transborder and national level and response to such situations; and achieve operability goals by MES formations assigned to perform the task of the PfP programme as well as their ability to operate together with NATO and partner countries' forces for participation in search and rescue and humanitarian operations.

Realisation of the State Programme of Ukraine's cooperation with NATO was designed through the measures of the annual Working Plans for implementation of the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between Ukraine and NATO and the IPP which should be considered as a component of this Programme. The financing of the State Programme was carried out at the expense of the funds allocated by the State Budget of Ukraine for relevant ministries, other central bodies of executive power, and also at the expense of the financial support from NATO and its member states. It was determined that cooperation of Ukraine with NATO as to observation of secrecy regime would be regulated by the Agreement on Security between Ukraine's Government and NATO of 13 March 1995 and Ukraine's legislation.

The following conclusion can be drawn from the analysis of the Programme. Proper fulfilment of the provisions of the document could raise the Ukraine-NATO cooperation to a qualitatively new level, a level higher than NATO's cooperation with any partner state,

applicant or even some NATO member states, at least as regards cooperation in high-tech or space exploration spheres. Otherwise, many aims of the Programme were not reached in full as a result of both political and financial obstacles.

#### **5.4. State Programme for Cooperation of Ukraine with NATO, 2001-2004**

On 27 January 2001 the Presidential Decree No.58/2001 introduced a new “State Programme for Cooperation of Ukraine with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation for the Years 2001 – 2004.” The programme aimed “to further execute the terms of the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between Ukraine and NATO, signed on 9 July 1997 in Madrid, and to increase cooperation of Ukraine with NATO.” An overall responsibility for its implementation was laid on the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine.

The State Inter-Departmental Commission on Cooperation of Ukraine with NATO was ordered to inform the President on the execution of the programme.

General provisions of the programme envisaged that “developing its national policy in security sphere, Ukraine intensifies its activity directed to the deepening of constructive cooperation with NATO, EU, WEU, EAPC, OSCE, and the Council of Europe, on which basis a new architecture of the 21<sup>st</sup> century is being formed.”

It was underlined that Ukraine’s attitude to NATO as the most effective structure of collective security in Europe remained unchanged. Taking in to account the Alliance’s considerable contribution in strengthening peace, stability, and general climate of confidence in the Euro-Atlantic space, in creation of a new security architecture in Europe, the deepening of disarmament processes, arms control and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, Ukraine broadens its participation in the EAPC activities and in the PfP Programme.

Developing cooperation with NATO, Ukraine has an aim to ensure its independence, democratic development and territorial integrity, to support national security, to prevent the emergence of new threats to stability and security on the European continent, and to use the experience of the Alliance member states in reforming defence and other related spheres.

The programme declared that the 1997 NATO-Ukraine Charter had created a new type of relations and had opened additional dimensions for cooperation with the Alliance. It was considered that the approval and execution of the “State Programme for Cooperation of Ukraine with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation for the period until the Year 2001” had created the internal conditions for implementation of basic tasks, defined by the Charter, and had given an essential impulse to cooperation with the Alliance in political, defence, economic, scientific, ecological, and other non-military spheres.

It was also highlighted, that in 2000 the President of Ukraine adopted a revised “State Programme on the Reform and Development of the Armed Forces of Ukraine for the period until the Year 2005” aimed at “the creation of the contemporary Armed Forces corresponding to the typical characteristics of the Euro-Atlantic model.” The programme contains a suggestion that during the last two years the Alliance has made important steps “in direction of its external adaptation and internal reorganisation, which provide impact on further development of cooperation between Ukraine and NATO” [54].

The above-mentioned factors make it necessary to approve a new document, which will bring Ukraine’s cooperation with the Alliance in accordance with today’s realities. In this connection, the State Programme for the years 2001 – 2004 was commented in its introduction “as a logical sequence of the previous one and aiming at the achievement of the

most complete and qualitative execution of the Charter.” This idea might be accepted as the most important political declaration of the Presidential Decree.

The programme contains several references justifying its correspondence to the terms of valid legislation, including regulations of the Ukrainian Constitution (Doc. No.254k/96 – the Verkhovna Rada), the “Main Guidelines of the Foreign Policy of Ukraine”, the “Concept (Principles of State Policy) of National Security of Ukraine”, the Military Doctrine of Ukraine, and other normative legal acts.

The aims of the Programme were as follows:

- Definition of priority directions for cooperation with NATO for the period until 2004;
- Deepening Ukraine’s cooperation with NATO within the Charter, EAPC, and PfP Programme so as to gain a higher quality of relations appropriate to the distinctive partnership level;
- Widening bilateral cooperation of Ukraine with NATO member States and Partners;
- Improving mechanisms for cooperation with NATO, as well as coordination and control procedures;
- Proving grounds for annual Working Implementation Plan in respect to the Charter and the Individual Partnership Programme, and providing instruments for their execution;
- Achieving the aims of partnership defined by Ukraine in the Process of Planning and Estimating the Forces within the PfP;
- Deepening contacts of the central bodies of Ukraine’s executive authorities involved in the implementation of the Charter with the corresponding NATO structures;
- Supporting the effective use of results of Ukraine’s cooperation with NATO by the central executive bodies;
- Creating an effective mechanism of information support for cooperation with NATO and promoting circulation of objective information highlighting its activity for the Ukrainian society

The execution of the Programme was laid on 17 Central executive bodies listed in the Supplement attached thereto. Some departments and boards of the National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine, the Presidential Administration, the Cabinet of Ministers, the Supreme Council of Ukraine, and also non-governmental organisations were involved (the latter could participate on their consent).

The Programme includes 7 chapters related to the General regulations, Cooperation in the political sphere, Cooperation in security and defence, Cooperation in non-military spheres, elaboration of normative basis for Ukraine-NATO cooperation, information support for Ukraine-NATO cooperation, and Final regulations. A special role in implementation of the Programme was laid upon the National Security and Defence Council (NSDC) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine. The NSDC staff formed the Secretariat of the State Inter-Departmental Commission as a permanently working department of this coordination authority.

However, current coordination and control for programme realisation were laid on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine and the General Military Inspection under the President of Ukraine.

In particular, within the powers of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) there were:

- development of conceptual grounds and recommendations on the relations with NATO as well as improvement of normative and legislative basis of these relations, and
- coordination of the work of executive power bodies on formation of the Working Plan for implementation of the Charter and Individual Partnership Programme.

The General Military Inspection under the President of Ukraine exercises control over the participation of the Military Forces of Ukraine (MFU) and other military formations in the measures envisaged by the annual departmental execution plans of the Programme and other forms of planning cooperation.

Cooperation with NATO in the spheres of security and defence is recognised as one of the priority directions of military politics of Ukraine in general. It embraces wide range of problems including military-political and military cooperation, peacemaking activities as well as achieving mutual understanding in the spheres of force control, telecommunications systems and arms. A new element of the Programme is a desire “to participate in the process of realisation of European Security and Defence Identity within NATO. It is mentioned in the document that Ukraine supports the efforts made by NATO on strengthening the European dimension within NATO and aims at more active involvement in realisation of ESDI politics. In the sphere of regional security an important direction of cooperation was defined as involvement of Ukraine in the subregional mechanisms created for the support of NATO activity including multinational military detachments.

In comparison with the previous programme, a peculiarity of the 2001-2004 Programme is the strengthening of emphasis on the economic and non-military aspects of cooperation. Thus, the Programme envisages:

- achievement of the objectives determined by Ukraine for the partnership with NATO in the sphere of armament;
- setting up cooperation with NATO member states on the issues of development and production of arms and military equipment;
- provision of the level necessary for interoperability in the course of cooperation in the sphere of armament by adaptation of the corresponding national standards with the NATO standards.

These aspects of cooperation are determined by the document “The state and principal trends of development of Ukraine-NATO relations in the sphere of armament”, for which a Joint Working Group Ukraine-NATO on the issues of cooperation in the sphere of armament has been created.

The Programme sets up a task to conduct preparatory measures for implementation of the NATO standards in Ukraine as well as the main principles of the NATO codification system.

It is fully evident that in case of successful execution of this Programme, a principally new situation will appear in relations between Ukraine and NATO, which will allow considering the membership in this organisation in the practical sphere. At the same time, in the text of the Programme there can be traced a desire of the executive power senior staff to develop more actively the relations in production of arms and military equipment, communications facilities, and space achievements.

A principally new element of relations can become the cooperation of the departments of "internal security" including the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the State Committee for the Defence of the State Border of Ukraine (Frontier Troops).

Within the non-governmental dimensions of cooperation with NATO there has been set up a task to improve the awareness of the Ukrainian population on the Alliance's activities and proliferation in the Ukrainian society of the information on the actual state and advantages of Ukraine-NATO cooperation. With this aim, it is envisaged to create an information centre for promoting cooperation of Ukraine with NATO and also to set up a direct communication line between the National Information Agency "Ukrinform" and the NATO Information and Documentation Centre in Ukraine as well as the NATO Information and Press Office.

The Programme also envisages implementation of the constantly acting programme "Ukraine-NATO" on the state TV and radio channels and preparation of a series of topical broadcasts and analytical programmes with participation of responsible executive bodies involved in cooperation with the Alliance.

At the same time it should be mentioned that from different political considerations in the course of the year 2001 the executive power structures avoided emphasising attention on the relations with NATO. It was mostly explained by the internal political tension around the political crisis caused by the "Tapegate" affair. The situation started changing from the beginning of June 2001 especially after formation of the new government headed by Anatoliy Kinakh and a visit to Kyiv by the US Secretary of Defence Donald Rumsfeld (5 June 2001). This visit symbolised cessation of indeterminacy in relations of Ukraine with the West and actual put a full stop in the international discussion around the "Tapegate" affair.

## **6. Tendencies of international relations in Central Eastern Europe**

### **6.1. Results of Transformations in the Central Eastern Europe and the Post-Soviet Space**

Social and geopolitical changes in the late 1980s and in the 1990s in Europe and Eurasia were indeed spectacular. The break-up of the USSR, socio-economic transformations in the countries of East Central Europe and the post-Soviet republics, along with the gradual weakening of Russia brought about geopolitical pluralism among the newly independent states and opened the door to the establishment of new forms of interaction and interdependence.

Adaptation of the subjects of European politics to a new alignment of forces was largely seen as a natural process of dissociation. Changes in the European system of international relations assumed the character of a gradual expansion of the Western (Atlantic) sphere of political, economic, legal, and moral influence in the East of the continent, subregion of East Central and post-Soviet area. From the viewpoint of the functioning and evolution of international institutions, this process was carried out through enlargement of the Council of Europe, the diversification of NATO functions, the intensification of activity by the West European Union, and the new quality of European integration.

However, despite the domination of Western, Atlantic, and Euro-Atlantic structures firmly established over the past decade, the current system of international relations and security in Europe as a functional characteristic of relationships still shows some signs of a transition period. Making use of the inertia of East European transformation processes and disregarding Russia's claims, countries of the Euro-Atlantic community intentionally avoided the contractual-legal consolidation of a new international order. This kind of arrangement

quite reasonably could have been considered an unwanted obstacle in the way of assertion with little effort of their dominant positions in Europe and the world. Completion of the formation of new pan-European systemic ties will focus attention on the state of relations of Euro-Atlantic structures with nations of Eastern and Southeast Europe, primarily with Russia, the Balkans, and to some extent Ukraine.

The transformation of the bipolar system of international relations occurred as a result of an abrupt weakening and destruction (to some extent, voluntarily opting out due to the liquidation of the USSR) of one of the world's two poles of power. Not only Russia, which inherited a seat in the UN Security Council from the USSR and contractual obligations regarding strategic arms, has been substantially weakened. Variations in the perception of the role and prospects of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) in the 1990s testified to Russia's inability to even partially restore the political potential of the USSR in the form of a "collective" power centre under Russia's control. It is precisely the awareness of Russia's inability to control the processes developing in the post-Soviet environment that conditioned its executive's actual forced abstention from active game of "mini-bipolarity" within European system of international relations. Simultaneously, one could observe an incessant devaluation of collective and individual roles of countries of the former Soviet bloc in the world balance of power. This did not take long to result in reducing the real and potential capabilities of the former Soviet states to influence the development of international relations and fundamental decision-making in the security sphere.

Countries of the former Soviet bloc began to develop in different ways. Most nations of Central Europe made attempts of accelerated transition to standards of the developed European democracies, striving to overcome the historical gap as soon as possible. The republics of Central Asia suddenly assumed the attributes of post-feudal societies, and their political systems began to remind one of some developing African and Asian countries. The socio-economic differentiation of the post-Communist states was accompanied by geopolitical divergence of the region that earlier had been under Soviet control. Ukraine, which is part of this post-Soviet environment, simultaneously belongs to the Black Sea area (Organisation for Black Sea Economic Cooperation) and participates in some structures of East Central Europe (the Central European initiative).

Internal transformations in post-Communist nations also took different directions. One can discern four tentative groups among them:

1. Countries, which as a result of internal transformation have achieved substantial economic stability and unhesitatingly, have chosen the European model of development;
2. Countries, which have carried out an initial reform process, but have failed to score significant economic and socio-political successes; the course of their further development is yet to be ascertained and depends on their domestic state of affairs;
3. Some Asian republics of the former Soviet Union, which have succeeded in stabilising their economies and embarked on the road of political development, typical of Asian postcolonial states.
4. Countries, in which the process of transformation has brought about economic and social degradation. Because of this, further prospects of their development seem to be bleak. The direction of future evolution of such countries appears uncertain and is likely to be determined by the chance interplay of internal and external factors.

Such a classification makes it possible to expect the complete or gradual integration of the countries of the first group and most states of the second group in the Euro-Atlantic community. As far as nations of the third and fourth groups are concerned, one should note

their temporary or even ingrained inability to overcome the trends of further economic and social decline. As for Ukraine, its prospects can still be treated within the framework of alternatives of either a Polish or Turkish scenario. During 1995-1997, certain half-measures were taken in the direction of the Central European model of development, but in 1998-1999 Ukraine had seen ever increasing trends of socio-economic degradation, which steadily brought the country closer to the loss of what it has left of the potential of being a developed country.

## **6.2. International security outlooks in the subregion of Central Eastern Europe**

The recent changes in the European political landscape were caused by the desire of a large group of the Central and Eastern European countries to achieve membership in the European Union and NATO. Nowadays, the eastern part of Europe consists of three groups of states that belong to:

Central Eastern Europe where the changes are moving faster than in other areas, and where the Western countries, particularly Germany, have a clear interest in helping the transformation processes.

South-Eastern Europe where the situation in the Balkans is still complex and less certain, which is threatening stability and security in Europe.

Post-Soviet Eastern Europe as quite a new geopolitical area which has appeared as a result of emergence of a number of newly independent European states such as Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine.

The prospects of a broadly based alliance of post-Communist nations in Central and Eastern Europe have been frequently discussed in the first half of the 1990s. Various proposals for cooperation have been based on an overall historical idea of "Mitteleuropa" as well as on the assumption that a union of small and medium-sized post-Communist countries could be a noteworthy force in the international system, the one which could oppose any rebirth of expansionist tendencies in Russia and also facilitate the integration of the union's member countries into Europe [55].

Several previous proposals concerning association of Central and Eastern European states have been put forward: a proposal for the Baltic-Black Sea Commonwealth or axis, the Central and Eastern European space for stability and security, NATO-2, etc. In early 1990s, there was a rather wide spectrum of projects ranging from economic cooperation to a defence alliance. Most of these proposals have not been worded clearly, however, and neither sphere of their operations nor possible implementation mechanisms has been clearly outlined.

Countries that were interested in Ukraine's deterrent potential had to consider opportunities (within the framework of PfP or in addition to it) to promote modernisation of Ukrainian armed forces and invest in the defence-industrial complex of Ukraine to supply themselves with armaments and munitions. After NATO enlargement was announced, it seems more possible that under certain circumstances Poland could become a basis for the subregional security system. Creation of joint Polish-Ukrainian battalion, which was attached to the KFOR, showed a good example of existing opportunities for cooperation.

In mid-1990s, it became evident that any plans for autonomous Central and Eastern European integration failed because of the dominant influence of the Western European integration mechanisms. All Central European states are seeking NATO and the EU

membership, while Ukraine nowadays is not even the second- or third-rank candidate to join these European structures.

By 1994, the Baltic States had achieved some level of political and economic stability as well as foreign policy experience and began to pay more attention to other nations of Eastern Europe. Documentary evidence of the Baltic States increasing attention to the Ukraine's role in ensuring political stability in Central and Eastern Europe was provided by a statement which the three Baltic Presidents issued on 25 March 1994 as well as a Joint Communiqué issued by the three heads of government on 13 June 1994. The latter document said that the stable development of Ukraine was of the utmost importance for the stability in Europe. Ukraine also has constant interest in cooperation with the Baltic States, which is guided both by foreign policy and economic considerations.

From the standpoint of the Baltic States, Ukraine is their natural ally in searching for security and territorial integrity, though, certainly, it is geographically situated on the periphery of the Baltic region. Ukraine's participation in the CIS is not an obstacle in this respect because it is not member of military-political structures (the Tashkent Treaty on Collective Security of 15 May 1992, etc.). The military potential of Ukraine at the level of conventional forces is so substantial that it can play a deterrent role vis-à-vis its neighbouring states [56].

Such achievements of 1996-97 as the Joint Ukrainian-Lithuanian Declaration (23 September 1996), Joint Statement of the Presidents of Lithuania, Poland, and Ukraine on the events in Belarus (20 November 1996) and 'strategic partnership' between Ukraine and Poland reflected an important trend of cooperation and foreign policy coordination between these countries. Three-lateral cooperation could secure both their mutual and national interests in the subregional and European processes. These developments were of intensive character before 1998. Since that three-lateral consultations they were slow down despite of the continuing active bilateral cooperation ties between Ukraine and Poland as well as between Poland and Lithuania.

These estimates provided reasons for the Central and Eastern European nations to unite their efforts with Ukraine thereby gaining equality with Russia.

In the first Leonid Kuchma's Presidential Administration the most influential person in determination of international security policy was Volodymyr Horbulin, then-Secretary of the National Security and Defence Council. Taking into account low chances of Ukraine's quick involvement into the Western European and Euro-Atlantic structures, in 1995-96 Horbulin expressed support for an idea of Ukraine's ever possible close security cooperation with the Central Eastern European states. At that time, he believed that Ukraine could choose and follow one of the five models of foreign policy strategy:

- Joining the Tashkent Treaty on Collective Security signed by some CIS states in 1992;
- Joining NATO and the WEU;
- Flexible participation in the system of transatlantic and all-European security structures including the umbrella Atlantic Community and Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council;
- Concluding a treaty on external guarantees of the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, and security of Ukraine similar to the State Treaty on Restoration of Independent and Democratic Austria (1955);
- Creating a separate Central Eastern Europe subregional security organisation with participation of the "grey zone" countries [57].

The first two models were regarded as the most unrealistic in practical terms. Joining the Tashkent Treaty did not comply with the valid legislation of Ukraine as well as joining NATO. Though, the President of Ukraine and other high officials repeated from time to time that the state's future would not obligatory continue to be of obvious non-bloc character.

Full membership in NATO seemed also hardly possible because of geopolitical, social, and public opinion as well as financial obstacles. After visiting NATO Headquarters in the early January 1997, Volodymir Horbulin stated that Ukraine was not ready to join NATO for economic reasons and because of non-correspondence of civil control over the armed forces to the NATO standards.

The comparison of general defence needs of the first group of aspirants to join NATO, the Vyshegrad group of countries including Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, in accordance with the existing ceilings of armaments required by the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe with that of Ukraine also brings disillusionment. The Vyshegrad group's defence allocation needs were estimated, as approximately 87-90% of Ukraine's defence needs.

It meant that Ukraine would have to increase its defence budget at minimum by 4 or even 6 times. Under the conditions of deep economic decline, such requirements for joining NATO are beyond Ukraine's financial capability [58].

Therefore, the last two alternatives should be examined. Signing a treaty on the former Austrian model, though providing an opportunity to fill a "security vacuum", would slow down Ukraine's political and economic integration into European structures. As for the last alternative, a plan for creating a regional "grey zone" association in Central and Eastern Europe is worth considering. Poland's 1991-92 proposal of a "NATO-2" or Ukraine's 1993 initiative to establish "Central European zone for stability and security" had been rejected as unrealistic.

Ukrainian observers and politicians expressed some reasonable criticism of the consequences of "geopolitical pluralism" principle for the Central Eastern European realities. These ideas were stated by Dmytro Vydrin (President Leonid Kuchma's political adviser in 1994-95) and Dmytro Tabachnyk (Head of the Presidential Administration in 1994-96): "The geopolitical pluralism within the common region (and, at the same time, within integral economic and socio-cultural complex) presupposes the differentiation in foreign policy directions of these states. This circumstance, certainly, causes their gravitation to the leaders outside their region..." [59].

These remarks applied to Ukraine's non-bloc or non-aligned status and reflected a necessity of such a position, which could prevent Ukraine's long term isolation from Euro-Atlantic security structures. In Horbulin's earliest vision, Central European cooperation in its broadest sense could be a step towards involvement in an all-European consolidation process [60]. From this standpoint, the Central European Initiative was regarded more as a peculiar but not transitional model of cooperation what it actually was.

One of the tenets of Ukraine's foreign policy is that, in light of its geopolitical situation, historical experience, cultural traditions, rich natural resources, and sufficient economic, scientific, technical, and intellectual potential, Ukraine has an ability to become an influential regional state, capable of playing a significant role in providing political and economic stability in Europe. Since Ukraine is already a recognised factor in European relations, it is difficult to speak about security in Europe without considering the role and the place of Ukraine in European geopolitical landscape.

Although Ukraine is not a candidate for the EU or NATO membership, its independence was of vital concern for the western strategy. According to the authors of a

widely circulated RAND Corporation research paper on the issue of NATO enlargement [61], the future orientation of Ukraine will be a main factor influencing the balance of forces in Eastern and Central Europe.

In 1995 the RAND Corporation experts proposed four scenarios of Ukraine's geopolitical future:

- Ukraine following the “Finnish model” with pro-Western orientation, politically and economically stable but neutral in military sphere. It's status in relations with Russia might be similar to that of Finland towards the Soviet Union during the Cold War;
- Ukraine increasingly re-orientating its economy towards Russia while maintaining its neutrality (a “light” Ukraine);
- Ukraine with its eastern areas joining Russia and its western areas being independent;
- Ukraine reintegrated with Russia in political and economic terms (a “heavy” Ukraine).

In the first half of the 1990s, Western experts mostly expressed their preference to see Ukraine of the “Finnish model”, i.e. politically and economically stable, with pro-Western foreign policy orientation, but militarily neutral. The worst alternative from the Western point of view was a complete reintegration of Ukraine with Russia and the CIS. Nowadays, Ukraine's position may be correctly defined as a “light Ukraine”. The government of Ukraine sought to establish working economic ties with Russian economy, but has refused to join the CIS collective security institutions.

Although economic ties between Ukraine and Russia are rather justified, its military reorientation might have destroyed the balance of forces in Central Eastern Europe. Therefore, after some period of doubts the Western policy is gradually focusing on strengthening Ukraine's independence, and preventing Kyiv's military integration into the CIS. Despite of the fact that NATO considered the “Finnish model” as an ideal alternative for Ukraine, this scenario is unlikely without substantial increase of political and economic support from the West.

The future security orientation of Ukraine will be decisively influenced by NATO enlargement. Ukraine plays the role of a political buffer for the Central Eastern European countries. For NATO Ukraine represents additional strategic depth in the case of new threats from Russia. If Ukraine were forced to strategic reintegration with Russia, it would considerably change all the parameters of NATO defence planning. Ukraine's security orientation will be shaped by the security guarantees NATO provides to its new members in Central Eastern Europe. If Ukraine becomes a stable and neutral state, this will greatly facilitate the security tasks of enlarged NATO. If Ukraine economically and politically reintegrates with Russia, giving Russian armed forces access to those parts of Ukraine close to the Polish border, NATO will have to take a more decisive stand, perhaps, including forward deployment of Western detachments in Central Eastern Europe.

After NATO enlargement, Ukraine as a non-bloc state might find itself playing the role of a buffer between two military arrangements – the Tashkent Treaty and NATO. Under certain circumstances, NATO enlargement might lead to the erection of a new “wall” and put Ukraine in an extremely difficult situation. Hennadiy Udoenko, then a Minister of Foreign Affairs considered, that “no one has the right to ‘veto’ any country's choice to join NATO: this is private business of such country and NATO. In this respect, we are, if one may say so, evolutionists: we favour a step-by-step examination of this question; we want Ukraine to be better able to defend its national interests, having become economically independent during this time. Therefore, we oppose speeding up the resolution of NATO enlargement issue” [62].

“Ukraine welcomes openness of North-Atlantic Alliance for cooperation and partnership with the new democracies of Eastern Europe. We believe that active participation in the PfP programme could play an important role in evolutionary process of possible NATO enlargement. At the same time, we perceive it as another confirmation of NATO ability to transform itself into a broadened Euro-Atlantic security organisation”, - emphasised Udovenko [63].

The two simultaneous processes including NATO enlargement and its further transformation might develop side by side. NATO enlargement process must not contradict national security interests of some Eastern European states, especially that of Ukraine. After publication of the study on NATO enlargement in September 1995, some new questions were put forward. Ukraine's political elite was concerned with the possible deployment of foreign armed forces and nuclear weapons on the territory of the neighbouring states. Ukraine was one of the first countries in the world, which agreed to eliminate such weapons, and joined NPT in 1994 as a non-nuclear state. Western and Eastern European leaders assured that there was no necessity to deploy nuclear weapons in the new NATO member states. These assurances looked symbolic because it would not take much time to move tactical nuclear missiles eastward under certain circumstances. Taking the decision on the elimination of the third largest nuclear arsenal in the world and thus achieving non-nuclear status, Ukraine's governmental authorities hoped that the world community would assess the importance of such a step for ensuring general European security and stability.

Since 1992 Ukraine has established and strengthened mechanisms of cooperation with Poland, which were related to international security matters. It was the first example of strategic partnership and cooperation in Ukraine's external relations.

In 1996 Ukraine has become a full member of the Central European Initiative, being a mechanism of multilateral cooperation in Central Eastern Europe. Ukraine had also started examination of the terms the Central European Free Trade Area (CEFTA). However its intends to join this EU-oriented community were devaluated by the 1998 economic crisis.

On the other hand, a lack of comprehensive structural reforms and difficulties related to the establishment of effective market economy and transparent methods of governmental management impeded rapprochement between Ukraine and the EU. Ukraine appeared unable to join the WTO, notwithstanding that this notion was envisaged by the 1994 Agreement on Partnership and Cooperation between the EU and Ukraine.

In 1995 the Executive Branch officials had first officially proclaimed, that integration with the European Union is a strategic aim of Ukraine's external policy.

On 21 May 1996 with its Joint Statement on Ukraine, the European Union started formation of its common position on relations with Ukraine. It became an important step forward in Ukraine's relations with the European institutions. Later on, in December 1999 it was followed by elaboration of the EU Common Strategy on Ukraine being an essential element of the CFSP.

Domestic critics of NATO-oriented policy often suggest that gradual integration of Ukraine with the EU is unrealistic. At the same time, modernisation of Ukraine's economy and diversification of foreign trade is a precondition to decrease Ukraine's traditional economic vulnerability. It would be naive to think that self-limitations in relations with NATO could improve the nature of the Russian-Ukrainian relations and bring economic benefits.

The first stage of NATO enlargement gave an opportunity to make first preliminary conclusions. The costs of joining NATO by Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic appeared to be much less than it was previously expected. Military experts of the new NATO member states suggest that their defence expenditure within NATO would be less than the

subsequent costs for modernisation of the armed forces in case of non-accession to the Alliance. This argument concerns Ukraine as well. Armaments, technical equipment and ammunition of the Armed Forces of Ukraine require modernisation. Inevitable subsequent spending for modernisation of equipment may presumably cover the costs of transition to NATO standards of armaments, ammunition and intercommunication.

The New NATO members have two simultaneous tasks:

- To achieve interoperability with NATO and modernise the defence sector, and
- Enhance economic and social reforms in order to achieve compliance with the Copenhagen criteria of the EU membership.

In contrast to the EU membership, NATO enlargement more depends on a common political decision of member states than on the economic compliance of the country to integration standards. Integration of the WEU into the EU institutional system opens prospects for appropriate reorientation of military and political priorities of the newly admitted NATO member states. In this context their closer cooperation within the WEU/ERRF may offer an alternative to the previous total orientation at NATO strategy. Ukraine should observe positions of the new prospective members, which will join the Alliance after 2002. Some of them may resist against further enlargement and impose veto on the admission of particular new members.

By admitting the countries of Central Eastern Europe, which had different historical claims to one another, NATO takes responsibility for reconciliation of relict disputes and stable allied cooperation between them. Though one of the main demands for the countries, which apply for membership, is a clear renunciation of reciprocal territorial claims. On the other hand, there may be attempts to dispute the concluding agreements in the future. Insofar, NATO's experience of successful settlement of conflicts between its members is not perfect. The Greek-Turkish case is both typical and exceptional example.

### **6.3. Ukrainian-Russian Relations in the Context of NATO Enlargement**

During his dialogue with President Bill Clinton in Helsinki on 21 March 1997, President Boris Yeltsin declared that Russia would not recognise NATO's enlargement and would not sign a document on cooperation with the Alliance until its claims were carried out to a full extent. These claims included:

- Not to admit the Baltic states and Ukraine to NATO;
- Not to place nuclear and additional conventional arms on the territory of the new members;
- Not to use the military infrastructure of the former Warsaw Treaty Organisation on the territory of Central and Eastern European states.

Actually, the motives of Moscow to oppose the process of NATO's enlargement are based on its geopolitical interests rather than on the perception of the growing military threat. Therefore, the most important claim from Russia to NATO consists in recognising Ukraine and the Baltic States a zone of Russia's vital interest. Such recognition would, in fact, mean division of the spheres of influence in Europe. According to the official US Administration comments, in Helsinki President Bill Clinton did not agree with Boris Yeltsin's suggestion that the former Warsaw Pact states should remain in the sphere of Russia's influence. Thus, if

these comments were true, the door to the Euro-Atlantic security institutions remained open for the Baltic States and maybe also for Ukraine and Moldova.

Realising the unevenness of concessions from the West in Helsinki, Russia started searching for the ways to implement anti-NATO enlargement policy. Among the basic elements of such policy the following attempts should be mentioned:

Establishing security cooperation between Russia and several Asian states such as China, India, Iran, and uniting them on a common and, actually, alternative to the US geostrategic platform;

Promoting and increasing certain divergences between the leading NATO countries, such as the US, France and Germany;

Achieving guarantees of non-deployment of NATO troops and non-use of the former Soviet military infrastructure inherited by NATO on the territory of the new members of the Alliance;

Creating a protective front-line to the west of Russia, which might probably pass through the territory of Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine and the Kaliningrad region (oblast) of the Russian Federation.

It is evident, however, that Russia has few opportunities to incline China or India to a strategy that is clearly alternative to that of the US and NATO. The losses of these countries associated with such a policy would exceed their gains. As for Iran, Russia could achieve such a union in exchange for selling it its missile and nuclear technologies. But such course of events may result in Russia's international isolation. It's worth noting that Russia's capacity to make obstacles to NATO and the EU enlargement policies substantially reduced after August 1998.

Thus, the main direction of Russia's efforts against NATO enlargement will be focussed on preserving and keeping the balance of forces in the Central Eastern Europe. This idea is present in the attempts to prevent deployment of NATO troops in the countries of Central Eastern Europe, eliminate the use of military infrastructure in the new member states of the Alliance alongside with preservation of Russia's military presence in Moldova, Ukraine and Belarus.

Russian military presence in these countries will become the central element of Russia's protective front against NATO enlargement strategy. On the one hand, such presence makes it possible to influence the domestic political situation in these countries in the direction favourable for Russia. On the other hand, it could allow Russia to maintain a certain balance of its own advanced deployment forces with those of NATO. Russia claims that NATO should not deploy its forces on the territory of the new members, while keeping its military units in the countries not being its military allies. These are the remains of the former 14<sup>th</sup> army in Moldova, and a 25-thousand-strong unit of the Russia's Black Sea Fleet troops in Ukraine. A 25-thousand-strong unit was also deployed in Belarus as well as numerous military bases were on a long-term basis kept in Armenia, Georgia, Tajikistan and Kazakhstan.

Russia claims that NATO is not to use the military infrastructure of the former Warsaw Pact on the territory of the new members of the Alliance, while using the ex-USSR military infrastructure on the territory of the Newly Independent States. Apart from the Russian land forces and frontier units on the Polish-Belarussian border, the first echelon of Russian Air Defence is deployed in Belarus. The Russian military unit in Baranovichi (Belarus) is a part of the anti-ballistic missile early warning system.

The Russian military authorities conducted negotiations with the government of Belarus about the transfer of the whole network of airfields in Belarus under Russia's control. All these airfields are practically ready to receive Russian fighting aircraft and to maintain it at any time when necessary.

After the USSR collapsed, Russia inherited 50% of its airfield network. Currently, the Russian Air Forces possess about 100 airfields with concrete runways. 65% of them are situated in the European part of Russia. Therefore, according to the Russia's Air Forces officials, the signing of a treaty with Belarus on the common use of the airfield network would provide Russia with wide opportunities to manoeuvre in respect to the implementation of the air forces' tasks. It would also significantly increase security of Russia's western borders and could be considered as an adequate response to NATO eastward enlargement.

Speaking against deployment of the nuclear arms on the territory of the new members of NATO, Russia, in exchange, gives support to the Belarussian initiatives concerning creation of a nuclear free zone in Eastern Europe. However, if this non-nuclear zone did not include the new NATO members, Russia would rather speak against its creation. But a situation may arise when NATO and its new members will take the obligations not to place nuclear weapons in Europe, while Russia will be free from such obligations. Such course of events is entirely possible if, for instance, Belarus joins the Russian Federation. Russia regards tactical nuclear arms as means of maintaining balance of forces in Europe. Thus, Eugeniy Primakov, as Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1996-98, speaking on the prospects of creating a non-nuclear zone in the Central Eastern Europe, declared that the Kaliningrad region of the Russian Federation would never become part of such zone.

It is necessary to notify that among the means of common military policy of Belarus and Russia there is reinforcement of the Belarussian Air Defence by the air units of the Defence Ministry of the Russian Federation and common roster of the air force of both countries. With this aim, fighting aircraft such as Su-27 and Su-24 carrying tactical nuclear weapons may be based in Belarus notwithstanding its international non-nuclear obligations. There is also a probable opportunity of placing the Russian strategic bomber aircraft in Belarus.

A desire to avoid confrontation trends between NATO and Russia as well as achieve stability and security in Europe presumes a necessity to change the starting point of the dialogue between NATO and Russia from "unilateral concessions in exchange for recognition of the enlargement" to bilateral steps towards:

- Lowering ceilings and limits of military presence in the Central Eastern Europe;
- Negotiating a rejection to deploy NATO's and Russian tactical nuclear weapons in the states of Central Eastern Europe;
- Non-deployment of the NATO troops on the territory of the new NATO members and non-deployment of the Russian troops on the territory of Ukraine and Moldova;
- Non-use of the former Warsaw Treaty's military infrastructure by the NATO troops, and
- Non-use by the Russia's military forces of the former USSR military infrastructure on the territory of the neighbouring countries,
- Non-use of the former USSR military infrastructure on the territory of the new NATO members which have common borders with Russia.

A short-term shift of Ukrainian foreign policy to closer cooperation with Russia was evident since mid-2000. Since October 2000 the Ukrainian executive authorities made few

concessions to meet Russia's interests in the military-technical and military-political aspects, and also in the energy sector.

In June 2000, at their summit in Moscow, the leaders of the CIS states agreed on cooperation in combating international terrorism. Ukraine signed the agreement to establish the CIS Anti-Terrorist Centre with reservations in respect to its national legislation. The Ukrainian officials were merely disappointed with the establishment of the Eurasian Economic Community (EEC) on 16 October 2000. According to Leonid Kuchma, formation of EEC is "a delayed-action mine put under the CIS".

Introducing Anatoly Zlenko as a newly appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs to the ministerial staff in October 2000, president Kuchma insisted on elaborating "a positive algorithm" in relations with Russia, "directed at mutually beneficial cooperation instead of confrontation." On his part Anatoly Zlenko considered the CIS as an international consultative mechanism aimed at addressing economic problems of its member-states and avoiding issues of purely political nature.

At the meeting with Putin in Sochi (October 16, 2000) Kuchma reaffirmed the previous Yevhen Marchuk's idea to let Russian companies participate in privatisation of Ukraine's gas pipeline network in exchange for Russia's allowance for the Turkmenistan gas transit through the Russian territory. The restructuring of Ukraine's 1999-2000 gas debts was also agreed.

Ukraine's concessions did not influence RAO "Gazprom" decision to start construction of a gas pipeline through Belarus and Poland to Slovakia bypassing Ukraine. Surprisingly, Ukraine's officials at all levels did not object to that and slightly ignored the Polish governmental proposal to coordinate positions of the two transit states on fuel transportation to Western and Central Europe.

Prime Minister Yushchenko's working visit to Moscow on November 17, 2000 was also devoted to the transportation of Russian gas to Europe in 2000-2001. During this visit agreements on the safety of gas transit, on the transit of electricity, and on restructuring the Ukrainian debts were signed. The Ukrainian government pledged to put an end to unauthorised siphoning off the Russian gas from the transit pipelines. In addition, the Russian government demanded that Ukraine should essentially raise gas export duties.

In December 2000 Putin promised Kuchma his protection in the talks with "Gazprom" concerning reconstruction of the Ukrainian pipeline network to increase gas transit. Ukrainian President expressed understanding of Russia's intents to increase the amount of gas supplies to Europe.

However, the Ukrainian-Russian rapprochement was most evident at the presidential meeting in Dnipropetrovsk on February 12, 2001. During Putin's visit, the parties agreed to connect electric energy networks of Russia and Ukraine and to increase cooperation in the aerospace industry. Despite all insistent denials as regards hidden political motives behind that meeting, there were grounds to think that Putin availed himself of the aggravated internal political situation in Ukraine and managed to impose his model of relations with Ukraine.

During the Kyiv visit of Russian Defence Minister Igor Sergeyev's in January 2001, the two ministries signed a plan for military and military-technical cooperation in 2001. The Russian minister resolutely condemned NATO's expansion to the east and tried to refute the rumours concerning Ukraine's possible involvement into production of newly sophisticated ICBMs. A decision was approved to establish a joint command post in Sevastopol to control inshore waters and arrange joint Russian-Ukrainian patrol watch. Therefore, a joint formation of the two fleets appeared for the first time the former Soviet Black Sea Fleet was divided in 1997.

Putin's administration was most interested in strengthening military and technical cooperation, with priorities in the outer space control, air and space attack warning, as well as anti-aircraft defence systems. The Kyiv meeting of the Security Council Secretaries of Russia and Ukraine (February 8, 2001) was devoted to joint production of armaments. It was agreed to coordinate activities in order to "avoid excessive competition" in arms production and trade. At the same time bilateral economic relations did not correspond with mutual declarations in the spirit of "strategic partnership".

The first serious trade crisis in Ukrainian-Russian relations that affected all spheres of bilateral relations happened in autumn 1996. It was stimulated by the Russian government's having imposed a value added tax on goods imported from Ukraine and accompanied by different hostile statements and claims on behalf of Russia's legislature and a number of politicians. This crisis reflected a substantial decline in Ukraine's political dependence from Russia, which was visible in its different attitude to NATO enlargement and other related issues.

During the last decade developments in relations between Ukraine and the CIS states created a pessimistic impression. In 1995 Ukraine was the first to implement the VAT on goods imported from Russia. In 1996 Russia imposed VAT on commodity import from Ukraine. Later on, in 1997 both state parties weakened tax limitations. However since 1997 the Russia's governments started to impose quotas on the main Ukrainian food exports that seriously affected Ukrainian interests. Continued "trade war" with Russia caused annual losses of at least \$2 billion US.

The Ukrainian-Russian relations were aggravated by a number of Russia's unilateral actions, including demonstrative delays by President Boris Yeltsin in signing the 'gross' interstate political Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Partnership with Ukraine in 1995 – 1997. The October-December 1996 decisions of the Russian State Duma (lower chamber of the Russia's Parliament) on the "Russian status" of Sevastopol and halting the Black Sea Fleet's partition had similar insulting effect of bilateral relations.

President Leonid Kuchma, the top officials of the Parliament (the Verkhovna Rada) and the Cabinet of Ministers even had a special meeting on this matter on 9 December 1996 in order to discuss challenges that appeared in the Ukrainian-Russian relations. Consensus decision was reached to follow the path of bilateral cooperation and solve problems "rather than undertake steps that might cause further destabilisation of relations with Russia."

In his Address to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Western European Union on 5 June 1996, President Leonid Kuchma defined Ukraine's attitude to the CIS. He named this institution "a mechanism aimed at solving the problems of the former USSR, its peaceful disintegration in a comprehensive and democratic way" and "a forum for multilateral negotiations and consultations."

Ukraine's indefinite status in the CIS was without any doubts a reflection of conscious position of the executive authority. Ukrainian governments made sporadic effort to ensure alternative sources of energy supplies and establish new forms of cooperation with several post-Soviet states. In the course of negotiations with Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Georgia and Azerbaijan in 1996 the Ukrainian government made its first steps towards diversification of oil and gas supplies. However Russia's position prevented coming into force the free trade agreements which Ukraine concluded (or attempted to conclude) with the members of the Customs Union [64].

Notwithstanding sporadic thaws in Ukrainian-Russian relations they continued to be tenuous. The August 1998 economic and financial crisis heavily affected the economies of both states. It also evoked the sharpening of bilateral economic contradictions and tension in

autumn 1998 and winter 1998-99. The latest trade crisis was provoked by another Russia's unilateral decision to impose limitations on Ukraine's import since July 2001.

#### **6.4. The Black Sea Subregional Dimension**

The most important dimension of Ukraine's subregional policy is the Black Sea area. Recently Ukraine's subregional activities were devoted to the establishment of local multilateral mechanisms and bilateral agreements. In this context its efforts aiming at institutionalisation of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation and the association of GUUAM were a success.

As a guarantor-state of the international process of reconciliation in Moldova, Ukraine is most consistent in demonstrating its political will for the ultimate settlement of the Transdnestrian conflict. Lasting from 1991, this conflict directly affects Ukraine's security interests. The settlement of the Transdnestrian problem is important for Ukraine as it may improve conditions for Ukraine's advancement towards the European integration. Ukraine's position on the settlement of the Transdnestrian conflict will also depend on a dominating trend in its foreign policy. With neutrality course or orientation at the European integration preserved, Ukraine will objectively promote the soonest settlement of the Transdnestrian conflict and preservation of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova.

Following the protracted delay, a summit meeting of the GUUAM states on 6 – 7 June 2001 undertook a long expected decision to transform it into a full-fledged international organisation. Despite certain scepticism as regards prospects of GUUAM, its institutionalisation was based on serious conceptual background. On 8 September 2000 the leaders of GUUAM states declared that this association was entering a new stage of development and expressed their intention to stir up multilateral cooperation. The GUUAM leaders turned attention at certain favourable conditions for boosting economic growth and raising living standards of their peoples, further development of the Europe-Caucasus-Asia transportation corridor, and promotion of mutual trade [65].

Common interests of the GUUAM states in security affairs were also deemed to be a perspective for multilateral cooperation. Theoretically, the common interests of the GUUAM states might include:

- Joint efforts and policy coordination as regards integration into the European security structures. In this respect, GUUAM could be comparable with the Vyshegrad Group of CEE states. The major task of that structure was to coordinate efforts of its individual members in their accession to NATO and the EU.
- Common security policy both within the CIS and in the European and subregional context.

Such policy would ensure the interests of each country in the post-Soviet area. Initially the basic principles of GUUAM were formulated during the Vienna negotiations on the adaptation of the CFE Treaty. Then Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Moldova appeared in the "flank zone". On 8 April 1997 Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Moldova made a joint statement to the effect that the provision allowing the Russian Federation to deploy its armaments and military hardware is subject to limitations under the Treaty within the "flank" district proportions providing that the appropriate bilateral agreements were not concluded.

Currently the GUUAM states are not members of the CIS Collective Security system. Insofar the Tashkent system did not present them with attractive prospects for political settlement of local (regional) conflicts in Transdnestria, Abkhazia, Nagorno-Karabakh, the

aforesaid countries may coordinate their foreign policy positions within the framework of newly established international institution.

Ukraine has already contributed its military observers to the conflict areas under the UN/OSCE mandate. Ukraine has training facilities and structures as well as relevant forces and means to prepare and carry out peacekeeping operations. The Ukrainian Defence Ministry has established a Peacekeeping Coordination Centre and approved the decision to establish a specialised peacekeeping training centre. As a military non-aligned state, Ukraine's interests are directed at prevention of chaos, reconciliation of conflicts and weakening of international tension in the Black Sea area.

As a mediator, Ukraine was involved in the Georgia-Abkhazia peace talks. The Georgian government expressed interest in the deployment of Ukraine's peacekeeping detachments in the security zone after the withdrawal of Russia's peacekeeping units. A Georgian-Azerbaijani-Ukrainian peacekeeping battalion may be created within the framework of PfP programme. As regards Moldova, Ukraine has achieved a status of a state-guarantor of the 1997 agreement between the parties to the Transdniestrian conflict. Together with Russia Ukraine signed a Memorandum on the principles of relations between Moldova and the Transdniestrian area.

Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, and Moldova are also involved in realisation of the European projects for restoring the "Grand Silk Route" (TRACECA). Therefore, it determines a sphere of cooperation with the EU, NATO and the business sector of European and American states.

Common interests of the GUUAM states may appear in coordination of the following trends of activities:

- Functioning of GUUAM as a subregional organisation.
- Coordinated policy concerning reduction of Russia's military presence on their territories will inevitably be put forward within the GUUAM.
- Strengthening regional and national security. Cooperation within this organisation cannot be directed against the third countries or groups. GUUAM is neither a military alliance nor a system of collective defence. In this respect evaluation of positions of Russia and Turkey as the states which relatively dominate in the area is important.
- The main task for GUUAM states should be the internal aspect of security focussed on strengthening domestic factors of security and stability.
- Close and comprehensive security cooperation with international organisations represented in the Black and Caspian Sea areas, including the UN, NATO, BSECO, OSCE, EU, CIS.

All GUUAM participants, except Uzbekistan, are members of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organisation (BSECO), founded in 1998. OSCE and NATO may become major partners for GUUAM in the field of regional security. The GUUAM states concentrate their efforts within the OSCE framework on the improvement of preventive diplomacy mechanisms, and arms control and confidence building measures in the military sphere.

Insofar the regional conflicts pose the most serious threat to European security, the OSCE major function in the area is to settle and prevent such conflicts. Subsequently, attention is to be paid to more active participation of GUUAM states in the OSCE peacekeeping missions, and development of the early conflict prevention mechanisms.

Proceeding from such vision, it is possible to foresee some forms of cooperation between GUUAM and NATO in the following dimensions:

- Joint participation in peacekeeping operations;
- Raising effectiveness of the North Atlantic Consultative Committee;
- Raising combat readiness of national armed forces and conversion to NATO standards;
- Democratisation and civil control over the military;
- Crisis management and conflict resolution;
- Doctrine and strategy compatibility;
- Coordinated approaches and measures enhancing stability and security in Europe;
- Access to NATO's information and technologies.

## **7. Conclusion**

During the 1990s', Ukraine's opportunities of closer military and security cooperation with NATO and EU/WEU were limited because of objective reasons. Therefore the dependence on its own defence potential with simultaneous advancement towards European collective security system, including international military, political, economic, humanitarian, and other institutions and contractual obligations, etc., seems ever more justified.

Having defined non-participation in military alliances as an eventual working principle of its foreign policy, Ukraine hasn't yet officially touched the question of membership in any military or political alliance. On the other hand, Ukraine's executive power institutions have kept their right to become a member of any military and/or political structure which would have a tendency to become an element of a new European security system. The military non-aligned status of Ukraine has not become a limitation reducing its wide-scale participation in programs and mechanisms of multilateral European and Euro-Atlantic cooperation aiming at strengthening stability and security in the region as well as in the future European security model. Enlargement of NATO will not undermine the balance in Europe if it goes forward in parallel with the creation of a system of multidimensional interdependency and establishment of new forms of cooperation between the countries of Eastern Central Europe including Ukraine.

Ukraine attaches great importance to the principle of full involvement into the emerging European security architecture attempting to diversify and deepen its connections with other European states and institutions in the field of security cooperation.

This is consistent with the basic principles of Ukraine's foreign policy, approved by the Parliament in 1993, and includes support for the principle of indivisibility of international peace and European security. Universality of these principles often served as an explanation to Ukraine's foreign policy pragmatism. During 1990s Ukraine's national interests were often interpreted as establishing motivated balance of political and economic relations with the East and the West, and also with the other most important World regions.

However, the 1993 foreign policy concept did not give an adequate answer to the prospects of Ukraine's position in the changing Euro-Atlantic political and security relations.

The specific position of Ukraine in the system of European security is determined by quite a number of circumstances.

First, that during the foreseeable time Ukraine will preserve the role of a principally significant component of the European security, at least unless the process of NATO enlargement and presence reaches Russia's borders in the Baltics and limits of the Caspian Sea.

Secondly, the change of geopolitical orientation of Ukraine can essentially influence the dimension of processes in the Eastern Europe.

This specifics is stipulated by the following factors:

1. Due to domestic peculiarities of Ukraine there are no grounds at the moment to expect quick changes in the development of democratic processes and fast economic recovering. It is evident that the country lacks wide non-left opposition capable to put forward a concept of national development attractive for the majority of the population and to receive ambiguous support at the elections.

2. The way of the country to the European values of political democracy and effective market economy should begin just with revision of inefficient economic policy and creation of the preconditions for economic growth. Under the circumstances of sharp weakening of the "middle class" and downfall of the living standards of the overwhelming majority of the population the simple personal change of the top state post-holders in the executive authority will not result in changing the character of domestic political and economic processes but will only mean a rotation of dominant groupings at power.

3. Because of the specific character of the transformation processes in the 1990s, the relative lag of Ukraine from the neighbouring states of the Central Eastern Europe has acquired absolute forms. Therefore, the main problem of the domestic policy of the country becomes not the search for the forms and methods for Ukraine to enter NATO and the EU, but adaptation to the conditions of presumably long coexistence with outer communities, deeply integrated in political and economic dimensions. They are represented by the Euro-Atlantic structures, as well as economic and military-political alliances created under Russia's unquestioned leadership.

4. Revival of the discussion on NATO and the EU enlargement as well as the increase of divergences between the intermediate-term strategic goals of these alliances create additional problems related to correction of the foreign-policy course of Ukraine as it complicates the choice of tactical priorities. The prospects and conditions of presumable introduction of Ukraine in NATO remain unclear until now. Of course, if the governmental circles of Ukraine will find expedient to address NATO Headquarters with an application for entry, and if for such a step there will be favourable or, at least, permissible internal conditions.

The other circumstance concerns the forecasting of opportunities and parameters for Ukraine's participation in the military-political projects within the framework of the EU. It is known that the Russian state officials avoid aggravation of relations with the EU and quite consciously focus on the development of economic partnership with Europe, first of all, in the sphere of energy supplies. On the other hand, now it is difficult to foresee how quick and efficient the process of the European military-political cooperation in the framework of ESDI / ESDP will develop. According to the Russian experts the efficiency of the Euro-corps and the European Rapid Reaction Force will be rather low at least for the next 10 to 15 years.

At the same time, inadequate financing of the military programs in Ukraine force to define precisely the priority areas of activity and to concentrate main efforts on them. In this

aspect the stake on entering NATO in the long term can prove to be more effective and reasonable decision. In particular, if at that the process of consecutive NATO eastward enlargement by admitting the new members recognised as candidates to enter the EC takes place.

5. Peculiarities of NATO and the EU enlargement within the next 5 to 10 years remain unclear. One can assume that the most favourable scenario for Ukraine will be prompt entry in NATO of the Baltic States. Membership of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in NATO will shift the accents of contradictions in relations between the Euro-Atlantic structures and Russia from the Balkans and the Black Sea subregion to the Baltics. Such development might temporarily relieve the Ukrainian-Russian relations of the contradictions between Russia and NATO. At the same time, this course of events could once again give the Ukrainian executive authority a temporary lag necessary for accelerated domestic transformations. It is quite evident that this scenario also suggests accelerated introduction of the perspective projects in the Black Sea area and, first of all, the European project for transportation of the Caspian oil on the route Baku - Supsa - Odessa - Brody.

6. Synchronisation of the processes of NATO and the EU enlargement would run counter to Ukraine's interests since meeting the EU membership criteria by this country doesn't seem possible for the next 20 years. On the other hand, the process of gradual or "evolutionary" NATO enlargement would evidently be more favourable. That is the process that would suppose gradual introduction into the Alliance of rather small groups of new members. This course of events would, first of all, result in decreasing the threat of a crisis in relations with Russia since economic weakness of Ukraine doesn't give grounds to count on an opportunity to take advantage of the crisis in support of Ukraine's national interests.

On the other hand, gradual NATO enlargement in the form of separate but regular phases of increasing the membership in the Alliance might give this process the semblance of continuity. That is each of the Central Eastern European countries, including Ukraine, should have an opportunity to enhance its status in the Euro-Atlantic Community.

7. Acknowledgement by NATO of Ukraine's significance concerning the European security should be accompanied by readiness for a wide dialogue on all aspects of mutual cooperation. It is quite evident that activity of the NATO - Ukraine Commission should not be limited to the European Security, military-political cooperation, a reform in the Armed Forces, civil control and scientific research. For the development of relations it is extremely important to discuss and develop cooperation in the sphere of defence industry. Disregard of this circumstance on the part of NATO bodies and governments of NATO member-states poses a justified threat that the informal purpose of NATO is isolation and destruction of the Ukrainian military-industrial complex. Under such circumstances the Ukrainian defence industry is compelled to compete simultaneously to the military-industrial companies of NATO countries and Russia, and in a number of cases, under favourable conditions and if it is possible with the political point of view, to participate together with the Russian MIC in joint industrial projects. This result in creating objective opportunities and prospects for political-military rapprochement with Russia, though here there are restrictions stipulated by the valid legislation of Ukraine.

8. From the point of view of international relations, in a purely theoretical discourse, the prospects for Ukraine to enter NATO depend on three major factors.

- Relations between Russia and NATO.
- Situation in Belarus.
- Processes in the Black Sea, the Caucasus and the Caspian Sea areas.

The first aspect concerns the formation of Russia's international strategy, its relations with the US and NATO and a degree of counteraction to further Alliance's eastward extension. The main question for Ukraine that stipulates special importance of development of relations between Russia and NATO is the fact of long-term presence of the Russian Black Sea Fleet on its territory.

On 28 May 1997 the Ukrainian and Russian Prime Ministers signed three agreements on the Black Sea Fleet of the former Soviet Union. They included agreements "On the transactions related to the division of the Black Sea Fleet and dislocation of the Russia's Black Sea Fleet on the territory of Ukraine", "On the status and terms of dislocation of the Russia's Black Sea Fleet on the territory of Ukraine", and "On the terms of division of the Black Sea Fleet."

These agreements determined that Russia would lease a naval base, including sea water area and infrastructure of the BSF on the territory of Ukraine for a 20-year term. The term of lease may be extended for the next 5-year periods under mutual consent of the two State Parties. The agreements came into force on the date of signing. The main naval base of the Russian BSF was situated in the city of Sevastopol. The Russian naval base also includes an airfield in Gvardiyske, a communication station, and some other facilities.

The agreements restricted Russian land forces of the BSF in Crimea to 132 armoured vehicles, 24 artillery units with calibre exceeding 100 mm, and 22 military aircraft of land deployment. The total personnel of the Russian BSF in Crimea should not exceed 25.000. Russia is forbidden to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of Ukraine.

However, under ratification of the 1997 Russian-Ukrainian Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Partnership in 1999, the Council of Federation, the highest chamber of the Russian parliament, approved a reservation that the three agreements on the Black Sea Fleet, signed in 1997, should be considered an integral part of the Treaty. Therefore, the term of the above-mentioned Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Partnership is 10 years with simultaneous prolongation for the next decade if any of the Parties announce a desire to terminate its participation in the treaty not later than a year before its expiry date.

If relations between Russia and NATO are tenuous and Ukraine's government has a desire to join NATO, it will have to halt its participation in the 1997 Russian-Ukrainian Treaty before March 2008. Otherwise, the Russian naval bases will be deployed on the territory of Ukraine until 2019,

Another option is that contradictory trend in relations between Russia and NATO will be a temporary accident and will decline within this decade. Development of constructive cooperation between Russia and NATO will mean that Russia's naval presence in Crimea lost its crucial significance and should not contradict the establishment of the PfP international training centre in the Lviv region of Ukraine or any other form of participation in the transatlantic security cooperation. At the same time, there are no bases to expect that development of the relations between Russia and NATO will go in such desirable direction.

The second aspect depends on the development of domestic political processes in Belarus. The present political regime creates a dangerous precedent, as it legalises a phenomenon of the authoritarian political power. Further development of the Russian-Belarusian Alliance can lead to the increase of the Russian military presence in Belarus, and consequently, to the increase of the military tension. If development of the relations between Ukraine and NATO causes a question about Ukraine's membership in the Alliance, the Belarusian factor will be directly considered. Thus, for the countries of Europe the involvement of Ukraine into the military structures of NATO will have both benefits (basically, of a military-strategic character) and losses (mainly in the form of aggravating the political

tension). It is also obvious, that the question of Ukraine's membership in the Alliance can evoke significant divergences between the EU countries and USA.

The third factor concerns the situation and processes in the Black Sea area.

The important circumstance increasingly influencing the cooperation between Ukraine and NATO is relations of the Alliance with Georgia and Azerbaijan. The president of Georgia Edward Shevardnadze declared that Georgia would, probably, address NATO with an application for membership after 2005. Azerbaijan, in its turn, has been proposing NATO from 1999 to conclude a formal political document on cooperation similar to the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine.

Ukraine, Georgia and Azerbaijan make a core of a new organisation - GUUAM, institutionally created in June 2001. The usual practice of foreign policy coordination between these states will promote a strengthening of security in the subregion. In the long term, in the event of successful economic development of this group of countries and conformity to the Alliance membership criteria, their synchronous entry into NATO in the context of some next future phase of enlargement is quite probable.

Terms and features of the Alliance's extension to the Black Sea subregion will depend on a degree of engagement and actual distribution of roles between NATO and the EU, economic importance of this area and its resources and also on the state of local conflicts in the Black and Caspian Sea states.

Ukraine's hypothetical joining NATO will have the following positive aftermath to its domestic development and external position:

- 'Reunification' with the Greater Europe and stable acquiring a status of a developed democratic state;
- A loss of a 'buffer state' status in a grey zone between NATO and Russia;
- Guaranteeing stable relations that exclude a possibility of economic pressure in relations with the Russian Federation despite of any variances in its domestic situation;
- Obtaining effective security guarantees and participation in a collective security system;
- Protection against territorial claims (for instance, on the part of Romania), enhancing the inviolability of frontiers;
- Closer and productive relations with the Central European states including Poland, Hungary, Slovakia and others;
- Supporting and developing relations of strategic partnership with the US, Germany, Poland;
- Stirring up activities of the defence industry of Ukraine;
- Accelerating reform of the Armed Forces according to NATO standards and requirements (reduction of manpower strength, increasing skill, modernisation of armaments and communication technologies);
- Extension of the US "nuclear umbrella" on Ukraine;
- Decrease of public support to the leftist political parties and movements;
- Stabilisation of economy and promoting economic cooperation with the West;

- Increase of investment and economic aid on behalf of the EU.

The arguments expressed in 1998 by Borys Tarasyuk, then Ukraine's ambassador in Brussels, on the obstacles to be removed and measures necessary to facilitate the process of joining NATO remain still acute [66].

Conditions that will make Ukraine's application for membership in NATO realistic include:

- Readiness of Ukraine's citizens and Ukrainian society as a whole for the country's membership in the Alliance. (Cooperation with NATO in the information field serves this purpose);
- Readiness of Ukraine's defence structures for cooperation with NATO partners, aimed to achieve through participation in PfP and through implementation of the Charter;
- Adequate perception by neighbouring states that Ukraine's membership in NATO is a step towards further strengthening stability in the region;
- Readiness of NATO members for Ukraine's membership in the Alliance.

### **Notes:**

1. RAND Corporation experts suggested that of a total of 12 countries are conceivably candidates for membership in NATO in the next 15 years, although only a few of them are actually likely to join NATO in that time frame. Nine countries have been identified by NATO as being on track to membership through the Membership Action Plan (MAP). The other three potential members are European Union (EU) members not currently in NATO; depending on the evolution of internal debates in these countries, any or all of them could decide to seek NATO membership during the next 10-15 years. Slovenia and Slovakia largely meet the criteria outlined by NATO and their accession poses no major strategic problems for NATO. Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia are advanced in terms of meeting NATO's preconditions, but the strategic ramifications of their accession loom large. Bulgaria and Romania have the opposite problem of being unable to meet NATO's preconditions, even though the strategic implications of their accession are not problematic. Macedonia and Albania are least advanced in meeting NATO's preconditions and their prospects for membership are distinctly long term. Of the European Union members currently not in NATO, Austria is in good position to join if it chooses to do so. To a lesser extent, so is Sweden. Finnish membership, however, would entail some difficulties because of the strategic cost it would impose on NATO. – Cf.: NATO Enlargement 2000-2015. Implications for Defense Planning. RAND's Project RB-62 (2001), – in: <http://www.rand.org/Abstracts/abstracts.html>.
2. Zbigniew Brzezinski. The Great Chessboard. Moscow (International relations), 1999, pp. 41-42, 231 (in Russian)
3. G. Herolf (ed.). Europe - Creating Security Through International Organisations. Stockholm (The Swedish Institute of International Affairs), 1996, p.17.
4. Yuri Fedorov. Critical Challenge to Russia, in: Pro et Contra (Moscow), Vol.4, No. 4, Autumn 1999, p. 19 (in Russian).
5. Pavel Ivanov, Boris Khalosha. Russia – NATO: What Comes Next? In: The World Economy and International Relations, 6/1999, pp. 5 – 15; Leonid Istiagin. Kosovo's lesson to the architects of the new world order, in: The World Economy and International Relations, 3/2000, pp. 112 - 120 (in Russian).

6. Ilya Mogilevkin. Struggle for Russia's space, in: *The World Economy and International Relations*, 3/2000, pp. 98, 101 (in Russian).
7. Strengthening transatlantic security. A U.S. strategy for the 21st century. – Wash., D.C., Dec. 2000. – <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/eurostrategy2000.pdf>, pp. 61-62.
8. The concept however declared that “the US must be straightforward in acknowledging that the this power—like every other country—reserves a right to act alone, or within a coalition of the willing, when our vital interests are at stake and an Alliance-wide consensus for action simply does not exist. In this extent the most important aspect is a resolute stance of the US government to defend US national and NATO's common interests including, when necessary, using the military might unilaterally”. The concept went on, that in practice, however, “this has occurred very rarely. We see a broad and growing spectrum of issues that are important to our security and where close cooperation with our Allies and Partners is a requirement—not an option. While some foreign policy commentators on both sides of the Atlantic seem quick to level charges of American “unilateralist” or “isolationist” tendencies, the facts almost never support such claims—and we should not be reluctant to point this out.”
9. Strengthening transatlantic security. A U.S. strategy for the 21st century. – Wash., D.C., Dec. 2000. - <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/eurostrategy2000.pdf>, p. 63.
10. Strengthening transatlantic security. A U.S. strategy for the 21st century. – Wash., D.C., Dec. 2000. - <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/eurostrategy2000.pdf>, pp. 62-63.
11. Warming the Diplomatic Climate: President Bush's Trip to Europe. The Brookings Institution Press Briefing, June 5, 2001.
12. Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine, signed on July 9, 1997, at the Madrid Summit Meeting of the North Atlantic Council contains a formal recognition of Ukraine as a integral part of the Central Eastern Europe. In: *NATO review* 4/1997, Special Insert - Documentation, pp. 5-6, here: p. 6.
13. Begun in 1996, SEDM brings together senior defence leaders from four NATO Allies (the United States, Greece, Italy, and Turkey) and six Partners (Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Romania, and Slovenia.) Although SEDM has no permanent structures – e.g., no founding charter or standing secretariat. Its annual meetings at the level of ministers and their deputies have spawned a variety of consultations, exercises, and workshops that build effective cooperation among regional defence leaders and facilitate the interoperability of Partners' forces with NATO. Ukraine achieved an observer status in this mechanism in early June 2001 as a result of warming in the US – Ukrainian relations under the George Bush Republican Administration.
14. Olav F. Knudsen. Cooperative security in the Baltic Sea region / Institute for Security Studies of WEU. Chaillot paper No. 33. Paris, November 1998. - <http://www.weu.int/institute/chaillot/chai33e.html>.
15. Olav F. Knudsen. Cooperative security in the Baltic Sea region / Institute for Security Studies of WEU. Chaillot paper No. 33. Paris, November 1998. - <http://www.weu.int/institute/chaillot/chai33e.html> .
16. Douglas Brinkley. Democratic Enlargement: The Clinton Doctrine, in: *The Foreign Policy*, No. 106, Spring 1997, đ. 127.

17. Alexander Wendt. Four Sociologies of International Politics, in: Peter Tzigankov (ed.). International Relations: Sociological Approach. Moscow (Gardarica), 1998, p. 70 (in Russian).
18. Peter Gowan. Three Kinds of Cosmopolitanism. Kyiv (the Atlantic Council of Ukraine), 2000, *đp.* 15 – 16.
19. Ian Bellany. Insuring Security, in: The Political Studies. Vol. XLIV, No. 5, December 1996, *đp.* 872, 887.
20. A year of governmental activities: figures and facts. Kyiv (The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine), December 2000, p. 8 (in Ukrainian).
21. Oleksandr Dergachov. On certain major factors governing Ukraine's international position. In: The Political Thought, 2000, No. 1-2, p. 132.
22. "The Gongadze affair" was generated by lawlessness. Silski visti, December 19, 2000, p. 2 (in Ukrainian).
23. Kuchma: "It is true that I have been recorded" – Holovaty, in: The Kyiv Post, 5 February 2001; Opposition protesters demand president's ouster, in: The Kyiv Post, 6 February 2001.
24. Leonid Kuchma, Ivan Pliushch, Victor Yushchenko. 'Anarchy and unlawfulness will not be allowed!' Address to the nation, in: The Kyiv Post, 15 February 2001, p. 7.
25. Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine, in: The Bulletin of the Supreme Council of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, 31/1990, p. 429 (in Ukrainian).
26. Resolution No.3360-XII of the Supreme Council of Ukraine "On the Main Guidelines of the foreign policy of Ukraine" in: The Bulletin of the Supreme Council of Ukraine 37/1993, p. 379 (in Ukrainian).
27. Resolution No.3360-XII of the Supreme Council of Ukraine "On the Main Guidelines of the foreign policy of Ukraine" in: The Bulletin of the Supreme Council of Ukraine 37/1993 (in Ukrainian).
28. Ibidem.
29. Ukrainskaya investitsionnaya gazeta (Ukrainian Investment Newspaper), February 16, 1999, p.2 (in Russian).
30. The inaugural speech of Leonid Kuchma on November 30, 1999. In: Uriadovyi Kurier, December 1, 1999, p. 2 (in Ukrainian).
31. See: Irina Kotsina. Why did the ambassadors of US and Canada need to intervene into Ukraine's internal affairs, in: Fakty i komentarii, September 29, 2000, p. 4 (in Russian).
32. Interfax-Ukraine, January 23, 2001.
33. Programme of the "Batkivshchina" all-Ukrainian Association, in: Slovo Batkivshchiny, May 25, 2001, p. 4 (in Ukrainian).
34. Programme and Statute of the Socialist Party of Ukraine (a new edition). Kyiv, 2000, 27 (in Ukrainian).
35. The Party of the Regions of Ukraine. Programme and Statute. Kyiv, 2001, p. 16 (in Ukrainian).

36. Programme of the Popular Movement of Ukraine. Kyiv, 2001, p. 35 (in Ukrainian).
37. On Relations Between Ukraine and NATO. Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada (the Parliament) of Ukraine. April 23, 1999, No. 612-XIV, in: Golos Ukrainy, April 27, 1999, p. 2 (in Ukrainian).
38. The Right of Choice. The President of Ukraine – 1999. Kyiv (Smoloskip), 1999, pp. 53 – 59 (in Ukrainian).
39. Ibid., pp. 60 – 66.
40. Ukraine before the challenges of globalisation, in: Den, 6 July 2000, p. 2 (in Ukrainian).
41. Vecherniye Vesti: 7 Days, April 29, 2000, p. 6 (in Russian).
42. Vadim Grechaninov. International security: content and prospects for Ukraine – NATO cooperation, in: Ukraine and Poland after NATO enlargement: geopolitical dimension. Kyiv (the Atlantic Club of Poland / the Atlantic Council of Ukraine), 1999, p. 6 (in Russian).
43. Ibid., p.7.
44. Interfax North-West, May 10, 2000.
45. Author's personal interview with Mr. Olexandr Puchkal, April 25, 2000.
46. NATO - Ukraine Joint Press Statement. NATO, Brussels, Press release (95) 83, 14 September 1995, p. 1 - 3.
47. Interfax-Ukraine, July 15, 1996
48. Interfax-Ukraine, June 26, 1996
49. Interfax-Ukraine, November 22, 1996
50. Will Ukraine “drag” Russia into NATO? In: Business (Kyiv), July 2, 1996, pp. 6-7 (in Russian).
51. Interfax-Ukraine, December 2, 1996
52. Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and Ukraine. Issued in Madrid, Spain, on 9 July 1997, in: NATO review 4/1997, Special Insert - Documentation, pp. 5-6, here: p. 6.
53. Javier Solana. Speech by the Secretary General at the “Ukrainian House”. - Kyiv, Ukraine, May 7, 1997.
54. Decree of the President of Ukraine No.58/2001 “On the State Programme for cooperation of Ukraine with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation for the Years 2001 – 2004”, Kyiv, 2001, p.3 (in Ukrainian).
55. Zbigniew Brzezinski. The Cold War and its Aftermath, in: The Foreign Affairs, 1992. - Vol.71, No.4, pp.46 - 50.
56. O. Potekhin, I. Oldberg. Military-Industrial Co-operation, in: Ukraine and Integration in the East. Economic, Military Military-Industrial Relations. Ed. by Lena Jonson. - Stockholm, 1995, pp. 69-79.

57. Volodymyr Horbulin. Our Goals and Chances, in: Polityka i chas (Kyiv), 1996, No 1, p. 8 (in Ukrainian).
58. The Budgetary Law for 2000 divided defence expenditure was into two clauses: general expenses (from general funds) - UAH 1 488 462 million (\$ 274.1 million); and special expenses (from special funds) - UAH 909 400 million (\$ 167.5 million). Totally it comprised UAH 2 397 900 million (\$ 441.6 million). Lack of budgetary allocations remained the greatest obstacle hampering the military reform. The defence expenditure amounted to 2.07 % of the GDP in 1997, 1.66 % in 1998 and 1.43 % in 1999. The part of defence expenditure from general fund of the Consolidated State Budget was envisaged at a rate of 1.04 % of GDP in 2001, 0.98 % in 2002, 0.9 % in 2003 and 0.86 % of the GDP in 2004.
59. Dmytro Vydrin, Dmytro Tabachnyk. Ukraine on the threshold of the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Political aspect. Kyiv (Lybid), 1995, p.268
60. 7. Volodymyr Horbulin. Our Goals and Chances, in: Polityka i chas (Kyiv), 1996, No.1, pp.8-9 (in Ukrainian).
61. Survival. - Vol.37, No.1, Spring 1995, pp.7-33.
62. Hennadiy Udovenko. Directions of Ukrainian Diplomacy, in: Polityka i chas.-1995, No.10, p. 5 (in Ukrainian).
63. Hennadiy Udovenko. Ukrainian Foreign Policy: Reality and Prospects, in: Polityka i chas.- 1996, No.1, p.10 (in Ukrainian).
64. The Customs Union was established by Russia, Kazakhstan, Belarus and Kirgizstan in 1995. In October 2000 this community was transformed into a five-lateral Eurasian Economic Community with the participation of Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kirgizstan and Tajikistan. Its first summit meeting was held on 31 May 2001 in Minsk.
65. Intrafax-Ukraine, September 8, 2000.
66. Borys Tarasyuk. Making the NATO-Ukraine Charter Real, in: Fulfilling the Promise: Building an Enduring Security Partnership Between Ukraine and NATO. A Special Report of the Preventive Defense Project / Conveners: Ashton B. Carter, Steven E. Miller, and Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall. Stanford, CA, Cambridge, MA, 1999, p. 29 – 30.