

Ukraine's 'European Choice' in the East-West Frontier

*Dr. Jennifer D. P. Moroney**

NATO Fellow, 1999-2001

Research for this Report was made possible through an award from NATO.

*Dr. Jennifer D. P. Moroney is an Associate at DFI International's Government Practice, a Washington, DC-based political-military consultancy firm, and an adjunct professor at The George Washington University.

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Chapter 1: <i>Introduction</i>	4
Chapter 2: <i>Theory and Literature Review</i>	11
Chapter 3: <i>NATO's Strategic Engagement with Ukraine in the East-West Frontier</i>	19
Chapter 4: <i>Advancing Ukraine's Aspirations in the European Union: Problems and Prospects</i>	24
Chapter 5: <i>Ukraine's 'European Choice' in a Regional Context: The Case of GUUAM</i>	38
Chapter 6: <i>Conclusion</i>	46
<i>Appendix: List of Interview Partners</i>	49

Chapter One: Introduction

Considering that the new security environment of Europe is presently under construction and rapidly changing, there is need for continued analysis of the decisions being implemented and the context and theoretical framework of the issues, not only of Western institutions such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU), but also of states in Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union (FSU). Those states that are oriented toward Europe, but considered fragile, unstable, or under-developed on an economic, political, and social level are particularly important in this new security arrangement and thus, should be given ample scholarly attention.

This project is, therefore, focused on Ukraine, one such relatively weak and fragile state. Ukraine has become a focus of scholarly attention due to its geopolitical location between an enlarged NATO and Russia. In Western diplomatic discourse, the association of the terms 'linchpin', 'pivot', and 'keystone in the arch' has become as politically correct as the term 'partnership' with Russia. Ukraine's geopolitical location has often been an added constraint on the government's foreign and security policy decisions *vis-à-vis* the West, Russia, and within the region. The Ukrainian government is facing considerable external pressures and as a result, its foreign and security policy decisions are constantly changing, responding, and adapting to the external environment in a manner which makes even firmly established decisions at the highest political level subject to change.

The Ukrainian government is also facing immense challenges on the domestic level. Real economic reforms have yet to be fully implemented, state- and nation-building is still in the relatively early stages, and corruption at many levels is visible not only to external actors but also to the citizens themselves. Ukraine is constrained by its dependency on Russia for energy supplies and even for trade (45 percent of Ukrainian trade is with Russia), and Russia has attempted to apply this leverage to draw Ukraine back into the 'Eurasian' sphere, a direction in which the Ukrainian executive has so far been unwilling to go.

In addition to these constraints on Ukraine, there is also the added factor that the processes of NATO enlargement and EU expansion to a select few states in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), as argued in this project, is creating a new political, military, economic and cultural frontier in Europe. NATO has been actively seeking to allay fears of this scenario by concluding separate treaties of friendship and cooperation with Russia and Ukraine. In addition, Ukraine has been successful in concluding bilateral treaties with all its neighbors in the hopes of reducing the negative effects that a new East-West division would create.¹

Why Ukraine Matters

In the introduction to his book *Dilemmas of Independence*², Motyl listed the characteristics that he feels makes Ukraine an important link in the future of Europe as a whole. Some of these characteristics include the sheer geographical size and population of Ukraine (232,046 square miles and a population of 49 million)³, the strong industrial sector, the agricultural sector once known as the 'breadbasket of Europe', abundance of natural resources such as coal and iron ore, and the high quality of human capital (which is nearly fully literate and close to 90 percent of the employed population possesses higher than a secondary education). According to Motyl, Ukraine's size and resources are two key reasons why it should be given considerable attention by Western observers.⁴

In addition to Motyl's reasons as to why Ukraine matters, there are other factors to consider. Given the emergence of a new security environment in Europe, specifically with the enlargement of NATO and eventually the expansion of the EU, it is ever more crucial that the West recognize the political, strategic and economic importance of Ukraine. The break-

up of the Former Yugoslavia has all too clearly demonstrated that this region is prone to fundamental shifts often resultant of ethnic and nationalist tensions. Therefore, it is most important to study the both 'Ukraine's European Choice' as well the West's response to Ukraine's economic, social and political troubles, and to discuss whether the response from the West seems to reflect these geopolitical realities.

Benefits of an Independent Ukraine to the West

The independence and stability of Ukraine gives four benefits to European security and two increasingly important ones outside Europe.⁵ First and foremost, and following the arguments of Brzezinski, a Russia unable to re-absorb or re-subordinate Ukraine stands little to no chance of re-emerging as the dominant influence in the former Warsaw Pact states of CEE. While it is unlikely that Russia will in the near future be in a position to impose direct threats to the region on a military level in response to an issue as politically charged as NATO enlargement, it is possible that a hostile, chaotic, unpredictable Russia could pose less obvious threats to the region in the form of organized crime⁶ and increased economic and political pressure, as is clearly evident with Russian President Putin's recent heavy-handed approach to the 'near abroad'.

Second, insofar as the Russian government accepts that the emergence of a sovereign independent Ukraine is a permanent feature of post-communist Europe, the groundwork will be laid for realistic discussions between Russia and Ukraine and between Russia and the West. But if Ukraine was unable to 'stand on its own feet', then the basis for realistic discussions would not only diminish, substantiating expectations that Ukraine's independence was a temporary phenomenon, but would also prolong the authoritarian perspectives that encourage such viewpoints.

Third, Ukraine's viability greatly reduces the significance of the 'Russia factor' in the domestic politics of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and other states in CEE. A Russia no longer seen as a direct military threat would contribute to the perception that change in the region is irreversible. This irreversibility means that any political party can come into power and there would still not be a threat of returning to the past or of a significantly re-oriented foreign and security policy.

Fourth, the stability of a multi-ethnic Ukraine bordering seven states would be a positive factor in a region, where neighboring countries face the risk of conflict along ethnic, regional or economic lines. Like Ukraine, these states suffer from the attributes associated with *negative sovereignty*, such as lacking national self-confidence, effective political and economic institutions, civil traditions, and a basis of trust between government and society. If Ukraine was able to maintain civic tolerance and strengthen its internal cohesion this would not counter the cause advanced by the advocates for tolerance elsewhere in the region. Yet, if Ukraine was to experience serious instability along ethnic lines, it is highly probable that this conflict would spill over into other states in the region. Such instability would, therefore, expand the inter-state risks associated with minority problems in Southern Europe.

Two other issues further enhance the importance of an independent Ukraine. The first of these relates to the political importance of energy resources in the CIS—a factor which is as important as the potential of oil and natural gas deposits in and in the vicinity of the Caspian basin has been realized by the CIS countries, Turkey, the EU, the US, Iran, Iraq, and China. The struggle to control oil transportation routes between Asia and Europe is quickly gaining in geopolitical as well as economic significance and is frequently discussed during meetings of heads of states and foreign and defense ministers in the region. The desire to lessen their dependence on Russian energy giants such as *Gazprom* and *Lukoil* has prompted Ukraine and the FSU states to take the initiative in attempting to have the new pipelines constructed in their territories.⁷ Second, although Turkey has developed its

relations with Ukraine cautiously for fear of alienating Russia, the Turkish-Ukrainian relationship adds a vital north-south dimension in European security, which also enhances NATO's cooperation with Ukraine. Further, the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization (BSECO) and GUUAM (Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, and Moldova) provide regional and subregional fora for addressing the issues of energy transportation.

These six concerns enable the provision of tenuous support from the West for Ukrainian sovereignty and territorial integrity. There is little doubt that Western states and institutions are beginning to grasp the importance of an independent, stable, and pro-Europe Ukraine to the security of Europe. However, these concerns generated equally powerful expectations and pressures upon Ukraine in the process of economic, political, and social transition. Only with further detailed analyzes of the internal dynamics that influence Ukraine's foreign and security policy will the West be able to comprehend the full range of potential risks and opportunities that lie ahead.

Relations with the West: Ukraine's Cooperative Nature

Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma has sought to obtain external support for his 'four-pronged transition' encompassing political reform, marketization, and state- and nation-building⁸ while continuing former President Kravchuk's policy of establishing closer ties to the West. Although Kuchma had a more realistic approach to Russia and the CIS than Kravchuk, this did not dampen his desire to orient Ukraine's foreign and security policy westwards. Ukraine has indicated its willingness to participate in organizations that promote permeability and transparency. Ukraine's domestic reform program is supported by the IMF, the World Bank, the EU, the EBRD, the G-8, and bilaterally by key Western states such as the US, Germany, and the UK.

However, in return for supporting Ukraine's independence, Western governments and institutions expect and often demand to voice their thoughts as to how Ukraine should proceed in its post-communist transformation process. This is not to say that international advice is always helpful; on the contrary, often it is counter-productive. Western policy pursues an across-the-board approach to the post-communist states without paying particular attention to their distinct histories, cultures, and structural differences. Also the added challenges of state- and nation-building of the states of the FSU, which is not as evident in the rest of CEE, were largely overlooked. Western aid packages favor the 'shock therapy' approach including stringent economic reform initiatives. But it should be questioned as to whether such radical change is possible in countries that lacked modern states and established institutions?⁹ Western policies and reform packages were by and large devoid of any long-term visions and were fraught with stipulations to which Ukraine must adhere.¹⁰ Also, Ukraine is obliged to profess its desire to develop relations with 'Europe' as a prerequisite for receiving economic support. Western institutions have thus had little leverage over those states in the FSU that are not actively seeking the West's financial assistance, security guarantees, or support for their sovereignty and independence (Belarus, for example).

Focus of the project and research questions

This project investigates the extent to which Ukraine's international and regional relations, particularly with Europe, are influenced by the state's geopolitical position in Europe's East-West frontier between Russia and the West. It is the author's contention that in the case of Ukraine and other post-communist states, one must consider both structural and behavioral aspects of international relations to understand how their foreign and security policies are

formulated as well as to account for shifts that may occur as a result of Ukraine's tilting between a pro-Europe or pro-Eurasia orientation.

It is argued that in order to deal with the dynamics that have resulted from the creation of a new East-West frontier in Europe, and in an effort to secure Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, while boosting the state's international profile, the Ukrainian government, under Kuchma, has pursued a relatively consistent foreign policy. This policy consists of cooperation with some Western institutions (e.g., NATO) and integration in others (e.g., EU), while promoting the proliferation of subregional organizations that are not dominated by Russia, and share in Ukraine's desire to develop its relations with the West (e.g., GUUAM).

This project is concerned with geopolitical dynamics in the region and suggests that a new East-West frontier is emerging between those states that have been invited or are considered front-runners to join key Western institutions (NATO, EU) and those that have/are not. This new frontier may be developing along the lines suggested by Samuel Huntington, but perhaps a modified version of his 'clash of civilizations' thesis, but takes new factors, both structural and behavioral, into consideration.

It is argued that whereas the processes of globalization, transnationalism, and interdependence have tended to soften the impact and presence of frontiers and national boundaries around the world, the opposite is to a considerable degree occurring in Europe. As it is argued, the frontier in Europe is not only widening, it also appears to be hardening. Thus, taking these 'frontier dynamics' into consideration is crucial to understanding the domestic sources of Ukraine's foreign and security policy. The frontier resembles a 'third level' of analysis—it is neither the domestic arena, nor is it solely the international arena, but rather it is a place where crucial political developments unfold and where domestic and foreign politics come together.

As regards the politics of the frontier, the following questions are posed: Is there evidence which suggests that the East-West frontier has less the character of a linear boundary and more of a broad zone where the influence of NATO and EU member states gradually fades with distance from the frontier? If so, what transpires in this widening geopolitical space that is the frontier? Have structures emerged that differentiates the frontier from the political space on which it is encroaching as it is widening? Or is the frontier differentiated by a lack of mechanisms in a structure-less geopolitical space through which authority is exercised?

Although some regional structures and institutions have begun to emerge and develop a basis for exercising authority in various sectors (such as energy and regional trade relations), this project suggests that the frontier in Europe is still, for the most part, a rather under-organized geopolitical space. The zone of states between Russia and the West continues to be prone to instability along political, economic, social and cultural lines, as Bosnia and Kosovo have demonstrated. Still, it is not clear whether this instability is caused more by existing ethnic or other divisions in society or by the frontier's lack of superseding political or economic institutions in comparison with the West. Perhaps, as this project suggests, it is both at the same time.

Followed by a brief discussion of two contrasting views of Ukraine's role in European security, this chapter defines and discusses the term 'frontier' from a theoretical and empirical perspective. Chapter two reviews of the literature on Ukraine and European security as well as on the European frontier to show where gaps can be found. Three distinct case studies are then presented in Chapters three-five, which are Ukraine's ties to NATO, the EU, and in the region (i.e., GUUAM) in an effort to analyze Ukraine 'European choice' from a political, military, economic, and national identity perspective.

Brzezinski versus Huntington: Two schools of thought on Ukraine

Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel Huntington, two prominent analysts of international relations and European security, have advanced rather different schools of thought regarding Ukraine's role and place in Europe. It is interesting to compare and contrast these views and the rationale that prompted each to arrive at their respective conclusions. Brzezinski is a great supporter of the West's strategic engagement with Ukraine as an independent state. He has argued that 'it cannot be stressed strongly enough that without Ukraine, Russia ceases to be an empire, but with Ukraine suborned and then subordinated, Russia automatically becomes an empire'.¹¹ This mode of thinking falls in line with that of Garnett's 'keystone in the arch' thesis.¹² Moreover, Brzezinski argues that the stability along NATO's new front line, which now lies on Poland's eastern border, depends largely on the consolidation of Ukraine's nation and statehood, success in economic reforms, and on its ability to balance closer cooperation with NATO and the EU and economic and political relations with Russia.

Samuel Huntington has since advanced a different line of thinking on Ukraine. Speaking in Kyiv in October 1999, Huntington stressed that global politics is being configured along cultural and civilizational lines and thus, for the first time in history, global politics is truly multi-civilizational.¹³ The relationship between 'the West and the Rest' will be the most important factor in global security because the West will continue to impose its values on other structures. Indeed Huntington argues that the 'clash of civilizations' is alive and well, and the global power structure resembles a '*uni-multipolar system*' having four levels with: 1) the US as the only superpower, 2) Russia and China as the major regional powers, 3) the UK and France as secondary regional powers, and 4) secondary regional states such as Ukraine, Japan, Australia, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Argentina, Pakistan, and India. The implications for Ukraine are even more daunting. According to Huntington, a new dividing line has replaced the Iron Curtain, which is Western Christianity versus Muslim and Orthodox traditions. He points to Kosovo as a classic example of the clash of civilizations, and argues that a new security order based on civilizations is taking place in Europe where Russia will assume responsibility for stability among the Orthodox countries and states which are 'culturally part of the West' will eventually be integrated into European and Trans-Atlantic institutions. Thus, Huntington does not include Ukraine in the latter category and labels Ukraine as non-Western, culturally divided, and situated on the 'break' between the Christian and Orthodox worlds. Ukraine cannot join NATO or the EU and is unequally situated according to his 'great power divide' to play a central role in the stability and security of Central Eurasia.

After more than two generations of ideologically driven East-west conflict, it is not surprising that Western elites have often embraced images of an ethnically and culturally divided Ukraine, speculating that this situation would eventually lead to a spill-over of instability in the region. Although such simplistic images of Ukraine have diminished since 1994, Western states and institutions, particularly the EU, continue to view Ukraine as non-European, tied by culture and identity to Eurasia, dwelling on asking such questions relating to identity as: is Ukraine closer to Europe or to the slavs in the East? Such an approach is problematic at a time when Ukraine's government is working to implement economic and administrative reforms with the goal of aligning itself closer to Europe and its institutions.

Overall, the US and NATO seem to back the Brzezinski argument, while the EU backs the Huntington one. The US and NATO recognize the importance of viewing Ukraine separate from Russia (and have backed that view with concrete programs of cooperation) and strategically central to European security, and as such they have encouraged Ukrainian elites to continue to strengthen the pro-West vector of the state's foreign policy. But while EU officials speak of Ukraine's geopolitical importance, the quality and quantity of ties with Ukraine are not as dynamic. EU officials often argue that enlargement of the EU is a 'win-win' situation for the new members and also for those who are not included in the Helsinki or Luxembourg groups- the so-called fast and slow tracks states-because of the rather extensive programs of assistance already in place (i.e. TACIS, etc). They also argue that

new dividing lines will not be created and that new opportunities will be created (trade and foreign investment)—but the ball is clearly put in Ukraine's court (to implement the 1994 Partnership and Cooperation Agreement). In order to avail of these opportunities, Ukraine must first continue structural reforms and harmonize its legislation with EU standards. The EU Commission must thus work harder to stimulate cross-border cooperation in the short-term. But since the EU has not concluded an Association Agreement with Ukraine (World Trade Organization [WTO] membership is required before this can happen), it is highly unlikely that any new initiatives, which would help to curtail the creation of dividing lines, will be forthcoming.

New borders, frontiers, and boundaries in Europe

It is appropriate at this stage to briefly introduce some of the terms that are employed in the analysis as well as to pose some additional research questions. *This project seeks to determine the extent to which geopolitics has influenced Ukraine's European Choice vis-à-vis NATO, the EU, and within the region. It is suggested that the existence of physical or psychological borders, frontiers, and boundaries is an important factor in shaping Ukraine's domestic foreign and security policy.*

The general impact of frontiers is rarely analyzed in contemporary social science literature. This project attempts to fill a gap by looking at the nature of frontiers and their influence on the foreign and security policies of states specifically in Ukraine. It is argued that the new frontier of European security following the first wave of NATO enlargement in 1999, now lies on the border between Poland and Ukraine.

Haller has noted several meanings attached to the terms 'borders' and 'limits' in a number of European languages, and has detected a fundamental double meaning.¹⁴ According to Haller, on one hand, borders may be seen as ends or barriers and on the other as passages, filters, or gateways between systems contiguous to each other. This dual meaning is similar to the long-standing distinction that political geographers have made between 'boundaries' (definite lines marking the limits of jurisdiction) and 'frontiers', which in the past have referred to zones, which faced an enemy. The term 'border' can be applied to a zone, usually a narrow one, or it can be a line of demarcation (the border between England and Scotland is both). In more contemporary usage, the term 'frontier' can mean the precise line at which jurisdictions meet, usually demarcated and controlled by customs, police, and military personnel. A frontier can also refer to a region, as in the description of Alsace as the frontier region between France and Germany. In a broader sense, 'frontier' has been used to refer to the moving zone of settlement in the interior of a continent as in the great American western frontier. Thus, 'boundary' is the narrowest of the four terms as it is always used to refer to a definite line of demarcation or delimitation. For this analysis, the above slightly modified interpretation of a contemporary 'frontier' is applied, which describes a region (not simply a specific line of demarcation) where jurisdictions and spheres of influence converge and are intertwined.

Historically, frontier or border regions have been the site of conflicts over territory and are frequently characterized by different ethnic, religious, linguistic, or national composition than that of their respective nation-states, which is a reminder of the lack of coincidence between national and other socio-economic boundaries. The allocation and demarcation of borders has historically been an elite function that was normally supported by a degree of military force or the threat thereof, which has resulted in the forcible inclusion, and exclusion of several minority ethnic groups or parts of these groups.¹⁵ According to Hansen, all of the European countries created over the last 150 years have had regional border problems, which have arisen from the demands of minorities seeking to realize their 'national values' within the framework of an organized political state.¹⁶ Therefore, the drawing of national

borders in Europe has led to the exclusion of some ethnic minorities, many of which are located in frontier regions.

This project contends that the definition of what constitutes a modern frontier is in the midst of change; it is widening and narrowing, while simultaneously undergoing erosion with respect to many issues, and reinforcement with respect to others. Rosenau postulates the following questions that are relevant to this discussion: How do we conceptualize the frontier so that it denotes identities and affiliations (such as religious and ethnic) as well as territorialities? How do those who are active along the frontier manage to absorb, circumvent, or otherwise cope with shifting and porous boundaries? And how long can an increasingly interdependent and transnational world organize its affairs in terms of exclusive boundaries? Rosenau's response is to treat 'the frontier as becoming ever more rugged, and thus, as a widening field of action, as the space in which world affairs unfold, as the arena in which domestic and foreign issues converge, intermesh, or otherwise become indistinguishable within a seamless web'.¹⁷ This, Rosenau asserts, is the new politics of the frontier. Thus, if one concurs with Rosenau's views regarding the importance of developments in the frontier then logically a focus of scholarly attention should be on those states that are geographically situated in this frontier of European security.

Due to the processes of globalization, many regional frontiers in the world are softening, and in some cases, even disappearing, as globalization has tended to reverse the inclination to solidify borders. However, this project argues that the opposite is occurring with respect to frontiers in Europe. There is evidence that suggests that a new East-West frontier has been emerging in lieu of NATO enlargement and EU expansion to include a selected few states in CEE. This project demonstrates how the notion of the East-West frontier has often been internalized in many aspects of Ukrainian politics: from foreign policy, to defense policy, to the economic and energy sectors. The presence of an East-West frontier in Europe which consists of international, regional and subregional organizations, states, societies, and cross-border working relationships has created a new dynamic in the region which indeed carries implications for the way in which we view international relations. The frontier has brought about a new level of analysis, which, includes the convergence of domestic and international politics in the widened geopolitical space that is the frontier.

Chapter Two: Theory and Literature Review

This project is primarily concerned with Ukraine's role in European security, and Ukraine's 'European choice'. The debate is placed within the theoretical and conceptual construct of the East-West frontier, or Europe's security gray zone. It is the author's contention that frontier dynamics have greatly contributed to the Ukrainian government's desire to pursue deeper cooperation and even integration into the West's key international and regional organizations, namely NATO and the EU. Ukraine has not only sought to strengthen ties with these organizations on a bilateral basis, but has also taken a leadership role in the region with those states that also share in Ukraine's desire to deepen its ties with the West.

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section reviews the empirical literature on Ukraine's role in European security and regional cooperation, and the second reviews the conceptual literature and the theoretical debate on contemporary frontiers to show the present gap in the scholarly literature.

Ukraine and European Security

There are several scholars who write on the importance of Ukraine to European security. Some focus on Ukraine's relations with NATO¹⁸, some on Ukraine's geopolitical position between Russia and the West¹⁹, and others on Ukraine's role in the region, or a regional approach to European security.²⁰ Still, in other works, scholars have focused their attention on the domestic challenges to Ukraine's stability, and to what extent European security could be affected by an unstable Ukraine²¹, and finally on developments in Russian-Ukrainian relations.²² Surveyed below are some of the more prominent and widely cited works.

In *Keystone in the Arch*, Garnett produced the first comprehensive post-Cold War study of Ukraine's critical role in European security. He sees an independent and stable Ukraine as a crucial factor in the stability and sovereignty of the CEE states. Garnett warns that a NATO-centered view of Ukraine's security role misses this point: it is not whether Ukraine is eventually invited to join NATO, but how the US and other governments can help to ensure that Ukraine becomes the principal stabilizer among the other 'outs' of the enlargement process, and defines itself in a way that does not complicate an already difficult relationship with Russia.²³ He argues that the emergence of an independent Ukraine represents a great departure from the accustomed patterns of political life in CEE. The old patterns of empire may not vanish, and the small and medium sized states may not be guaranteed success, but it is clear that the chances for both propositions will greatly increase if Ukraine remains an independent, sovereign state.²⁴

Garnett also makes several important points regarding the future of NATO-Ukraine relations that are worth noting.²⁵ Ukraine's NATO policy is first of all based on public hopes and private fears. The public hopes are to see a more stable and secure Europe in which NATO enlargement runs in parallel with closer strategic cooperation with those states, which are not invited to join NATO. Most Ukrainian officials also understand the value of the NATO alliance and its role in European security and they support NATO as a counterweight to Russian power. NATO enlargement helps to preserve the breathing space that will enable Ukraine to consolidate its independence. The private fears center on the creation of a new dividing line in Europe. He states that, 'this line should not be either a new Berlin Wall or the sole and defining security feature in the region, but it is there and should be acknowledged.'²⁷ The strategic nightmare of the Ukrainian leadership is that NATO enlargement will renew tensions and competition between Russia and the West, which will threaten Ukraine's relatively peaceful external environment and exacerbate internal tensions at the precise time when economic and political reforms are working to close them.

Kuzio and Garnett seem to share similar views about NATO-Ukraine relations. Both emphasize that the chances for furthering the development of Ukraine's pro-Europe choice is linked to its successes at state- and nation-building in terms of political and economic reform. Kuzio²⁸ argues that Ukraine's elites have made a strategic choice in favor of integration into European and Trans-Atlantic structures, and that these elites can be divided into 'romantic' and 'pragmatic' groups. The former supports a Baltic-style demand of immediate membership of NATO, while the latter opts for non-bloc status as a means of achieving eventual membership, or at least closer cooperation with NATO. Kuzio advances three possible foreign policy options for Ukraine:

- 1) to remain a self-declared non-bloc state;
- 2) to 'rejoin Europe' through membership of Trans-Atlantic institutions, or
- 3) to integrate into the Eurasian CIS in the manner of Belarus.

Kuzio argues that the first option is a stepping-stone to the second, while the third option can be ruled out altogether. Neutrality and non-bloc status have been utilized as a means to thwart Russian pressures on Ukraine to join the Tashkent Collective Security Treaty. Ukraine's self-declared neutrality has thus, successfully 'fulfilled its function to find a way out of the sphere of exclusive Russian influence made possible by the development of the Tashkent military bloc into a counterbalance to NATO.'²⁹ In his conclusions, Kuzio claims that Ukraine's future application to join NATO will depend on three interrelated factors: the future evolution of NATO into a pan-European security structure, the success of Ukraine's four-pronged transformation process of democratization, marketization, and state- and nation-building, and finally, on developments in Russia. These three factors will determine whether Ukraine will drop its non-bloc status in favor of applying for NATO membership, thereby joining the Baltic States in hopes of becoming part of the second wave of applicants.³⁰

In another important contribution on Ukraine's foreign and security policy, Bukkvoll draws attention to three features of independent Ukraine: the evolution of democracy, the potential of ethnic Russian-based anti-independence mobilization, and the troubled Ukraine-Russia relationship.³¹ He makes two main claims. First, although Ukraine is still only a democratizing rather than a truly democratic state, developments in Ukraine demonstrate that the country is moving in the direction of a stable democracy. Second, a politically stable Ukraine at peace with its neighbors is fundamental to peace and stability in Europe.

Bukkvoll argues that since most Ukrainian elites see Russia as the main threat to Ukraine's security, the state's desire for closer cooperation with the West should be viewed as a 'balance of threat' policy.³² According to then Deputy Foreign Minister Tarasyuk, 'there is currently no country or group of countries that could dare attack Ukraine militarily.'³³ Ukraine's strategic choice of the West is undoubtedly motivated by a fear that Russian revisionism or hegemonism might increase in the long run, yet Bukkvoll argues that this is only part of the equation. Security concerns are not the only factors that influence the direction of a state's foreign policy. Allying with the West has a much greater value to Ukraine than just being a reaction to the Russian threat. In both economic and political terms, the West is the winner of the Cold War and as Schweller points out, states often ally with what they see as the wave of the future.³⁴ Whether or not to ally depends on the balance of interests or the costs a state is willing to pay to defend its values relative to the costs it is willing to pay to extend those values.³⁵

Some states, Bukkvoll explains, are satisfied with what they have and they will pay a high price to defend it but only a limited amount to extend their values. Other states are unable or unwilling to defend even what they have, to say nothing of extending their values (Belarus would be an example). There are also those states that are willing to risk all that they have for what they could get (Hitler's Germany would be an example here). Then there are states that will pay high costs to secure the values that they have, but are also willing to

pay even more to extend their values. Bukkvoll argues that the Ukrainian political leadership's change of mindset regarding NATO enlargement reflects such reasoning. Ukraine is willing to pay high costs to defend its independence and sovereignty and also appears willing to pay the costs of alienating Russia. This is demonstrated by its change from a policy of balancing between the West and Russia to becoming an associate of the West, even if this relationship has not yet been formalized (i.e. Ukraine's full membership in NATO).³⁶

This 'balance of threat' versus balance of interest' scenario is useful in helping to explain why Ukraine has oriented its foreign policy more toward the West than toward Russia and the CIS, particularly when one considers the national identity question. Ukraine can only achieve a national identity that is separate from Russia and part of CEE by re-orienting itself towards Europe and away from Eurasia. Further, the national identity question may be seen as a stepping-stone to achieving two goals, which are military and economic security.

Ukraine and regional cooperation in Central and Eastern Europe

A limited number of scholars have written on the development of Ukraine's relations with its neighbors³⁷, particularly with Poland. Polish-Ukrainian relations have been described as Europe's new strategic axis³⁸ and a pillar of regional stability.³⁹ Further, Polish-Ukrainian relations have been viewed by some as a testing ground between future 'ins' and 'outs' of the enlargement process (which makes perfect sense since Poland is now a NATO member and in the near future will join the EU). Both Pavliuk and Brzezinski argue that too little support has been given to the emerging 'strategic' partnership between Poland and Ukraine and this is a downfall of the West's approach to European security. Pavliuk argues that NATO and the EU in particular encourage Ukraine's regional cooperation through the Central European Free Trade Area (CEFTA), Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization (BSECO), and GUUAM.⁴⁰ The West should support regional cooperation and not view it as an obstacle to, but rather a supplement and precondition for European and Trans-Atlantic integration. Further, Pavliuk argues that the encouragement of regional ties should be maintained in parallel with the gradual process of enlargement, as this would play a positive role in regional security. It should be realized that if Ukraine becomes isolated and unstable, the security of all states of the region will be compromised. On the other hand, a stable Ukraine that is secured in its place in CEE should become a reliable partner of the West and an additional contributor to regional security and stability. The consolidation of Ukraine's position in the region should also facilitate the improvement of relations with Russia. In this regard, the West should see the benefits to viewing and treating Ukraine as part of CEE rather than as part of the CIS.⁴¹

Re-defining the frontier of Europe: Frontier dynamics and Ukraine's foreign policy orientation

According to some scholars we are living in a world where state borders are becoming increasingly obsolete. This view holds that international borders are becoming so permeable that they no longer fulfill their historic role as barriers to the movement of persons, goods, and ideas. This suggested withering away of the strength and importance of international borders and frontiers is linked to the predicated demise of the nation-state as the primary unit of authority in international relations. Further, the supposed passing of the nation-state is linked to the weakening of political, social, and cultural structures and institutions. As a result, the role of individuals in these structures is called into question, particularly in terms of their identities and loyalties. Working alongside the reduction of influence of traditional

power apparatuses is the rise of the new politics of identity⁴², in which the definition of citizenship, traditionally referring to nation-state identities, now incorporates a new political significance, such as gender, ethnicity, race, occupation, among others, which struggle for control of the scholarly political imaginations of the contemporary world. These processes are thought to be intensifying, shifting the ground upon which nation-states once stood, changing the framework of national and international politics, creating new categories of transnationalism, while increasing the significance of images about the relevance of 'other' world cultures in our everyday lives.⁴³

Globalization and Europe's East-West frontier

The term 'globalization' seems to imply that all frontiers will eventually be effaced. However, the processes of globalization, transnationalism, and the shrinking of borders and frontiers are only one slant on international politics in the post-modern world. Definitions of 'political', which in modern times emphasizes notions of self, gender, ethnicity, profession, class, and nation underestimates the role that the state continues to play in the everyday lives of its citizens. Post-modern analyzes often fail to query the degree to which the state maintains its historically dominant role as an arbiter of control, violence, order, and organization for those whose identities are being transformed by world forces.⁴⁴ Such analyzes are also shortsighted as regards accounting for the sustained influence that borders, boundaries, and frontiers have on policymaking.

Political scientists have seldom explicitly analyzed the role of frontiers in contemporary political life. Anderson explains that this is partly because boundary effects on the behavior and values of the populations enclosed by them are difficult to assess, let alone measure. Attempts to measure them seem shallow and usually produce obvious results that derive directly from the assumptions upon which they are based. Perhaps more importantly, there are differences of viewpoints about frontiers in the historical and political science literature.⁴⁵ Some historians and political scientists tend to regard the characteristics and functions of frontiers as dependent on the internal organization of societies and the way in which political power is exercised in the core regions of the state. Debates between realist, pluralist, interdependence, and Marxist theorists arise out of differing views regarding the nature of states. Frontiers are thus thought of as entities whose role and function is dependent on the characteristics of the state. However, for others, including political geographers, the characteristics of the frontier are fundamental influences on the way a society develops and on the political options available to it.⁴⁶

I tend to agree with the viewpoint of the political geographers and further suggest that border issues are back on the Europe's political agenda. Many internal borders have been upgraded or in some cases downgraded into external political frontiers, while other state borders in Europe have diminished in political, military, and/or economic significance as selected countries have been invited to join key Western institutions. Yet, for those states that have been left outside of the enlargement process, geopolitical instability has been connected to people's perceptions of security and identity and in this regard, political borders and frontiers in CEE are still problematic and warrant further study and analysis. As House notes, 'there is an urgent need both for empirical and comparative studies of a dynamic nature for frontier (border) situations, whether those involve confrontational or cooperative relationships, and for a more coherent set of theoretical frames within which to study such situations'.⁴⁷

The old concept of the frontier has returned at a time when the enlargement of NATO and expansion of the EU is seen, rightly or wrongly, as the necessary next steps in the geopolitical reorganization of the continent, placing the fate of those countries, which have not been invited to join the 'clubs' in jeopardy. From the Baltic to the Black Seas, a kind of

Mitteleuropa, an in-between Europe, is reviving, whose fate will be decided outside the region in Brussels, Washington, Moscow, Berlin, and perhaps London and Paris.

During the Cold War, the East-West frontier was clearly defined as NATO countries on one side and Warsaw Pact countries on the other. But at the dawn of the new millennium, the new features and defining characteristics of 'Europe' and 'European security' are in the process of transition. The majority of states in CEE desire to be members of the 'civilized' and democratic world, which includes specifically Western economic, political, and security institutions. However, not all CEE states will be invited to join until perhaps years into the future, which is due to difficult economic circumstances, military forces, which are not up to Western standards, and also to the geopolitical environment, particularly as regards uncertain relations between the West and Russia.

Defining and Re-defining the East-West Frontier of Europe

As discussed briefly in Chapter one, an earlier meaning of the term frontier was military, or a zone that faced an enemy. However, in more contemporary usage, a frontier has referred to the precise line where (political) jurisdictions meet, but has also signified a region or a broad zone where domestic and international issues converge. Prescott⁴⁸ explains that subsidiary organizations can be created within political frontiers. These organizations include marches⁴⁹, buffer states⁵⁰, and spheres of interest and influence. Buffer states have been constructed in frontiers when two strong neighbors have desired to reduce the likelihood of conflict between them.⁵¹ Some European colonial powers have employed neutral zones to serve the same function as buffer states. For example, in 1887 Britain and Germany separated their interests in Togoland and the Gold Coast by a neutral zone, which was located north of the convergence of the Dakka and Volta rivers. The concepts of spheres of interest and spheres of influence developed during the nineteenth century when European powers were establishing actual and potential claims to parts of Asia and Africa. During the Cold War, this terminology has been utilized extensively by the US and the USSR referring to interests in Western and Eastern Europe, and by the US in reference to interests in Latin America. Both concepts are a means of reserving a portion of territory from the political intervention of another state. A sphere of interest is seen as a less significant claim than a sphere of influence, which suggests that the former becomes the latter when there is a threat of rivalry from another state.

As Anderson notes, all political authorities and jurisdictions have physical limits. Where the limits are located and the purposes they serve influences the lives of all the people separated by frontiers. Frontiers may take the form of a terrestrial borderline delimiting one state, like a landed estate, separating it from the territory from which it does belong. Such a border can have the character of an insurmountable obstacle to everyone who wishes to enter or leave such as desert, body of water, high mountains or other geographical feature. It can also be created by artificial means including walls, barbed-wire fences, watchtowers, land mines, or shooting devices and manpower as was the case before 1990 of landlocked Czechoslovakia in relation to Western Europe. At the other extreme, frontiers can fade into abstract lines that stand out neither in the landscape such as the borders between the Netherlands, Belgium, and Germany, and France⁵², nor in the cultural separation along state borders between France, Luxembourg, and Germany.⁵³

This project suggests that frontiers are not simply lines on maps where one jurisdiction or political authority ends and another begins; they are central to understanding political life. Examining the justifications of frontiers often raises crucial, even dramatic questions concerning citizenship, national identity, political loyalty, exclusion, inclusion and of the ends of the state.⁵⁴ In this regard frontiers between states are both institutions and processes. As institutions they are established by political decisions and regulated by legal texts. The frontier is thus a basic political institution by which no rule-bound political,

economic, or social life in complex societies could be organized without. This earlier characteristic of frontiers is embodied in public international law.⁵⁵ When a state collapses, the agreements concerning its frontiers remain in force. Frontiers are thus regarded as prior to the reconstitution of a state, and are recognized to be a prerequisite for that reconstitution. Frontiers also define, in a legal sense, the identity of individuals as the conditions for claim to nationality and exercise of rights of citizenship are delimited by it.⁵⁶ The same questions, that have been asked about institutions may be asked about frontiers: Are they needed? What purposes do they serve? How can they be justified? The answers will naturally vary according to historical circumstances as different kinds of frontiers existed before the modern nation-state.

Frontiers are part of political processes with four defining dimensions.⁵⁷ First, they are instruments of state policy because governments attempt to change to their own advantage the location and the function of frontiers. Although there is no simple relationship between frontiers and inequalities of wealth and power, government policy on frontiers is intended to both protect and promote the interests of populations or groups enclosed by the frontier. Second, the policies and practices of governments are constrained by the degree of *de facto* control that they have over the state frontier. The inability of governments in the modern world to control much of the traffic of persons, goods, and information across their frontiers is changing the nature of states and by extension, of the frontiers themselves.

The third dimension of a frontier depicts them as markers of identity, usually national identity, although political identities may be larger or smaller than the nation-state. Thus frontiers, in this sense, are part of political beliefs and myths about the unity of the people and the natural unity of the territory. These 'imagined communities' to use Benedict Anderson's terminology⁵⁸ are now a universal phenomenon and have deep historic and cultural roots, and are linked to the most powerful form of ideological bonding in the modern world which he sees as nationalism. Myths of such unity can be created or transformed rapidly during wars, revolutions, or political upheavals. Fourth, the 'frontier' is a term of discourse. Meaning is given to both frontiers in general and to particular frontiers, and these meanings change from time to time. 'Frontier' is a term used in law, diplomacy, and politics and its meaning varies according to context. In scholarly works in the fields of anthropology, economics, political science, history, geography, law, and, sociology its meaning changes according to the theoretical approach used.⁵⁹ For people who live in a frontier region or whose daily life is affected by the rules that govern the frontier, the dominant mental images of the frontier may be of a barrier or junction.⁶⁰ On the other hand, West Europeans, for example, might look upon the same emerging frontier in CEE as a safeguard against political, economic, and social instability.

All frontiers have a psychological component, which is an important point to make in this project that is focused on those left outside the NATO/EU enlargement processes. Individuals have a concept of bounded personal space and invasion of that space without invitation or consent will often provoke an emotional response of anxiety or even hostility. Governments and their ruling elite are sensitive to intrusions into that bounded space and to threats, real or imagined, that result from such an intrusion. The more closed the frontier, the stronger has been its influence as a practical and symbolic threshold and the stronger the belief that strict control of the frontier is essential to the maintenance of their power and authority. Examples include the Cold War Iron Curtain, the imposed frontier between Israel and its Arab neighbors, the partition line separating Greek and Turkish Cyprus, and the partition between North and South Korea.

As regards their justification, the question that has yet to be addressed is: What human purposes do frontiers serve? Evaluations of the frontiers vary, ranging from viewing them as essential and precious protection, to accepting them as a fact of life, to considering them as a tiresome and arbitrary constraint, to outright hostility toward their existence. Liberal-pacifists have condemned frontiers as instruments for turning into enemies those who would prefer to live in harmony and for helping to maintain historic hostilities when the

causes for them have disappeared. Another view in the western liberal tradition is that frontiers are essential for ordered constitutional politics, the preservation of citizenship rights, and the maintenance of community. Liberals and Marxists may agree that boundaries are made and manipulated in order to ensure a certain power distribution but Marxists, holding to the primacy of class struggle over any other form of conflict, contend that frontiers are transitory instruments for upholding particular forms of class domination. Without frontiers most liberals and conservatives would agree that politics would be inconceivable and that international relations in its current sense would disappear.⁶¹ The 'concept of the political', according to Schmitt's argument, is unintelligible without the notion of 'friend and foe', and thus of the boundaries between them.⁶²

Some fundamental questions should now be posed to clarify what type of entity is being analyzed in this project. First, when is a border not a frontier and when is a frontier not a border? Simply put, a border is not a frontier if there is a clear and definite line of political, economic, cultural division between states, nations, organizations, and cultures. A frontier is not a border when, for example, organizations or cultures overlap and there is no clear line of division. Thus, frontier is a much more comprehensive term than is border and as a result, more difficult to identify and analyze. Second, do states rigidly apply their laws at the boundary or border or do they combine or moderate policies to minimize the adverse effects of the border region or frontier on the inhabitants? Ukraine, in this frontier region, has attempted to deal with this situation in two ways: 1) by advocating a multi-vector foreign policy by simultaneously concentrating on improving relations with the West (NATO/EU) and Russia, and 2) by seeking to expand and diversify its relations with regional and subregional organizations that are not dominated by Russia (i.e. GUUAM, BSECO, CEFTA). Finally, how does the presence of a border or frontier influence the development of policies of adjacent states and institutions?

The discussion to this point has attempted to define the 'frontier' in a more contemporary sense. The following section exploring the linkages between the frontier and Ukraine's foreign and security policy *operationalizes* the concept. The following questions will be addressed: What transpires in the widening political space that is the frontier? What issues sustain the politics of the frontier? Have structures evolved that differentiate the frontier from the political space on which it is encroaching as it is widening? Or is the frontier differentiated by a lack of mechanisms in a structure-less geopolitical space through which authority is exercised? Such questions are not so easily addressed for many reasons, not least because we are taught to think of domestic and international politics as separate playing grounds. Thus, it is often difficult to conceive of the existence of higher structures and processes that supersede national authorities.

The 'Frontier Mentality' and Ukrainian Policymakers

Since independence it has become apparent that Ukraine's policymakers have been highly conscious of the state's geopolitical position between Russia and the West and have allayed fears of being caught in a gray or buffer zone of European security. Having expressed this fear to Western officials, Ukrainian elites have demonstrated their preoccupation with the state's geopolitical position, which is reflected in both their foreign policy attitudes and also in policy itself. Thus, it can be said that these policymakers have adopted a kind of 'frontier mentality' in their foreign policy attitudes and decisions.

Scholars have discussed the effects of the widening frontier on individual states, and policymakers within the frontier by focusing on the specific components of the domestic political structure. Rosenau has argued that the frontier has influenced the constitutional structure of many governments. He states that the processes of globalization have 'infused the subsoils of all political systems with some of the same ingredients', including secessions to unification and aspiration for autonomy to those for integration.⁶³ Further, whenever basic

constitutional arrangements have surfaced on political agendas, the central concern has been the creation of effective authority in response to the widening frontier, where none has existed previously (such as in the creation of regional organizations), where a prolonged period of time has elapsed since an effective authority structure was present (as in the two Germanys, Koreas, and Chinas), or where the existing structures are deemed pernicious and in need of replacement (as in countries that have transformed their governments from communist to democratic).⁶⁴ Rosenau's explains that *most constitutional changes that have occurred in states situated within a frontier have been more or less in response to the frontier itself*. Thus, Ukrainian elites are tasked with the creation of an effective regime, which is capable of responding in an appropriate and timely fashion to the dynamics resulting from the widening of the frontier.

Ukrainian policymakers are aware of the challenges brought about by the country's geopolitical position between East and West and have sought to lessen the chances of being isolated from the West by pursuing a pro-Europe foreign policy, as well as nurturing its often tenuous relationship with Russia. Taking into account the internal and external constraints, the proceeding chapters analyze the extent to which Ukraine's 'European choice' has been realized, both in Ukraine and in the West.

Chapter Three: NATO's Strategic Engagement with Ukraine in the East-West Frontier⁶⁵

Since its independence, NATO has been the Western institution that mattered the most for Ukraine. During the years immediately preceding Ukrainian independence, the primary question was: Will Ukraine remain an independent state? NATO has played an important role in ensuring that the answer to that question was 'yes'. But today the immediately pressing question for Ukraine is: Will the state be viewed by the West and treated as part of 'Europe' or will its place in Europe's frontier or gray zone of security be solidified? NATO plays a key role in ensuring that Ukraine will be anchored to the West and its institutions, but so also does the EU with increasing importance, as discussed in the proceeding chapter.

In Ukraine, many hope and fear that closer cooperation with NATO along many levels will eventually lead to membership. But President Kuchma has tried to draw a distinction between *integration* and *cooperation* with NATO. This distinction is supported by NATO, which views Ukraine's participation in PfP (which is deeper and more substantial than any other PfP member) not as a means to achieve full membership, but rather as a means of advancing cooperation, trust and understanding, and most importantly, the security and sovereignty of Ukraine.

From an empirical and theoretical perspective, this chapter will analyze NATO-Ukraine relations and the impact of NATO enlargement within the context of an emerging East-West frontier region in Europe. Some key questions contemplated are: What effects does the frontier have on policy where a nation-state is still being built? How does NATO view Ukraine and why is this important? The main theoretical argument as regards the frontier is that whereas the processes of globalization, transnationalism, and interdependence have tended to reduce the significance of national and other barriers throughout the world, the opposite appears to be occurring in Europe. In this respect, Ukraine's relations with NATO are discussed in the context of a re-emerging political, military, economic, and cultural frontier between the post-Soviet states and the West. It will be argued that Ukraine's ties to NATO and key western states such as the US are more developed on many levels in comparison with Europe's other key institutions, including the EU, which indicates that for Ukraine, the EU is the more profound frontier of European security and prosperity.

NATO, Ukraine, and Europe's Frontier

As discussed above the conceptualization of the term frontier has undergone significant changes in recent years. Contemporary analyzes tend to view frontiers as a region where civilizations, jurisdictions, and spheres of influence converge. Contemporary frontiers also take account of economic and social issues. Moreover, the psychological effects of the frontier are highlighted, as demonstrated by the confidence in international and regional relations exhibited among those states that have joined or are front-runners to join NATO and those that are not considered as such.

NATO more so than any other Western institution has been a source of confidence building for Ukraine. NATO engages Ukraine through the numerous PfP and bilateral 'in the spirit of' (ISO) PfP exercises on a political-military level. NATO also supports the development of civil-military relations, bilateral summits at the highest political level through the NATO-Ukraine Joint Commission and sub-groups such as the Joint Working Group on Defense Reform (JWGDR). NATO offers practical support for Ukrainian programs in the technical and scientific spheres, and other programs covered under the 1997 *Charter on a Distinctive Partnership Between NATO and Ukraine* (see below). Overall, NATO has more or less managed to develop its relations with Ukraine separate from Russia.

Ukraine's relations with NATO have not only advanced since 1994, they have been institutionalized on several levels. Inside Ukraine a network of officials and military professionals are committed to Ukraine's 'Euro-Atlantic' or 'pro West' choice. This network is placed within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), and to a lesser extent, the National Security and Defense Council (NSDC), the General Staff of the Armed Forces and the Ministry of Defense (MoD). The network is an institutionalized check on those who would prefer to develop and deepen ties within the CIS framework, with Russia directly, or on an independent basis. In addition, the establishing of a formal multilateral mechanism through the NATO-Ukraine Charter has increased the likelihood that security threats to Ukraine, both domestic and external, would capture NATO's attention in a way that would make it difficult for NATO not to intervene in support of Ukrainian independence.⁶⁶ Ukraine also now has the right to consult NATO through the 'Crisis Consultative Mechanism' of the Charter if it feels there is a direct or indirect threat to its security. Multilateral mechanisms, such as the NATO-Ukraine Commission, are reinforced with the domestic variants in Ukraine such as the departments in the MFA (inside the Department for European and Trans-Atlantic Integration there is a separate NATO Division), MoD, and General Staff, which handle the development and enhancement of Ukraine's ties with the Alliance.

Ukraine's relations with NATO are far more advanced than with other Western institutions and the NATO-Ukraine Charter provides ample room for an enhancement of those ties in the political, economic, and civil-military spheres. Although the Charter establishes no legal or military obligations, it does imply a certain psychological or moral commitment. Ukraine has been given special recognition, similar to that of Russia, which is perceived in Kyiv as evidence that NATO is committed to building an enhanced partnership with Ukraine.

Moreover, the Charter established a NATO Information and Documentation Center (NIDC) in Kyiv, which opened in May 1997. The main goal of the NIDC is to facilitate awareness of NATO and its mission and values in Ukrainian society and to work with the Ukrainian MFA and MoD to foster greater cooperation between Ukraine and NATO. The NIDC receives hundreds of proposals from academics, NGOs, the media, the Ukrainian MFA, MoD, and Ministry of Emergencies, and is thus actively seeking to organize seminars, conferences, and other activities.⁶⁷ NATO's Military Liaison Mission (MLM) to Ukraine complements the NIDC. The MLM opened in April 1999 and is physically housed within the Ukrainian MoD in the Partnership for Peace Coordinations Center so that the NATO military contacts would be readily accessible to MoD and General Staff officials in order to facilitate Ukraine's direct contact with NATO.⁶⁸

President Kuchma responded to the challenges and opportunities of the NATO-Ukraine Charter by approving a decree in November 1998 on Ukraine's cooperation with NATO in the framework of PfP. The *National Program of Cooperation Between Ukraine and NATO for the period up to year 2001* outlines Ukraine's activities with NATO in such areas as foreign policy, military security, airspace control, information technologies, and research and industry. This is the first time such a comprehensive document on relations with NATO has been initiated in Ukraine and is unprecedented for post-communist countries participating in PfP.

The Impact of the Kosovo War

The war in Kosovo did not significantly affect NATO-Ukraine relations. On the contrary, aside from a few attempts by the Verkhovna Rada to stifle ties to NATO (attempts were made to re-acquire nuclear weapons, close the NIDC, recall Ukraine's Mission to NATO, and cease participation in PfP), thus shifting Ukraine foreign policy eastwards, relations between the two have increased substantively since 1999. Ukraine even sent a delegation to the

Washington Summit during the height of the Kosovo War and brought with them a proposal aimed at solving the crisis using Ukraine as a mediator.

Moreover, the clearest example of Ukraine's pro-West orientation took place in June 1999 when Kyiv briefly closed Ukrainian airspace to Russian aircraft trying to reinforce their troops at Pristina airbase in Kosovo. Ukraine's short-lived decision (only a matter of a few hours) to deny its airspace to Russia was significant in the sense that Ukraine followed in the lead of Hungary and of Bulgaria and Romania (two supposedly neutral countries) and therefore, sided with NATO. *Kyiv's decision to balance against Russia by siding with NATO gives the impression that Ukraine is willing to pursue the pro-West vector of its foreign policy even at the risk of provoking Russia.*

Furthermore, Ukraine is actively participating in a joint peacekeeping battalion with Poland (UkrPolBat) in KFOR by sending 237 troops including a military field hospital, a motorized company, a helicopter and an aeromobile unit equipped with soldiers, officers, technicians, ensigns and translators, personnel carriers, communications vehicles, and trucks. Ukraine's peacekeeping force is deployed in the American zone of responsibility.⁶⁹

A New Impetus to the Partnership?

NATO's Secretary General Robertson made two official visits to Kyiv in 2000—one in January and one in March. General Wesley Clark, former Commander and Chief of NATO Allied Forces Europe, also visited Kyiv in February. These high-level visits were intended to boost the profile of NATO-Ukraine cooperation and to move forward, particularly in the sphere of so-called 'soft security', which includes science and technology, economic aspects of security, and emergency and civil defense planning. Lord Robertson stated that Ukraine's problems are NATO's problems, and the Alliance is determined to help Kyiv solve them.⁷⁰ Even more significant is the fact that the North Atlantic Council (NAC), NATO's decision-making body, in its simultaneous capacity as the NATO-Ukraine Commission (NUC), met in Kyiv at the beginning of March. This is the first time the NAC has met outside of its member-states' territories. The decision to meet in Kyiv can be interpreted in a number of ways including NATO's wish to demonstrate support for Ukraine, but also as a gesture that the West is seeking to expand its ability to operate jointly with the forces of 'neutral' nations on Russia's periphery.

Moreover, only days before the NAC summit the *Rada* ratified the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA), which determines the legal status of the forces and provides the necessary legal protection to NATO countries' forces⁷¹ and the Open Skies Treaty, which allows its signatories to carry out supervisory flights over each other's territories.⁷² The ratification of these agreements should be seen as an indication that the *Rada's* desire to deepen cooperation with NATO and is also testimony to the fact that some of the barriers to cooperation have been removed. Moreover, Kuchma has expressed that he is prepared to further extend relations with NATO and noted that reform of the economic and administrative structures as well as the armed forces is an integral part of the partnership with NATO.⁷³

Barriers to NATO-Ukraine Cooperation

NATO allies have expressed what many refer to as 'Ukraine fatigue'. However, it is important to point out that the barriers to the facilitation of NATO-Ukraine cooperation are numerous, but not insurmountable. The first is undoubtedly economic. Often and without much warning, the Ukrainian MoD cancelled its participation in PfP and bilateral 'in the spirit of PfP' exercises due to a lack of adequate financing. Ukraine seems to expect NATO to pay the bulk of their expenses in the various military and non-military exercises, and often cannot cope with their share of the financial burden.⁷⁴ But according to the Ukrainian

Ministry of Emergencies, Ukraine places an extremely high value on its cooperation with NATO on a multilateral level and particularly with the US and others on a bilateral level. Enthusiasm and even politics is not a barrier, but money can be a tricky issue.⁷⁵

Another acute challenge is the disorganization of the Ukrainian government. As one NATO official described the Ukrainian bureaucracy, 'there are busy cooks in the kitchen, the food is there, but dinner never arrives'.⁷⁶ In other words, there is a lot of talk with few tangible results. Another challenge is that there is limited knowledge of Ukraine in the West and that there is resistance within the Ukrainian MoD and General Staff to develop closer ties with NATO. This has to do with several factors including the MoD's bureaucratic inertia, a fear of losing jobs, the lack of a strategic vision, and habits of heart and mind (i.e. still picturing NATO as an adversary).⁷⁷ But overall, there is no actual *plan* for Ukraine's integration into European and Trans-Atlantic structures—there is only an *idea*—and ideas have not had the effect of stimulating the desired level of reform in Ukraine.⁷⁸ Yet, perhaps there are the beginnings of a plan, but the real problem is that there is still no clear conception in the Ukrainian government as to what it takes to achieve membership in NATO and the EU.⁷⁹

Although *cooperation*, as discussed previously, has advanced rather rapidly on many levels, the notion of *integration* has not been given serious attention by NATO.⁸⁰ This is evident in the following areas. Firstly, collaboration in both averting and responding to emergency situations in Ukraine (through the Joint Working Group on Emergency Preparedness) tends to assume either a symbolic or narrowly technical form, neither of which measures up to the scale envisioned by Ukraine's National Security Concept which was ratified by the Verkhovna Rada in January 1997. Secondly, while Ukraine's armed forces through PfP have gained considerable experience in operating jointly with NATO in such areas as peacekeeping and humanitarian missions (i.e. Kosovo), Ukraine's forces are not yet interoperable with NATO forces, nor are they likely to be in the near future. Thirdly, although national policy has changed fundamentally, there is still an absence of serious steps to move beyond the strategic culture inherited from the USSR. These changes are necessary not only for Ukraine's cooperation with NATO, but also with its neighbors in the region. For example, civil-military relations along Western lines helps to intertwine state and society. Fourthly, there is a growing tendency on the part of Ukraine to treat the state's official partners as outsiders. Ukrainian professionals, most of who are grossly overworked and underpaid, have been encouraged to spend less time talking and developing external relations, and more time in reshaping Ukraine's defense structures.

Also very importantly is that there is largely an absence of clear-cut guidelines and policy objectives on the part of NATO and sometimes individual departments conduct their programs in an 'uncoordinated ideological vacuum'.⁸¹ The pledging of NATO's support for Ukraine's independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity is a vital mechanism that can encourage Ukraine to be more proactive in its foreign relations. *Only time will tell whether the NATO-Ukraine Charter was only intended to perpetuate some sort of distinctiveness about Ukraine or whether it was seen as a significant step for Ukraine towards membership in NATO.* Most evidence would suggest the former, as NATO has not even hinted that full membership could be in Ukraine's future.

It will take time to determine if NATO's policy towards Ukraine and the other 'outs' is able to reduce the negative effects that will most certainly accompany the creation of a new East-West frontier in Europe. Prospective members currently see NATO membership as the solution to security problems, rather than as a framework for resolving them. The popular belief that NATO will ensure and that members will be spared of the necessity for finding national answers for security problems reflects what is probably *the* most serious misunderstanding of the new and potential members—that is, that NATO is the Western version of the Warsaw Pact, which in reality NATO bears little resemblance to.⁸²

Globalization carries with it the ability to increase the proximity of what was previously a distant dispute or problem. In other words, the distance between states and

regions is closing, often propelling previously uninvolved entities into a conflict. Therefore, it is logical to assume that zones of stability and security should be cautiously expanded, but in some cases it is desirable to retain a certain distance from high-conflict zones by maintaining the frontier as a buffer region, which ultimately one could argue coincides with NATO's view of Ukraine. Thus, globalization is also having a dubious affect on the East-West frontier in Europe in one sense because as the distance between entities in CEE closes, the likelihood for conflict between the actors has tended to increase, thus extending their political, economic, and cultural distance from Western Europe, thereby reducing their chances for accession to Western institutions in the short to medium term. NATO, more so than the EU, as discussed in the proceeding chapter, has attempted to allay the fears of those states presently left outside the enlargement process by working with them in multilateral and bilateral forums, and by increasing cooperation in the military, political, scientific, and technical spheres. With PfP, NATO has established not only a program but also a mechanism for softening the distinction between full membership and partnership.

Chapter Four: Advancing Ukraine's Aspirations in the European Union: Problems and Prospects⁸³

Since 1994, Ukraine has frequently affirmed that its foreign policy goal is to join 'all European and Euro-Atlantic structures with priority given to the European Union', but it was not until June 1998 when Ukraine officially stated its foreign and security policy goal of integration into the EU. Since this time Ukrainian officials have sought to convince their European counterparts that Ukraine should be anchored into the EU and be accorded associate membership status, with the aim of securing a free trade agreement in the short term, followed by eventual full membership.

In September 1999 at a summit of 22 Black Sea and Baltic states in Yalta, Ukrainian President Kuchma called upon European nations not to create a new 'Paper Curtain' of travel restrictions across the continent in place of the Cold War 'Iron Curtain' which would harden the division between Western Europe and the rest of the continent. Kuchma warned that the establishment of new divisions could alienate wealthy European nations from the less developed ones. Kuchma stated in reference to emerging visas, red tape, and other curbs on travel within Europe that:

We (Ukrainians) are convinced that visa and other restrictions should not become an insurmountable obstacle for free movement of law-abiding citizens of states aspiring for European integration... There is a real threat that the Iron Curtain may be replaced by a much more humane but no less dangerous Paper Curtain.⁸⁴

Kuchma, furthermore, asked EU states to reconsider their stance on the issue of visa restrictions for travel between Ukraine and future EU member-states, particularly with Poland. According to the Ukrainian leader, the possible expansion of the EU visa requirements means not only barriers in personal contacts, but also in political, economic, and humanitarian links, which already exist in the region.

Although EU officials have since acknowledged Ukraine's concerns regarding EU enlargement, and have recognized Ukraine's European aspirations, they have been reluctant to officially state that Ukraine would be welcome in the EU even if it met certain conditions, the so-called Copenhagen Criteria for membership, which is why Ukrainian officials have spoken out so strongly against the ramifications of EU enlargement.

Despite the fact that considerable progress has been achieved, relations between the EU and Ukraine continue to experience some difficulties, particularly in comparison to Ukraine's ties to NATO. An understanding of the EU, its mechanisms and functions, and the costs and benefits of European integration is still limited in Ukraine. The EU is mostly viewed from a political perspective, while its nature as a complex economic mechanism is often misunderstood and underestimated. By the same token, the EU has yet to fully comprehend the domestic processes in Ukraine and the fundamental reasons behind its European drive. As a result of these factors, EU-Ukraine relations are still not broadly based and remain the prerogative of political elites. Thus, there is an urgent need to build a strong basis in Ukraine and to enhance cooperation between EU and Ukrainian constituencies including the members of parliament (European Parliament and the Verkhovna Rada), the private sector, regional and local governments, NGOs, scholars and researchers, the mass media, and the public at large.

But while the EU needs patience, it is imperative that Ukraine should give a new and dynamic impetus to domestic reforms and pursue such reforms aggressively. *The laggardness of Ukraine's implementation of reforms has tended to hinder its European*

choice, and thus has increased the likelihood that Ukraine will be treated as an outsider to Western Europe and its institutions. Despite growing pressure for change, pro-reform and pro-European forces in Ukraine (democratic parties, NGOs, scholars, small and medium-size enterprises [SMEs], etc.) are still relatively weak, under-organized, and somewhat marginalized, while the leftist forces remain influential, as demonstrated by the sacking of Ukrainian Foreign Minister Borys Tarasyuk and Prime Minister Viktor Yuschenko. This situation highlights the urgency for external support for Ukraine's pro-reform and European aspirations.

Similar to the previous chapter on Ukraine's ties with NATO, this chapter considers the basis for EU-Ukraine cooperation on a legal, political, institutional, economic, and social level and will discuss the progress made so far as well as to show where there is room for improvement. It also examines Ukraine's participation in inter-European dialogue, the sources of Ukraine's European drive, and the motivations for Ukraine's desire to deepen its ties to the EU. This chapter will consider such questions as: Do Ukrainian elites have an overall *plan* for European integration (which go beyond political declarations) as opposed to simply an end *goal*, which is full integration into the EU? Is there a strategy in place (or being discussed) to achieve this goal or is it only an abstract idea based on an unclear understanding of what it takes to achieve EU membership? How do Ukrainian policymakers view the EU enlargement process? What are the real barriers to the deepening of EU-Ukraine cooperation? Is it the creation of a new East-West frontier? How favorably does Ukrainian society view this 'European choice'? And what should be done in the short term to improve cross-institutional cooperation as well as to enhance understanding and knowledge of the EU among the public at large?

Why the European Union?

Ukraine has set integration into the EU as its strategic goal because this path is seen as the best way to promote its national interests, which are centered on improving the economic and adherence to democratic norms, and on the strengthening of Ukraine's international standing in foreign relations. Thus in 'choosing' the European path Ukraine is opting for a proven way to modernize the country, bridge existing technological gaps, create new jobs, attract foreign investment, and improve domestic producer's competitiveness in EU and global markets.

Several arguments can be made in favor of supporting Ukraine's European aspirations. Membership in the EU is viewed first and foremost as the means to achieve a greater political stability and economic prosperity. From an economic perspective, the EU constitutes a very large export market and is an excellent source of consumer goods and investment products for Ukraine. Trade with the EU is also a source of hard currency and helps to reduce dependency on barter trade between Ukraine and its eastern neighbors. Ukraine would also do well to increase cooperation with the EU to help to modernize its manufacturing sector to the point of being technologically and productively comparable with the EU. Ukraine also needs to facilitate its integration into the broader global market. Entry into the European market would be a means to enable Ukraine to compete with leading foreign producers and manufacturers and would also allow Ukraine access to know-how for the best practices for managing, developing, and sustaining a socially-oriented market economy.

From a political perspective the benefits of Ukraine's closer cooperation with the EU include a more stable and democratic political system with developed and sustainable institutions and the rule of law with a transparent legislative process, respect for human rights, and an ingrained culture of democracy.⁸⁵ European integration would also strengthen Ukraine's national security and by extension, the individual security of the citizens of Ukraine as an increasingly integrated Europe rejects the use of force as a means to resolve disputes.

Additionally, similar to Ukraine's ties to NATO, Ukraine's 'return to Europe' is also seen as the best hedge against Ukraine's potential reabsorption into the Russian sphere of influence. Ukraine's successful integration into Europe in this context is seen as a possible way to bring Russia closer to the EU and would, therefore, help to strengthen Ukraine-Russia relations.

Socially, Ukraine would benefit considerably from integration into the EU. The result would be a greatly increased standard of living and public welfare including a heightened sense of personal security, education, medical care, cleaner environment, and access to public information. Very importantly, EU membership would also allow Ukrainian citizens to travel and seek employment within the EU. Ukrainian companies would also benefit greatly from the free movement of goods, capital, and services.

On the other hand, left on the outskirts of the EU integration process would turn Ukraine into an object, rather than a subject, of European policies with little economic or political leverage at its disposal. This could easily lead to a situation where Ukraine would become politically unstable, exacerbating the current economic crises, and thus moving Ukraine further from European institutions. However, without a solid record on reforms on which to trumpet, it is difficult to see how the EU could press ahead with cultivating its relations with Ukraine on an economic level. Ukraine lacks the fundamental attributes of western-style economic and political institutions and from an EU perspective, this is *the* main reason why Ukraine's rapprochement with the EU has been fraught with difficulties.

The Partnership and Cooperation Agreement: The Basis for Deepening Cooperation

EU-Ukraine relations have a legal basis in the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) signed in June 1994. This was the first PCA to be signed with a country of the FSU, although now there are agreements with ten other FSU countries.⁸⁶ The PCA, which experienced a lengthy ratification procedure,⁸⁷ did not enter into force until March 1998. The PCA was intended to establish a strong political relationship, which would constitute a new link in the developing network of Ukraine's connection with the EU. The activities under the PCA offer an opportunity for Ukraine and the EU to begin to harmonize their political and economic agendas. On the political side, the PCA established an institutional framework based on annual meetings at the Presidential and ministerial levels (the EU-Ukraine Summit and the *Cooperation Council*—which meet annually), senior official level or Foreign Minister level (*Cooperation Committee*), and regular exchanges between the Ukrainian and European Parliaments (the *Parliamentary Cooperation Committee*). In addition, the European Commission also holds 'bilateral' meetings with Ukrainian counterparts at regular intervals and as needed. Also, there is expert-level dialogue, consisting of about 12 representatives from the EU and Ukraine sides, to discuss such security issues as cooperation with the OSCE, proliferation, disarmament, conventional arms, and security policy. Further, at the working level, six sub-committees have been created which include trade and investment; economic issues and statistics; energy, nuclear issues and the environment; customs, cross-border cooperation, illegal immigration, money laundering and drugs; transport, telecommunications, science, technology, training and education; and coal, steel, mining, and raw materials. These subcommittees are intended to meet at least once a year, but many times convene more frequently than this.⁸⁸

On the economic side, the PCA marks an important step in helping to bring Ukraine in line with the legal framework of the single European market and the WTO. The PCA contains a number of evolutionary clauses, including the prospect for a free trade area, and provides for wide-ranging cooperation in the industrial, commercial, scientific and administrative fields. The PCA also has provisions that govern goods, services, labor, and

capital, and introduces legally binding requirements that carry considerable implications for the domestic legislation of Ukraine and the other partner countries.

The PCAs concluded between the EU and its partners were primarily intended to facilitate the development of free trade between them. The EU has concluded further Association Agreements, also called the 'Europe Agreements', with countries in CEE, which have applied for membership. In their preambles these Agreements recognize the fact that the ultimate objective of each of these countries is to become a full member of the EU, and that the Association Agreements are a vehicle, which will help them to achieve this objective. Much of the text of the Europe Agreements is synonymous with the PCAs, but it is with respect to trade matters that they differ as the former are preferential agreements geared toward the establishment of free trade areas for goods and services.⁸⁹

The PCAs can be seen as a kind of road map for assisting in the introduction of economic policies and trade-related policies in the fields of goods, services, labor, current payments, and capital movement, while moving in the direction of a market-based economy. Although the document is in many ways evolutionary, it is clear that the implementation of the PCA is a prior condition for the development of further trade relations between the parties. The PCA is thus a demanding legal instrument that is far-reaching into the realm of domestic policies and regulations, which for Ukraine represents a challenge in terms of adapting its legislative framework to conform to EU standards. *It is most important to note that the PCA relies heavily on the determination of the Ukrainian government to effectively implement it as part and parcel of its own policies, not as an order reluctantly complied with.* In addition, the PCA directly affects the business environment in Ukraine by limiting government intervention and promoting freedom of action for economic operators. In sum, the PCA promotes the development of a different type of company; one that is more sensitive to market conditions and is less influenced by governmental regulations.

Advancing Ukraine's European Aspirations: Problems and Prospects

Ukraine's MFA declared in April 1998 that its immediate foreign policy goal was to gain associate member status of the EU. In June 1998 the *National Strategy for Ukraine's Integration into the EU* was adopted which fixed full membership in the EU as Ukraine's long-term strategic goal. At the same time the EU-Ukraine Cooperation Council (which was established under the PCA) met for the first time in Brussels and adopted the Joint PCA Work Program consisting of seventeen priorities for cooperation. The EU reaffirmed at the Vienna conference later that month that it attaches 'fundamental importance' to its partnership links with Ukraine and in this spirit, decided to develop the EU Common Strategy on Ukraine (see below). The MFA had hoped that this document would be perhaps similar in scope and stature to the bilateral NATO-Ukraine Charter, providing a long-term perspective on closer relations between the EU and Ukraine, including the possibility of future membership. During 1998 and 1999, the MFA conducted an intensive campaign to secure associate membership status, but despite these efforts, Ukraine has still not been granted this status even though most of the rest of CEE states have already become EU associate members.

Although considerable progress has been made in the political sphere, on the whole relations between the EU and Ukraine have advanced rather slowly (particularly when compared to relations with NATO), and are faced with a number of practical problems as well as other serious challenges of a more general nature. First, there are several trade disputes that both curtail further growth bilaterally and lead to mutual accusations of misconduct. For example, the EU has accused Ukraine of not meeting WTO entry requirements, specifically of excessive certification procedures, discriminatory excise duties, unexpected increases in tariff rates, and other protectionist measures. Ukraine, in turn, has criticized the EU for imposing restrictions and limited quotas on Ukrainian textiles and

applying anti-dumping measures against Ukrainian chemicals and steel, thus practically closing the EU market to Ukrainian products. Second, EU financial assistance has been far from meeting the country's needs or expectations. We can compare 823 million Euros of TACIS money to Ukraine with 2,024 million Euros allotted to Poland from 1990-99 under the PHARE program. Additionally, EU Technical Assistance to the CIS (TACIS) program (minus nuclear aid) was 40-50 million Euros (\$39-49m) in 2000 and 2001. In comparison, USAID program in Ukraine is \$70m plus another \$37m for nuclear safety. In addition, programs funded by US Department of Defense and Department of Energy and the State Department's non-proliferation program add another \$215-216m, and exchange programs account for another \$24m. Perhaps surprisingly, the EU's trade with Ukraine accounts for only 10 percent of its trade with Russia.⁹⁰

The development of Ukraine's relations with the EU is more difficult than with NATO due to several other factors. First, many EU members are still not willing to view Ukraine as an independent entity separate to Russia, and are not willing to develop closer ties with Ukraine than with Russia despite the fact that Russia has not declared EU membership as its official goal while Ukraine has. Indeed, as Kuzio argues, it is not even clear if the EU sees CIS countries such as Ukraine⁹¹ as part of 'Europe' because of their history and geographical size. Second, Ukraine's efforts at economic and political reform have not been consistent and thus, Ukraine has not been viewed as a potential member of the EU.⁹² Third, Ukraine's integration with the EU would require extensive economic, legal, and social obligations, none of which would be necessary with NATO. On the other hand, Ukraine's cooperation/integration with the EU is not controversial either domestically or externally (from Russia's perspective) in comparison with NATO for obvious military and political reasons. Thus, in many ways it is difficult to see why the Ukrainian executive has not until recently placed as much if not more emphasis on trying to improve the state's standing with the EU as they have with NATO.

Overall, mutual misunderstanding, disappointment, and even frustration on both sides have characterized EU-Ukraine relations. Each still has limited knowledge of the other and it is clear that the EU and Ukraine view the future of their relationship quite differently. While Ukraine has declared its intention to become an EU associate member and its ambition to become a full-member, the EU has not included Ukraine in either the 'fast-track' or 'slow-track' groups. The perception in Ukraine is that the EU applies double standards to Ukraine, as the economies of some of the slow-track group were not as strong as Ukraine's (e.g., Albania and Macedonia, for example). This has given Ukrainian officials the impression that the door to the EU is closed for Ukraine, whatever its performance might be, and that for the EU, 'Europe' ends where the Former Soviet Union (with the exception of the Baltic states) begins.⁹³ In addition, Ukraine's neighbors to the west, some soon to become members of the EU, will have to introduce stricter border regulations and visa requirements for their eastern neighbors. Most problematic in this respect is the effect this will have on Polish-Ukrainian relations, which has become the most promising and dynamic in the region. For the millions of Ukrainians visiting Poland each year, Polish economic achievements are the best indication of the need for continued reform in Ukraine. Imposing new restrictions on travel between Ukraine and Poland will have a negative psychological effect on those reform-minded, European-oriented policymakers, and will effectively reinforce the presence of the East-West frontier.

From PCA to Common Strategy

Some optimism should also be expressed with the EU's *Common Strategy on Ukraine*, which was adopted in December 1999 at the Helsinki Council of Ministers Summit and modeled on the structure, and main thrust of the EU's *Common Strategy on Russia* (as adopted in June 1999 at the EU Summit in Cologne). *The Common Strategy made one very*

important proclamation: it declared that the EU acknowledges Ukraine's European aspirations and welcomes Ukraine's pro-European choice, but most importantly, the EU declared that the door for Ukraine was not closed. If there is substantial support among EU allies for this approach, then this official statement is a very important tool that the Ukrainian government can use to continuously remind EU officials of their so-called 'pledge'. However, the Common Strategy is a rather vague document, which did not intend to take relations with Ukraine to a new qualitative level. Indeed, Ukraine was not invited to attend the Helsinki Summit as an observer, which clearly demonstrates that there is room for improvement in cross-institutional cooperation at the highest level.

The objectives of the Common Strategy are: 1) to support democracy and the economic transition process; 2) to ensure security and meet common challenges on the European continent; and to 3) to support strengthened cooperation between the EU and Ukraine within the context of EU expansion. The document was intended to give a new impetus to the development of EU-Ukraine ties by calling for, among things, the establishment of regular dialogue between EU institutions and Ukraine and between Ukraine and the Troika (the meeting of states which hold the past, present, and future Presidencies of the Council of Ministers), the setting up of a European news network on Ukrainian television (*Euronews*), training courses in criminality and environmental issues, and the possibility of free trade in the future once Ukraine has implemented all PCA requirements. As the PCA is rather limited in the sphere of justice and home affairs (JHA), the Common Strategy also sought to address more of these concerns that are high importance to both the EU and Ukraine (e.g., as cross-border cooperation, drug trafficking, illegal immigration). Also, an Ombudsman has now been appointed to facilitate Ukraine's access to the EU to discuss a host of JHA issues including the trafficking of women and 'white slavery' issues.

Also, and very importantly, the Common Strategy has created conditions in which Ukraine could 'align' itself with EU positions in CFSP. But it is also imperative to note that this so-called alignment is at a unilateral level—in other words, it was not meant to be an institutional mechanism to invite Ukraine to align with EU common positions in a strict sense, but the Ukrainian MFA can do so on its own if it so chooses.⁹⁴

Overall, the Common Strategy was viewed by Ukrainian officials as somewhat disappointing as no provision was made for Ukraine's eventual full membership, even if Ukraine was to meet the Copenhagen Criteria. The EU maintains that it is not in a position to endorse Ukraine's objective of EU membership as its own and that neither Ukraine nor the Union itself is ready for such a step.⁹⁵

Economic problems have contributed greatly to the EU's growing sense of ambivalence with Ukraine. In 1998 and 1999 the EU has been increasingly disappointed with the slow pace of reforms, the inconsistency of its economic policy, and the state's inability to comply with the PCA requirements. Although the EU continues to recognize the political importance of working with Ukraine to ensure its transition to democracy and a market economy, and nation-state building, the EU's policy actions have not always reflected this recognition, which has led to a contradiction between political declarations and the development of a positive Ukraine policy.⁹⁶

But while the Ukrainian government continues to look to the EU for definite positive signals (i.e. the prospect for integration), the EU justifiably claims it is not prepared to send such a signal at this time due to Ukraine's failure to effectively implement the PCA provisions effectively. Moreover, most EU officials, consciously or subconsciously, continue to link Ukraine with Russia. It had become evident by the late 1990s that the EU still lacks a clear vision on Ukraine.⁹⁷ Thus, it may be concluded that the most significant obstacles to EU-Ukraine relations are not only economic and political, but also psychological.

The EU's Common Strategy was an overall disappointment for Ukraine in that it did not amount to much more than a collection of political declarations with statements of positive intentions. As one member of the European Commission explained, the Common Strategy will not revolutionize EU-Ukraine relations. No one is ready to talk membership.

Such an option cannot be given to Ukraine at this time. The EU tends to *react* to external events, from COMECON, to the demise of the USSR, to the Bosnia and Kosovo Wars, and even to the earthquake in Turkey in 1999. The sad irony is that it may take a catastrophic event in Ukraine such as a social uprising or a natural disaster to capture the EU's attention in a more constructive way.⁹⁸

Ukraine's Response to the Common Strategy

In anticipation of the EU's Common Strategy, President Kuchma signed a decree in July 2000 approving a program to integrate Ukraine into the EU. The draft program provides for three stages of integration covering the years 2000-2007. At the first stage, Ukraine aims to accede to the WTO; at the second stage, Ukraine will sign an agreement with the EU on setting up a free trade area and join the EU as an associate member; and at the final stage, talks are to be held on joining the EU as a full member.⁹⁹ Clearly, the goals are in place for Ukraine's integration into the EU, but what about a plan to achieve those goals? And how will the Ukrainian government implement such a plan? The PCA is not even mentioned in these stages and this clearly problematic because the EU justifies the deepening of its relations on Ukraine's ability to follow through with its political and economic commitments, particularly the implementation of the PCA provisions.

In July 2000 the EU and Ukraine held talks, although no new policy orientations were produced. The committee meetings were dominated by trade-related issues in which the EU reportedly received little satisfaction from their complaints about Ukraine's trade restrictions that are inconsistent with PCA provisions. Both sides, however, called for greater access to each other's markets, but ultimately agreed to conduct a feasibility study on the creation of an EU-Ukraine free trade zone. In this regard, EU authorities emphasized the need for Ukraine to work harder towards WTO accession. The EU does in fact support Ukraine's candidacy for WTO membership as a more 'realistic and pragmatic' approach to relations with the West and with the EU.¹⁰⁰

Former Ukrainian Foreign Minister Borys Tarasyuk suggested that the primary goals of Ukraine's rapprochement with the EU are the development of trade-economic relations, access to the European market, and the procurement of modern technologies.¹⁰¹ In the political sphere EU-Ukraine relations have developed rather well; however, Ukraine's economic difficulties have long curtailed progress in economic cooperation. Ukraine continues to be viewed as a state with a non-market oriented economy. The number of EU anti-dumping cases against Ukraine has significantly increased in recent years, thus limiting the export of Ukrainian commodities and especially industrial products.

The Ukrainian government has responded to the EU's call to begin the process of harmonizing and adapting its legislation to the laws of the EU, at least at face value. The spheres of legislation upon which Ukraine's closer economic relations with the EU depend are entrepreneurship, protection of competition and intellectual ownership rights, customs regulations, transport, communications, certification and standards. Ukraine intends to adapt its legislation in three stages. In the first stage, attention will be given to bringing the legal system in line with the requirements of the Declaration approved by the EU in 1993. The second stage will encourage Ukraine to orient its legislation and regulations in line with the EU. This would include the revision of Ukrainian laws in line with the PCA in preparation for the creation of a free trade zone between the EU and Ukraine, as well as obtaining associate member status in the EU. The level of ties set forth in the final stage, which is largely undetermined at present, will depend on whether Ukraine has achieved associate member status.¹⁰²

But according to EU officials, Ukraine tends to abolish one PCA incompatible law (for example, on foreign trade or taxation of foreign companies seeking to establish in Ukraine),

only to reintroduce the same legislation under a different name shortly thereafter.¹⁰³ The most striking case remains the February 1999 Ukrainian authorities responded to EU pressure to abolish a law on the practice of discriminatory registration and expertise fees for imported pharmaceutical products, only to put in place in May 1999 a new regulation having the same effect. Additionally, Ukraine is in breach of many PCA provisions on trade in goods. For example, there is the 1997 law on the stimulation of automobile production in Ukraine and the accompanying regulations on the second hand car market (the Daewoo case), which are in breach of five separate PCA provisions. Obviously, if we look at Ukraine's actions in terms of legal harmonization, the EU is not reassured that Ukrainian policymakers are serious about integrating with the EU, and more importantly, Ukraine does not seem to realize what it takes to achieve full membership or even associate membership.

Aside from these practical barriers, EU membership for Ukraine is not provocative or controversial in Russia. Theoretically Ukraine has no external barrier that would impede the development of its multidimensional relations with the EU. So given this scenario, how can the slow pace of Ukraine's integration into Europe over the past decade be explained? This slow pace can perhaps be attributed to an amorphous and hesitant EU policy *vis-a-vis* Ukraine, which stems firstly, from Ukraine's acute economic crises and failure to comply with the PCA requirements, and secondly, from the unwillingness of EU officials to distinguish Ukraine from Russia, fearing that an independent policy for Ukraine might aggravate Moscow, thus curtailing the development of EU-Russia ties.

Ukraine and the EU: Different Approaches, Different Perspectives

It is certainly clear that the EU and Ukraine have some serious work ahead of them in order to harmonize their views on a multitude of issues. Understanding is particularly crucial for Ukrainian policymakers. For example, Ukrainian officials still do not seem to fully understand the difference between a high-level document concluded with the EU and one concluded with NATO. The NATO-Ukraine Charter is a *bilateral* document, whereas the EU Common Strategy on Ukraine is considered a *unilateral*, internal, or 'EU' document. However, perhaps one should not put too much blame on Ukraine for this confusion. One high-level document with Western institutions has basically the same effect in the Ukrainian MFA—it provides the impetus for going full-force in pushing for enhanced ties at a multitude of levels. Given the MFA's eagerness to develop ties with the EU and with NATO concurrently, it is not surprising that they have not made this distinction. According to EU officials, Ukraine is lucky enough to be consulted on the Common Strategy as this is EU business—it is a tool for enhancing the EU's CFSP and encourages the Commission and the member-states to speak with one voice on Ukraine. Constant Ukrainian pressure on the EU for associate membership has tended to create an atmosphere of 'Ukraine fatigue' similar to the atmosphere found at NATO Headquarters. In sum, the EU Common Strategy is not meant to be a vehicle for seeking to push for what Ukraine wants *vis-a-vis* the EU.

Additionally, as European integration is a very complicated process of domestic reform and adaptation of the national legislation to EU standards, it can be said that the EU on the whole is a *process-orientated* institution. Integration into the EU is a process that requires much more effort by an applicant than by any other international agreement of participant. While paying most attention to the end result—that is full membership—it can be argued in this chapter that the Ukrainian government is *goal-oriented* in its approach to the EU and as such, Ukraine's elites often neglect or underestimate all of the commitments and legal, economic, political, and social obligations that stem from EU membership and its consequences for the country's domestic situation. In other words, *Ukrainian policymakers pursue final solutions to socio-economic and security challenges as opposed to the EU's process solutions*. Ukraine needs to go through all of the necessary stages so that it can

reach the end of the process—that is, full integration. The process itself, which also includes EU involvement in Ukraine's domestic affairs (something which the Ukrainian government has not accepted), should help Ukraine to develop a more effective democracy and a stronger economy.

The more developed and successful Ukraine becomes and the more closely Ukrainian institutions resembles those in the EU, the more favorably the EU will view Ukraine as a legitimate candidate for membership, thus making it more difficult for the EU to reject Ukraine. Still, to aspire to full membership is simply not enough. It is imperative to show a strong willingness and ability to implement the agreed-upon commitments, particularly those in the PCA. Ukrainian officials must understand that European integration should not only be a goal in itself; integration should be viewed as a tool by which to modernize the country, establish a regulatory framework, and ultimately to achieve a higher standard of living for the people.

Has the EU 'Chosen' Ukraine?

Ukraine's integration into the EU cannot be one-sided. Unless the political will exists among EU member-states to press ahead with substantial deepening of political and economic cooperation with Ukraine, it is rather pointless to overestimate Ukraine's intentions toward the EU. It cannot be stated with any degree of certainty at present that the EU does in fact view the enhancement of its ties with Ukraine as a priority, even though political dialogue with Ukraine at the highest level has been institutionalized.

At the Third EU-Ukraine Summit in September 2000 in Paris, Ukraine unveiled a new program of integration into the EU. The decree was issued by Kuchma on 14 September, and signed literally on board the plane to France.¹⁰⁴ Javier Solana, the EU's High Representative for Foreign and Security Policy, traveled to Kyiv in 2001 to examine the document. Ukraine's domestic development and its political and economic situation, the EU Common Strategy on Ukraine, formation of a common European Security and Defense Identity/Policy (ESDI/ESDP, respectively), EU expansion, the development of bilateral relations, and the role of the G-7 and the EU on the closure of the Chornobyl nuclear power station (which Kuchma firmly pledged as 15 December 2000) were all discussed at the Summit. Considerable attention was given to the implementation of the PCA, especially in the framework of an improved political dialogue, as well as to the creation of a favorable investment climate in Ukraine, and the implementation of a memorandum on mutual understanding between the EU and Ukraine.

Additionally, in a joint statement issued at the conclusion of the Summit the two sides emphasized that it is in their interest to 'maintain a stable and healthy partnership with Russia based on shared values, notably respect for human rights and basic freedoms'.¹⁰⁵ Some progress was also made on trade-related issues as the EU informed Ukraine that it was considering removing Ukraine from the list of non-market economies (which it has since done) in the EC antidumping legislation and granting it the same treatment as Russia and China in antidumping proceedings.¹⁰⁶

Although Ukraine acknowledges that the EU has its own integrated legal system, the Ukrainian government has expressed that it would like to retain its previous agreements, especially those on visas and customs regulations, with other EU aspirant states such as neighboring Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary. As Kuchma states, 'we believe that with EU expansion, the interests of our state need to be taken into account. We need to avoid new barriers appearing between us and keep all the positive things that have been reached in relations between Ukraine and the EU'.¹⁰⁷ However, the issue of a free economic zone between the EU and Ukraine was not resolved at the Summit. Kuchma, nonetheless, confirmed that the EU and WTO are Ukraine's strategic goals.

It was expressed to the author by an official from the Ukrainian MFA that the September 2000 EU-Ukraine Summit was the most successful one yet, mostly because Kuchma was briefed in detail well in advance and as a result, he was confident, articulate, and effective in the discussions. In addition, EU officials reiterated that the two sides were on the same wavelength, and in fact over the past six-eight months, EU-Ukraine relations have steadily improved. The Ukrainian delegation accepted that in order to move forward, the first step must be implementation of the PCA.¹⁰⁸

The Ukrainian side presented two memoranda to their EU counterparts- one on security cooperation (under CFSP political dialogue: ESDI/ESDP, military cooperation with Poland, etc) and one on how best to combat organized crime. In addition, the Ukrainian side presented their 'Program of Ukraine's Integration into the EU until the year 2007', which was modeled on Poland's program on how to adopt the *acquis communautaire*. This document, which is nearly 300 pages in length, outlines short (1-2 years), medium (3-5 years) and long (5+ years) term priorities to implement the provisions of the PCA. Also, and very importantly, *this document holds the interagency in Ukraine accountable for the implementation of PCA regulations (i.e. Ministries of Economy and Energy and the Verkhovna Rada)*. The problem for the Ukrainian MFA has been that they are virtually paralyzed when it comes to forcing the other Ministries into implementing specific PCA provisions and as a result, political relations with the EU have suffered. In addition to this Program on EU Integration, there is also a shorter, more easily digestible 'Action Plan' for PCA implementation, which is approximately 10-20 pages and covers the scope of one year. Naturally, EU officials tend to favor these shorter, more concise documents to lengthy, 'philosophical' Ukrainian ones often submitted by the Ukrainian delegations.

Implementing Ukraine's European Policy

Implementing Ukraine's 'European choice' will not be an easy undertaking in any sense. Ukraine's ability to accede to the EU lies in its successful implementation of economic, political, and institutional reforms, and this reform process must be transparent to the EU and the West in general. Ukrainian legislation needs to be harmonized in a plethora of areas, and this should be done by adopting European laws as described in about 80,000 pages of obligatory EU legislation—the *acquis communautaire*—and by amending existing domestic legislation to conform to EU standards (without reintroducing new legislation that is incompatible with the PCA).

Integration into the EU must be more than a goal of the executive branch of government, or the MFA specifically. There should be an interagency body, particularly to include the executive branch, but should also include the Rada, which would have the authority to effectively coordinate and develop Ukraine's relations with the EU modeled on similar interagency committees in Central and Eastern Europe. As EU integration should be a goal of the legislative branch, the Rada should consider giving greater impetus to its subcommittee on European integration. This body could coordinate directly with the European Parliament at various levels (e.g., working group, expert level, etc) with the aim of tracking EU integration issues, bringing Ukrainian legislation in line with EU standards, and increasing the overall support for Ukraine's accession to the EU within the Rada. Ukraine should also look to its neighbors for advice, particularly those further along the negotiating process with the EU (e.g. Poland and Hungary) as virtually every EU candidate state has addressed parliamentary division of labor in this manner.

However, implementing Ukraine's 'European choice' requires much more than political will. It requires a well-trained and knowledgeable cadre of civil servants at the national, regional, and local levels. Training programs should be introduced that would focus on educating civil servants on the European integration process and the benefits it would bring to Ukrainian society. A deep understanding of the legal, political, economic,

institutional, and social aspects of the EU is still lacking in Ukraine today, even among the higher-ranking officials in the government. In addition, an important component of the implementation process should also include the publishing of a 'White Paper' on European integration. Such a document, accompanied with concrete reform programs, would convey to EU authorities that Ukraine is serious about joining, or at least achieving associate member status in the short to medium term.

But European integration should not only be a priority among Ukrainian governmental officials; it should also be supported by society at large. For this to happen the Ukrainian public must be informed and educated about the nature of the EU, how it functions and what benefits the EU brings to its citizens. To this end, it is the responsibility of the Ukrainian government to initiate a proactive information campaign aimed at society at large in order to promote the broadening of contacts with EU member states. Perhaps there is a momentum developing as of lately. For example, polls taken by the Ukrainian Center for Economic and Political Research in 2000 indicated that 57 percent of Ukrainians want to be in the EU (with Western and Central Ukraine being the most supportive from 58-69 percent).¹⁰⁹

It should be remembered that an applicant country requires that a comprehensive and coherent plan of action be introduced and accepted by the wider public. The process itself envisages harmonization of economic and legal systems, institution building, development of human resources and training of civil servants, and a public information campaign which would provide citizens with a realistic picture of the pros and cons of European integration specific to Ukraine. A timetable and a target date are important components of this campaign. The EU's Mission to Ukraine in Kyiv can help in this regard. The Mission needs to take on a more proactive role in terms of education and promotion of EU activities and norms. Finally, and very importantly, the Ukrainian government should not only consider what benefits it can draw from the EU; it should also focus on what Ukraine could contribute to the EU as a whole.

In terms of practical steps the Ukrainian government should take, implementation of the PCA provisions must be a priority. Although the PCA provides for the establishment of a possible free trade area, Ukraine must do many things, including joining the WTO, before negotiations can begin. 'The dynamics of the Ukrainian European integration strategy's implementation is not sufficient to fulfill tasks set by the Ukrainian President', said former Foreign Minister Tarasyuk, after his meeting with Ukrainian ambassadors to Europe. Tarasyuk believes that there are both objective and subjective reasons for this. Firstly, since there is no actual schedule or timetable of Ukraine's European integration process at present, there is no sense in arguing that Ukraine is lagging behind in this process. Some of the models of a united Europe that are actively being discussed in various bodies of the EU to which Ukraine is eagerly striving do not always meet Ukrainian interests. The main concern is that Ukrainian diplomats are sometimes told indirectly and sometimes *directly* that there is no place for Ukraine in Europe. Ukraine is clearly impeded by its unreadiness for European integration and inconsistency of its foreign policy (the so-called multi-vectoral foreign policy which has been more or less followed since 1994).

Secondly, Ukrainian state bodies primarily declare intentions regarding their aims for the country's EU integration; however, they have not yet made any substantial, credible, and sustainable moves in that direction. This lack of activity in the European direction mentioned by Tarasyuk could have been equated with the absence of any activity at all. Compared to Poland, the Czech Republic, and the Baltics states, for example have clearly had economic difficulties, have nonetheless managed to redirect their trade and investment cooperation to the West. Ukraine, out of economic necessity, has intensified its trade relations with its neighbors to the east.¹¹⁰

How to Proceed?

In order to lessen the effects of the creation of a new frontier between Ukraine and the EU, Ukraine's movement towards Europe should be intensified, and full implementation of the PCA is the first step in that direction. Integration into the EU is impossible without harmonization of legislation. According to one Rada deputy, the first steps Ukraine needs to take along these lines are to adopt a new tax code assuring transparent and reasonable taxation, simplify the rules for foreign business establishment and operation, streamline custom procedures, bring legislation on protection of intellectual property in line with European standards, and eliminate its import and export limitations and restrictions.¹¹¹

From an EU perspective, Ukraine must take these steps as a matter of priority:

- 1) Move away from a policy of declaring its desire for EU membership to one of full implementation of the PCA
- 2) Take concrete and sustained steps in this direction and begin fulfilling the PCA provisions
- 3) Develop an Action Paper (or 'White Paper') outlining how Ukraine will do the above and share this paper with EU officials. Such a document should not be a long 'philosophical' one, but rather a short, concise document which outlines specific dates and immediate target goals
- 4) Consult the EU regularly (as well as key member states) using the Action/White Paper to highlight where practical action has been taken and how reform has progressed
- 5) Energize working groups in the executive and legislative branches, which will be compatible with their counterparts in the EU (such as a subcommittee in the Rada on European integration which would work directly with the European Parliament). Other expert groups should also be formed and given impetus (i.e. real decision making powers) to take advantage of the highly skilled Ukrainian society particularly in the scientific and technical spheres
- 6) Stimulate EU interest in Ukraine by attracting EU investment and inviting more visitors. Strict visa requirements for EU citizens to visit Ukraine do not help in widening knowledge about Ukraine (*even if the EU has visa requirement for Ukrainian citizens, this policy need not be reciprocated*)¹¹²

But from a Ukrainian perspective, the EU should take the following actions:

- 1) Consider relations with Ukraine in a more positive light
- 2) Recognize that Ukraine's failure to establish closer ties with the EU will only serve to strengthen the position of the opponents of reform in Ukraine
- 3) Accord Ukraine a positive signal by acknowledging Ukraine's EU membership aspirations) from the EU in the NEAR TERM as economic and institutional reforms are implemented
- 4) Continue to encourage Ukraine in inter-European forums to be pro-active about passing and implementing reform legislation to help Ukraine's 'image problem' and undercut EU arguments aimed at excluding Ukraine in an expanded vision of Europe

Ukraine should prioritize the establishment and invigoration of joint working groups with the EU to promote the implementation of the PCA in general, and also facilitate cooperation with the EU in terms of justice and home affairs, particularly fighting organized crime, illegal immigration, terrorism, and drug trafficking. Because Ukraine is concerned about the introduction of new visa regimes with its neighbors, border issues should be a central focus of EU-Ukraine cooperation. These working groups could be modeled on NATO-Ukraine committees designed to deal with specific areas of cooperation such as science and environment, technologies, political cooperation, and even defense-related cooperation. Ukraine and the EU should endeavor to establish a positive working relationship at the committee/working group/expert level with the goal of eventually

streamlining responsibilities so that the representatives participating in these forums are able to deal with specific challenges to their relationship, rather than to be bogged-down with specificities at the foreign minister or presidential levels.

At the center of a newly invigorated EU-Ukraine cooperation effort should also be an increase in activities between the Rada and the European Parliament because if the leftist forces in the Rada are hampering reform efforts and thus Ukraine's 'return to Europe', then the legislature is where the EU should be an important focus of attention. As mentioned already, the Rada has established a subcommittee on European (and strangely enough, CIS) integration; however, this body is not comparable at a functioning level to similar committees in other 'aspirant' countries such as in Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, Bulgaria, and Romania. This is in part due to a lack of experience and insufficient contact with the European Parliament and an institutional and human level. Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) need to establish a working relationship with Rada deputies to bolster the European idea among Ukrainian parliamentarians. Significant effort has been made to educate the Ukrainian executive branch regarding the EU, but not enough attention has been given to the Ukrainian legislature.

Ukraine undoubtedly faces several fundamental problems in its cooperation with the EU. First and foremost, many representatives from EU member-states believe that Ukraine will never be a part of 'Europe'. Ukraine's authorities have expressed disillusion at Ukraine's exclusion from the EU fast and slow track group of states to EU membership—the so-called Helsinki and Luxembourg groups. Ukrainian MFA officials believe this decision was based primarily on political, not economic criteria.

The Ukrainian government wants to receive a positive geopolitical signal from the EU as a means for curtail the negative effects of the East-West frontier. Although the EU views enlargement as an open-ended process, Ukraine fears that time is running out and that the membership window may be closing. The recent introduction of visa requirements for travel to the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Slovakia all too clearly help to justify Ukraine's fears. Ukraine wants that 'positive signal' from the EU that 'Ukraine would be welcome to join the EU if it met the Copenhagen Criteria for membership'. This statement on an official level would send a clear signal that EU membership is based on economic criteria and PCA implementation in general and not on political, cultural, or other factors.

The central problem with the PCA from Ukraine's perspective is that this document is viewed as one-sided and out-of-date. At the Helsinki Summit Ukrainian officials had hoped the PCA would be replaced by a new, 'fairer, and more realistic' EU approach to Ukraine, but the Common Strategy fell short of explicitly stating that Ukraine would be welcome in the EU if it met the specified criteria, and as a result, according to Ukrainian officials, this document did not really re-energize the Ukraine-EU partnership, at least not to the level that Ukraine was counting on.

Ukraine's European direction is not yet developed to the extent of its neighbors- that is, 'at the point of no return'. Negative internal developments in Ukrainian politics, such as the murdered independent journalist case and the President's alleged involvement (i.e., Kuchmagate) in November 2000 highlight the fact that cronies are still running the Ukrainian government, which has undoubtedly resulted in a setback in Ukraine's rapprochement with the EU.

The main problem with Ukraine's 'return to Europe' is that Ukraine's integration into the European Union or Ukraine's overall 'European Choice' is not based on a cost-benefit analysis. It is a political decision based on political motivations championed by the MFA. EU integration clearly does not have the full support of the Ukrainian inter-agency and this is a problem on a domestic level that must be resolved before Ukraine can move closer to the EU. From an EU perspective the ball is in Ukraine's court. It is up to Ukraine to fulfill its legal, economic, and political obligations in the PCA, otherwise, EU officials can easily justify keeping Ukraine at arms length.

It has been argued in this chapter that Ukrainian policymakers tend to pursue final solutions as opposed to the EU's process solutions. A change in this approach to the EU's way of thinking is absolutely necessary in order for Ukraine to continue to move closer to EU associate membership. Ukrainian elites clearly desire the end goal of full integration into the European Union. The problem is that as of yet there is no clear and coherent plan in place that would enable Ukraine to achieve this goal. There is only an idea that has generated some interest and discussion among Ukrainian officials, mostly within the MFA, but to a lesser extent, the Rada and other government agencies. However, this idea has not yet been able to stimulate the desired level of economic and institutional reforms in Ukraine. In the absence of a clear signal from the EU, adversaries of Ukraine's European integration have a greater opportunity to both hamper economic and political reforms and to slow down the process of Ukraine rapprochement with the EU.

It is important to re-emphasize that despite the progress achieved, relations between the EU and Ukraine remain constrained by inadequate mutual knowledge and understanding of one another. While Ukraine has yet to fully comprehend the nature and complexity of the European integration process, the EU also needs to deepen its understanding of Ukraine's desire for European integration. Because the drive to join the EU does not come from society at large, one must assume that the desire to deepen Ukraine's ties with the EU remains the prerogative of political elites, particularly the MFA. Perhaps a more pressing issue is that Ukraine has yet to rid itself of the Soviet legacy of legislative repudiation under which both domestic laws and international agreements are often blatantly ignored. In the end, however, what Ukraine needs is time. Yet, it is the time factor, which prolongs and reinforces the East-West frontier and prolongs Western and particularly EU perceptions of Ukraine as an outsider.

Chapter Five: Ukraine's 'European Choice' in a Regional Context: The Case of GUUAM

From the outset of the states' independence, Ukraine's leadership has sought to intensify its European ties and distance itself from the CIS—particularly the security structures—and has searched for alternative routes for its energy supplies (other than via Russia). In this regard, Ukraine has been actively engaging its eastern neighbors in such organizations as the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization (BSECO) and particularly GUUAM (Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, and Moldova). Members of the anti-CIS GUUAM alliance view the CIS as a vehicle to promote a 'civilized divorce' of the former USSR and also as a means to support their pro-West foreign and security policy.¹¹³

Loosely defined at present, GUUAM is an interesting test case in the proliferation of subregional organizations within East-West frontier between Russia and the West for two specific reasons. First, these five states are not considered as potential members of Euro-Atlantic institutions; however, GUUAM is the only subregional organization in the FSU that is distinguished by its pro-European and Euro-Atlantic orientations. Second, for the last several years, GUUAM members have also simultaneously pursued an anti-CIS foreign policy stance in order to promote their sovereignty and independence separate to Russia.

Participation in regional organizations such as GUUAM is also reflective of the participants' desire to bring some order to the rather under-organized frontier, and to lessen the effects of the creation of new dividing lines in Europe. However, the US and NATO have been apprehensive in supporting regional ties (at least on an official level), for example, within the GUUAM framework, reflecting the West's desire not to endorse any regional alliances that might alienate or provoke Russia, therefore, highlighting the West's *de facto* 'Russia first' policy.

Beginning with a brief history of the organization, this chapter considers GUUAM's potential role in European security and the 'Russia Factor' from a theoretical perspective. The motivations or factors, which have brought the five members of GUUAM together are then be outlined. Next, GUUAM relations with the West—namely the US, NATO, and the EU—are discussed, followed by an analysis of GUUAM's prospects as a viable economic, political, and security institution. It is argued that GUUAM's existence reflects the member-states' concern about being left in a security gray zone following rounds of NATO and the EU enlargement. *Ukraine has thus taken a leadership role in GUUAM in an effort to boost its international profile, promote its sovereignty and territorial integrity in light of resurgence tendencies from Russia, and ultimately, to bring about some kind of institutionalized security to the frontier by banding together with those states in the region which share in Ukraine's pro-European choice.*

History and Evolution of GUUAM

GUUAM was formally founded as a political, economic and strategic alliance designed to strengthen the independence and sovereignty of its members. Some of the key ideas behind the formation of GUUAM was to search for alternative energy routes to establish closer ties to NATO and the EU, and lessen the effect of the creation of new dividing lines in Europe following NATO/EU enlargement. During the five years of cooperation GUUAM, was looking to enhance regional economic cooperation through the development of a Europe-Caucasus-Asia transport corridor. But it has also evolved into a forum for discussing existing security problems and promoting conflict resolution and the elimination of other risks and threats.

Cooperation among delegations of Azerbaijani, Georgian, Moldovan and Ukrainian officials started in 1996 in Vienna, Austria at the CFE Treaty Conference, where four states

issued joint statements and proposed common initiatives. In October 1997, the Presidents of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine met in Strasbourg during the Council of Europe Summit and stated their mutual interest in developing bilateral and regional cooperation, European and regional security, and political and economic contacts with the West.

In their Joint Communiqué, the Presidents stressed the importance of the four nations cooperation in supporting the EU's project for a Eurasian, Trans-Caucasus transportation corridor (TRACECA), and underscored the importance of strengthening the quadrilateral cooperation 'for the sake of a stable and secure Europe guided by the principles of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, inviolability of state frontiers, mutual respect, cooperation, democracy, supremacy of law and respect for human rights.'¹¹⁴ In April 1999, GUUAM was enlarged by one with the addition of Uzbekistan, which joined at the GUUAM Summit held during the NATO/EAPC Summit in Washington D.C. Following on the heels of the NATO Summit, GUUAM representatives were invited to participate in a conference at the US Congress to discuss the development of the 'Silk Road' energy transportation corridor.

In July 1999 during the Florence Summit, then Secretary of State Madeleine Albright officially met with GUUAM representatives for the first time. In September 1999 at the Vienna/OSCE Summit, the GUUAM Foreign Ministers met again. From approximately May to September 2000, the activities of GUUAM countries' embassies were heightened in the US and as a result of intensive lobbying efforts of GUUAM embassies in the US, GUUAM representatives met again in the fall of 2000 at the US Congress.

In September 2000 at the UN Millennium Summit in New York, the Presidents of GUUAM countries pledged to intensify multilateral cooperation within the framework of GUUAM by giving it a multilevel character, including an institutionalized status, and to hold a summit in Kyiv to officially lay down the structure and objectives. To this end, it was deemed appropriate and necessary to convene regular summits at the level of Heads of State at least once a year, and hold meetings at the level of Ministers for Foreign Affairs at least twice a year. In the Joint Communiqué of their meeting, the GUUAM leaders articulated that among other tasks of cooperation, the establishing of favorable conditions for boosting economic growth and raising living standards of their peoples were among the priorities. Moreover, it was intended that 'GUUAM departments' of the respective agencies of the member states (e.g., commerce, energy, economics, science and technology, culture, transport) would be established. GUUAM countries, therefore, agreed to strengthen and improve the mechanisms of consultations and coordination of actions within the framework of international organizations, and to actively promote the practice of joint statements at various levels (e.g., executive and legislative branches, business circles, NGOs, etc.).

In November 2000, the first high-level diplomatic conference on GUUAM, which included US representation, was held at Stanford University. This point of this conference (as well as the timing) was to discuss the formal institutionalization of GUUAM and the individual positions of its members.

GUUAM was set to institutionalize its structures in March 2001.¹¹⁵ However, due mostly to pressures from Moscow, GUUAM's formalization was postponed indefinitely. Had GUUAM institutionalized when it had planned to do so, there is no doubt that the West, particularly the United States, would have been obliged to seriously consider the potential role of GUUAM in European security.

The postponement of the GUUAM Summit was officially due to the request of Presidents Haidar Aliiev of Azerbaijan and Petru Lucinschi of Moldova. However, unofficially, there has been talk of President Kuchma himself postponing the Summit due to political pressure from Moscow, which Putin was able to leverage given the fact that Kuchma is forced to look East for political friends at this time due to the unstable domestic situation in Ukraine.¹¹⁶ Kuchma's earlier decision to host the Summit and cast Ukraine as GUUAM's locomotive predates the internal political crisis currently facing the President. Last

December, Kuchma still had enough political clout to pull off the Summit, but now the political situation has deteriorated to the extent that Moscow was apparently able to force Kyiv's hand (as well as the other GUUAM members) in concessions. Kuchma's popularity has since deteriorated significantly. A recent public opinion poll reveals that only 6.1 percent of Ukrainians support Kuchma.¹¹⁷ The GUUAM Summit's postponement clearly illustrates two very important points. First, the extent to which the fate of uninstitutionalized organizations within Europe's security gray zone highly depends on subjective factors such as the personalities of state leaders, political ideas and personal agendas. Second, the postponement also highlights the extent to which Russia is still able to effectively control the fate of its 'near abroad'.

The establishment of GUUAM and other subregional organizations reflects a desire on the part of its members to bring about some kind of institutionalized security or 'political normalcy' to the rather under-organized frontier region between Russia and Europe. The crucial question now is will the West support this movement towards geopolitical pluralism in the region? There is no easy answer to this question, and because of the largely pro-West foreign policy of GUUAM members, recognition by the US, NATO, and the EU is of utmost importance to GUUAM in its ability to transform itself into a viable regional organization with international ties. Yet, Russian opposition to GUUAM has been a key factor in determining the West's attitude towards GUUAM, thus reflecting the West's desire not to endorse any regional organization that might provoke or antagonize Russia. Therefore, GUUAM, at best has been greeted with 'cautious optimism' from the US, NATO, and the EU.

Russia's response to GUUAM: Key to the West's Policy

Russia has been concerned with regard to the strengthening of GUUAM since the group's inception. One might argue that Russia's negative attitude toward GUUAM is testimony to Moscow's neo-imperialist tendencies. If a Russia led by Putin seeks to restore its control and influence over the CIS countries, then GUUAM would objectively pose a threat to the realization of such intentions. If Russia follows such a policy, the instinct would be to try to destroy GUUAM, or at least, to try to reduce the organization's impact to purely ceremonial functions and to simultaneously seek to enhance Russia's military presence in the Caucasus and the Black Sea region. However, the price Russia would have to pay for such a policy would be an increase of stability on its own territory, as Chechnya vividly demonstrates.

With Russia continuing to regard the external world as a 'hostile environment', any regional organization in which it does not play the role of a dominating power, is met with hostility. If the Russian policy continues to be aimed at the 'struggle for dominance in the region and the preservation of old imperialist or Soviet-style status quo, GUUAM would naturally be an obstacle to achieving such dominance in the Caucasus region and expanding to adjacent areas.¹¹⁸

Furthermore, Moscow counterattacked GUUAM on several fronts, both officially and through proxy. Moscow sponsored the 'anti-GUUAM' group of Transdniester, Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Karabakh- the territories which have seceded from the countries of Moldova, Georgia, and Azerbaijan, respectively. On 19 and 22 January 2001, Russia's MFA issued perhaps its sharpest attacks to date on GUUAM's proliferation, accusing the member-states of aiming to create a military bloc, thus deviating substantially from GUUAM's original agenda.¹¹⁹ The Russian MFA charged that first of all, GUUAM had moved beyond its 'initial character as an informal consultative group within the CIS'. Second, it asserted that GUUAM's agenda- focusing on Caspian oil and gas pipelines and the European transport projects- has departed from the group's original goals, which had in principle been comparable with the 'integration within the CIS space'. Third, Moscow accused GUUAM of 'forcing up the pace of military cooperation in obvious contradiction to the group's initially stated goals' (the proposed peacekeeping battalion- the so-called 'GUUAMBAT').¹²⁰ But the

charge that GUUAM has the potential to develop a military component in the short-term is grossly exaggerated. Not least due to the lack of economic resources, but there is also a lack of political will on the part of the member-states. It is a known fact that Moldova has on more than one occasion denounced any interest in GUUAM's potential role in peacekeeping and/or pipeline security.

The rhetoric coming from Russia generated an unprecedented international interest in GUUAM in the months immediately preceding the planned March 2001 Summit. US government agencies also began to take a greater interest in GUUAM, though the US did not collectively lend official support to the institutionalization process. The EU was less enthusiastic, though the EU Commission was 'interested' in the developments. The talk also 'intimidated' some GUUAM members. For example, there have been reports that Moldova and Uzbekistan do not support the 'excessive politicization' of the group. In short, clouds have been undetectably been gathering over GUUAM for the past year, and the intensification of these trends may eventually lead to the collapse of the group.¹²¹

Immediate and Long-term Goals of GUUAM Outlined

There are several key integrating factors of GUUAM members including the establishment of a Caspian-European oil transportation corridor, the desire to deepen political and economic cooperation and to create institutionalized security in the region, the desire to establish a peacekeeping role for GUUAM, and their common opposition to Russian domination in the CIS.

GUUAM has established roughly four areas that serve to characterize the direction of its integration. These areas are institutionalization, economic/trade cooperation, humanitarian affairs, and cooperation in the sphere of security. Each of these areas is briefly outlined below.

Institutionalization

First of all, GUUAM members have agreed that they must first and foremost institutionalize if they are to expect external international actors to extend credence to their 'club'. The establishment of a legal charter, a secretariat, and formalized meetings at the Presidential and ministerial levels, for example, is certainly one way to capture the attention, and thus, to win the support of influential Western states and institutions.

The following are some initial and longer-term steps that should be taken to achieve this goal:

- Elaborating the conceptual basis of the GUUAM development;
- Implementing GUUAM's program as an international organization;
- Articulating program purposes, tasks and functions of GUUAM;
- Drafting and ratifying the Charter and organizational structure of GUUAM as an international organization, its institutional bodies including the secretariat;
- Establishing a format and strategic direction for GUUAM's cooperation with other international actors and institutions.

Subregional Economic/Trade Cooperation

Since economic and trade relations are one of the cornerstones of GUUAM's rationale for further integration, the following immediate and longer-term goals in this sphere are conceivable:

- Harmonization of economic interests and the creation of a free trade zone in the GUUAM framework;
- Establishing overall directions of economic cooperation in the GUUAM framework;
- Defining principles and mechanisms of creation of joint financial and economic structures;
- Defining and developing perspective directions of a transport-energy and economic infrastructure in the GUUAM framework and reviving the 'Silk Road' as the pan-European economic project;
- Taking concrete steps toward integration of GUUAM countries in the European economic space;
- Developing a strategy of GUUAM's partnership with the EU and determining the best course of action to achieve EU associate membership status.

Humanitarian Development

As regards cooperation in the humanitarian sphere, GUUAM seeks to:

- Analyze migratory processes in GUUAM;
- Analyze the demographic situation in GUUAM countries and interethnic and religious contradiction;
- Investigate the situation in the sphere of human rights and freedoms in GUUAM countries;
- Analyze the level of development of democratic processes in GUUAM countries;
- Address the problems of adaptation of the national and local legislation to EU standards.

Security Cooperation

In the sphere of security cooperation, the GUUAM countries have agreed in principle to pursue the following objectives:

- To establish agreed upon conceptual basis and strategies of cooperative security of GUUAM;
- To elaborate the new approaches as to definitive settlement of conflicts in the region;
- To outline the basic directions and forms of military-technical cooperation in the GUUAM frameworks (with US/EU/NATO/bilateral);
- To prioritize the deepening of GUUAM's partnership with NATO to reinforce national and regional security issues.

GUUAM's Relations with the West: US, NATO, and EU

As mentioned previously, the West and the US in particular has approached GUUAM with cautious, unofficial support. In 2000, the US Congress took limited steps to 'recognize' GUUAM by allocating annual Foreign Military Financing (FMF) to 'GUUAM + Armenia'. Additionally, the US State Department established a 'consultative framework' in December 2000 for engaging GUUAM.

Regarding defense relations and perhaps because the US Department of Defense (DoD) has extensive bilateral defense and military ties with GUUAM countries already, it has hinted that it may support the informal GUUAM association if it specifies common interests in

the defense sector. In such a case, DoD might be ready to provide assistance. The possible creation of 'GUUAMBAT' would naturally be of particular interest to US defense structures. Ukraine has training centers and structures in place as well as relevant forces and means to carry out peacekeeping operations. For example, the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense has established a Peacekeeping and Verification Center in Kyiv, while the Yavoriv base in Western Ukraine has been transformed into a PfP peacekeeping training facility. Ukraine and other GUUAM members are focused on making a contribution to NATO and UN peacekeeping operations (Ukraine through UkrPolBat in KFOR), and all have an acute interest in settling conflicts on their territories (e.g., Nargano-Karabakh, Abkazia, Ajaria, and Transnistria) and enhancing stability in the Black Sea region as a whole. However, because GUUAM failed to take such steps in terms of formalizing its structures and objectives, USG's interest in GUUAM for the moment has been pushed to the wayside.¹²²

NATO and the EU have been even less enthusiastic in supporting and holding consultations with GUUAM. In the case of NATO, GUUAM has asked for consultations within the '19+5' format in Summer 2000, but NATO rejected this proposal. Basically the attitude is that NATO's partners can pursue cooperation with NATO through the fP and through bilateral mechanisms. The EU, similarly, has extensive political and economic contacts with the FSU and with GUUAM members, specifically through the PCAs, as discussed in the previous chapter, and executive and legislative consultation ties and thus, the EU does not see the urgency in opening up formal diplomatic and other contacts with GUUAM, particularly since it has not been institutionalized.

GUUAM's Most Significant Challenges: Domestic Perspectives

The most serious challenges to GUUAM are not in its international relations, but rather in the internal weaknesses and vulnerabilities of individual member-states. For example, Moldova is virtually paralyzed by Russia's continued refusal to comply with the OSCE-Russian agreements on the removal of Russian forces from the Transnistria. As a result of Moldova's new communist-led government, President Lucinschi has also spoken out against making GUUAM into a new political organization with corresponding structures. Also, Uzbekistan is deeply involved in the struggle against the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU). Additionally, Georgia is in the process of trying to persuade a reluctant Russia to carry out its promise and withdraw its forces from Georgian territory. Ukraine is in the midst of a domestic political crisis involving President Kuchma's alleged involvement in the murder of a leading independent journalist, and as a result, the President has been turning more and more to Putin for the support he is currently not receiving from the West. Finally, Azerbaijan, probably GUUAM's strongest supporter at present, continues to be preoccupied with its ongoing dispute with Armenia.

In addition to the domestic situations in the GUUAM countries, there are also higher forces at work that have hindered the integration and formalization of GUUAM. It is evident that Ukraine has been focusing its foreign policy towards Russia since the latter part of 2000, just after the sacking of pro-West Foreign Minister, Tarasyuk, and again in 2001 with the sacking of Prime Minister Yuschenko.

At a meeting held in Astana, Kazakhstan in October 2000, a group of CIS countries (including Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Belarus, and Tajikistan), led by Russia, decided to transform the customs union into the Eurasian European Community (EEC) and thus, signed an agreement which established a new organization which supports a process of 'real integration in former Soviet States'.¹²³ The first meeting of the EEC is scheduled to be held in Minsk in September 2001. Thus, essentially, the geo-economic space in the CIS has been transformed into pro-West vs. pro-CIS emphasis on trade agreements- or GUUAM vs. EEC.

The Potential Risks of Western Ambivalence Towards Subregional Cooperation in the Region

GUUAM should be viewed as a test case for the proliferation of new security organizations in the frontier region between the West and Russia. The countries of the FSU (with the exception of the Baltics) which lie outside of NATO's and the EU's direct purview or liability, are also targets that Russia strives to dominate on any level that it can. Such a situation makes for the possibility of rising new threats and challenges for European security. Logically speaking, it will be more difficult for NATO and the EU to influence those countries that are outside of their immediate zone of liability. Thus, the neutralization of new threats for Europe originated from the post-Soviet space and the reinforcement of its stability can be reached through the creation of definite subregional security outposts. The creation of such zones in the post-Soviet space is made possible due to current fragmentation that encourages countries in the region to unite in subregional organizations such as GUUAM and BSECO.

GUUAM is the only subregional organization comprised of post-Soviet states distinguished by its pro-Western European and Euro-Atlantic orientations. Hence, the support of subregional development from the side of the Western countries and particularly the US will bring about an establishment on the eastern borders of the EU and NATO which is **not** a buffer zone, but rather a stable subregion in which countries are able to contribute to European security and stability. However, the creation and development of this organization is not imagined to be constructive without deep theoretical, conceptual and analytical underpinnings.

GUUAM members have found themselves in a zone of competing polar interests. The question is will GUUAM be able to overcome this setback? There really is no definitive answer, but several options can be discerned from the current situation: 1) Gradual collapse of the group (i.e., GUUAM to GUA to GA); 2) post-crisis truncation with further expansion to perhaps include Poland, Romania, Armenia, or Turkey; and 3) preservation of the alliances' current structure with considerable depoliticization which would NOT include a military element. The first and perhaps the third options would suit Moscow's interests. The second and third options would suit US interests. The first two options are the least likely, and only the third option can possibly become the basis for seeking acceptable compromises.¹²⁴

The question now to consider regarding the proliferation of subregional organizations is: If the US and the EU are truly concerned about the geopolitical configuration of Eastern Europe and the CIS and Russia's resurgent role in the region, should the West not lend political and economic backing to those states which have declared their desire to 'return to Europe'? Western governments should ask themselves this question: What is the cost of not doing so? Clearly, the fact that the US, NATO, and the EU have not officially declared their support to GUUAM was a major contributor to its decision not to formalize at this time. Since NATO, and the EU are not ready to talk membership with these countries, a logical alternative would be to not follow a wait and see approach, but rather to engage these countries at a multilateral and bilateral level, and to encourage them to take a more proactive role in safeguarding their own security at a regional level. In the end taking action can only serve to advance Western interests in the region.

For Ukraine and the other 'outs' of the NATO and EU enlargement processes, the presence of an East-West political, economic, security, and cultural frontier in Europe is unequivocal. Moreover, those states which have been excluded, even if only temporarily, from key Western institutions are likely to equate geopolitical instability with perceptions of their own security and identity. GUUAM is interesting because in a broad sense it reflects those states' concern about being excluded from Western security and economic organizations and thus, left in an unstable frontier region. Ukraine's leading role in GUUAM

is a reflection of its desire to boost its international prestige by banding together with those countries that seek to establish institutionalized security or *political normalcy* in the region.

It is becoming more clear that the notion of spheres of influence is alive and well in Europe, otherwise NATO and the US would be more outspokenly supportive of subregional organizations such as GUUAM and not fixated solely on Russia's response. This only proves that there are larger geopolitical forces at work that dictate the degree to which regional organizations are able to develop, function, and sustain. Regional cooperation in the FSU should be viewed as an attempt to organize an otherwise under-organized domain of states in the frontier between Russia and Western Europe. The processes of globalization has brought them in closer proximity to each other, but the frontier, reinforced by instability to the east and negative economic circumstances, is keeping many of these states from 're-joining Europe'.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

This project has analyzed Ukraine's 'European choice', and has sought to demonstrate how the emergence of a new East-West frontier has influenced Ukraine's international and regional relations with NATO, the EU, and in the region (i.e., GUUAM). For Ukraine, the most profound barrier to its desire to 'return to Europe' is clearly the EU, primarily because of the tightening of visa requirements between EU aspirants in CEE, and those states not yet considered as potential EU members. Ukrainians have thus seen the emergence of a new 'paper frontier' as the Schengen regime moves eastwards.

Furthermore, it has been argued that one cannot view the orientation of Ukraine's foreign and security policy in a vacuum, or separate from the geopolitical dynamics created by the East-West frontier of Europe. In an effort to secure Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, while simultaneously seeking to promote the state's international profile, the Ukrainian government under President Kuchma, since 1994, has pursued a relatively consistent, European-oriented foreign policy. Kuchma has done so both by promoting bilateral ties with NATO and the EU, and also by taking a leadership role in the region among those states which share in Ukraine's European aspirations, such as GUUAM.

This work has pointed out that border issues are back on the political agenda in Europe with the enlargement of the West's institutions to a selected few states in CEE. The concept of frontier has returned at a time when the enlargement of NATO and expansion of the EU are seen as the necessary next steps in the geopolitical reorganization of the continent. But for those states that have been excluded from the EU in particular, perhaps in some cases only temporarily, governments and society alike are tending to equate geopolitical instability with perceptions of their own security and identity. Thus, in this regard, political borders and frontiers in CEE are still problematic and warrant further study and analysis.

Ukraine in Europe's East-West Frontier

The definition of what constitutes a modern frontier is in the midst of change; it is widening and narrowing, while simultaneously undergoing erosion with respect to many issues, and reinforcement with respect to others. The frontier, as such, resembles a 'third level' of analysis—it is neither the domestic arena, nor is it solely the international arena. It is a place where crucial political developments unfold, and where domestic and foreign politics come together. Thus, taking these 'frontier dynamics' into consideration is crucial in understanding the realm from within which Ukraine's foreign and security policy is operating.

It has been argued that Europe's frontier is differentiated by a lack of institutionalized mechanisms in a rather structure-less geopolitical space through which authority is exercised. Although some regional structures and institutions have begun to emerge and develop a basis for exercising subjective authority in various sectors such as energy and regional trade relations (BSECO/GUUAM), the frontier is still a rather under-organized geopolitical space. The group of states between Russia and the West continues to be prone to instability along political, economic, and cultural lines, as Bosnia and Kosovo have clearly demonstrated. This instability is caused both by the existing ethnic or other divisions in society and by the frontier's lack of superseding political or economic institutions in comparison with the West.

Due to the processes of globalization, transnationalism, and interdependence many regional frontiers in the world are softening, and in some cases, even disappearing, as the processes of globalization has tended to reverse the inclination to solidify borders. However, this project has argued that the opposite is occurring with respect to the division in Europe. It has been suggested that a new East-West frontier has emerged in lieu of NATO

enlargement and EU expansion to include a selected few states in CEE. The presence of an East-West frontier in Europe which consists of international, regional and subregional organizations, states, societies, and cross-border working relationships, has created a new dynamic that carries implications for the way in which we view international relations. The frontier has thus brought about a new level of analysis that includes the convergence of domestic and international politics in the widened geopolitical space that is the frontier.

Globalization, Frontiers, and Ukraine's 'European Choice'

The processes of globalization have cultivated conditions of increased interdependence and reduced the significance of national borders and frontiers in many areas of the world. Globalization implies that all frontiers will eventually be erased as such political forces of interdependence, transnationalism, universalism, and the idea of a global society are realized.

This project has viewed the East-West frontier in Europe as an under-organized domain that consists of states with fragile sources of legitimacy and sovereignty. Rosenau conceptualizes the frontier as becoming ever more rugged and as a widening field of action when domestic and international issues converge and world affairs unfold. Many conditions have served to widen the frontier including technological advances, the proliferation of new regional organizations and the fragmentation of old ones, the integration of the regions, and fact that globalization has reduced the proximity between foes and has thus, provided the foreground for the revival of historic animosities leading to conflict based on nationalism and ethnicity. The presence and endurance of frontiers points to a new way of thinking about how world politics unfolds. It is neither the national arena, nor international arena, but rather a combination of the two.

Because the geopolitical space between Russia and the West resembles an under-organized zone of instability, it is logical that more capable institutions should seek to expand their influence into a strategically and economically crucial region with the goal of having a stabilizing effect. However, the expansion of key Western institutions into CEE has also had a destabilizing effect. States such as Ukraine and many of the other 'outs' have been preoccupied with attempting to convince these institutions, especially the EU, that Ukraine should be considered a potential member. Ukrainian elites have engaged in an overzealous campaign with the West in an effort to win economic and political support that they feel will eventually allow Ukraine to rejoin Europe. However, this effort is in vain because Ukraine has not prioritized economic and institutional reforms. Western institutions will continue issuing political statements of positive intentions without backing such statements with real substantive programs. Indeed the West will not be interested in Ukraine until the government has fully implemented the provisions of various agreements and has made considerable progress aimed specifically at economic and institutional reform.

One question that arises from this discussion is will the frontier continue to widen and the inherent contradictions on which its worldview rests continue to persist or will new institutions and boundaries eventually emerge and settle into place as the basis of another epochal transformation wherein the politics of the frontier becomes the politics of normalcy?¹²⁵ I tend to agree with Rosenau's assertion that the latter scenario is more likely. As the frontier widens, so will it manifest the creation of unaccustomed political institutions and arrangements. This can be exemplified by the creation regional and subregional organizations and institutions such as GUUAM, BSECO and others in the frontier in which their task is the creation of institutionalized security or political 'normalcy', while at the same time, providing a forum which helps them to lessen their dependence on Russia and at the same time moves them closer to Europe.

It is important to remember that although Ukraine has turned to the West for assistance and know-how, Ukraine's 'European choice' is by no means set, and will continue

to be affected by Russia's approach to the 'near abroad', which lately appears to be hardening. Kuchma's multi-vector foreign policy is a reflection of the state's need to maneuver between both the internal and external forces. Although this policy has not instilled the kind of confidence in Ukraine as a reliable partner for the West, Ukraine's historical legacy and the present geopolitical conditions in CEE suggest that this multi-vector foreign policy is most likely the state's only option in the short to medium term. Since independence, Ukraine's elites have been both pulled and pushed by domestic and external circumstances. But despite this constant tug-of-war, one very important factor is evident. Although not united in their perspectives on Ukraine's foreign policy course, the state's leaders, regardless of their political ideologies, support Ukraine's sovereignty and independence. Ukraine's active cooperation with the West, Russia, and in the region is testimony to the state's desire to secure its place and to establish its role in the international community in the midst of arduous economic and geopolitical realities.

The enlargement of NATO and the expansion of the EU to selected states in CEE has served to create a new division in Europe which has indirectly resulted in the creation of a gray zone of European security and prosperity. As the distance between the entities in CEE closes, the likelihood for conflict between them increases, thus increasing their political, economic, and cultural 'distance' from Western Europe, thereby reducing their chances for accession to the West's institutions in the short to medium term. But Western states and institutions (i.e., NATO) have attempted to allay fears of those states presently left outside the enlargement process by working with them in multilateral and bilateral forums and by increasing cooperation in the military, political, scientific, and technical spheres. However, the West has yet to develop clear objectives with regard to Ukraine, and as a result, assistance and cooperative efforts have not met the expectations of either side.

The emergence of a new security environment in Europe will more than likely create new political and cultural frontiers perhaps as some analysts contend along the lines of Huntington's 'clash of civilizations'. Those countries which are ethnically Slav and religiously Orthodox would be the 'natural' allies of Russia, whereas those countries which are religiously Catholic are linked to the Holy Roman and Habsburg Empires would align with the West. For the time being, CEE is bound to remain, in Bort's words, a 'difficult frontier' at the very least. It will be the terrain of political quicksands on which the Europe to come will have to be built.¹²⁶

List of Interview Partners

LTC George Bachman, NATO Military Liaison Officer to Ukraine, Kyiv.

LTC Harald Buchholz, Ukraine Desk Officer, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Washington, DC.

Fraser Cameron, Political Counselor, European Commission, EU Delegation to the United States, Washington, DC.

Marco Carnovale, Political Affairs Division, NATO HQ, Brussels.

Oleskandr Chalyi, First Deputy Foreign Minister of Ukraine, Kyiv.

Stacy Closson, Ukraine Country Director, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington, DC.

Christopher Donnelly, Special Advisor for Central and Eastern European Affairs, Office of the Secretary General, NATO Headquarters, Brussels.

Vasyl Filipchuk, Ukraine Mission to the EU, Brussels.

Elizabeth Franey, Ukraine Desk Officer, EU Commission, Brussels.

Col. Leonid Golopatyuk, General Staff of the Ukrainian Armed Forces, Kyiv.

Carl Hartzell, Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit for the Former Soviet Union, EU Council of Ministers, Brussels.

J.R. Hoag, US Mission to NATO, Brussels.

Col. Robert Hughes, Defense Attaché to Ukraine, Embassy of the United States, Kyiv.

Ambassador Robert E. Hunter, Former US Permanent Representative to NATO.

John Karwatsky, NATO Information and Documentation Center, Kyiv.

Sergey Khomchenko, Deputy Head of the International Department, The Ministry of Emergencies of Ukraine, Kyiv.

Dmitry Koublitsky, President, Europe Foundation, Kyiv.

Major Joe Knowles, Coordinator, State Partnership Program (Ukraine), Topeka, KS.

Bill Krug, US Mission to NATO, Brussels.

John Lough, Information Officer, Central and Eastern Europe, NATO Headquarters, Brussels.

Ivan Lozowy, Director of the Institute for Statehood and Democracy, Kyiv.

Natalie Melnychuk-Gould, Director, NATO Information and Documentation Centre, Kyiv.

LTC Frank Morgese, Branch Chief, Office of Russia and Eurasian Affairs, US European Command, Stuttgart, Germany.

Kostiantyn Morozov, Deputy Head of the Mission of Ukraine to NATO, Brussels.

Oksana Petriaieva, Ukraine Mission to NATO, Brussels.

Susan Pond, NATO Military Liaison Officer to Ukraine, Kyiv.

Klaus Schneider, Deputy Head of Unit for Relations with Ukraine, Moldova, and Belarus, European Commission, Brussels.

Oleksandr Shevchenko, Mission of Ukraine to the European Union, Brussels.

John Tedstrom, National Security Council (and RAND), Washington, DC.

Oleh Ventskovsky, Mission of Ukraine to the European Union, Brussels.

Andriy Veselovsky, Head of Policy and Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, Kyiv.

Vladyslav Yasniuk, First Secretary, Ukraine Mission to NATO, Brussels.

ENDNOTES

Chapter One

- ¹ Ukraine has concluded bilateral treaties with Russia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Moldova, Belarus, and Slovakia.
- ² Alexander Motyl, *Dilemmas of Independence: Ukraine After Totalitarianism*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1993.
- ³ The UK, Italy, and France outnumber Ukraine by only a few million.
- ⁴ Also produced in Ukraine were washing machines, refrigerators, cameras, televisions, and a variety of construction materials including cement, ceramics, basic chemicals and synthetic fibers.
- ⁵ Bukkvoll, pp. 31-32.
- ⁶ Which Ukraine itself has no shortage of
- ⁷ However, there is a much stronger force supported by the US which favors the Baku-Ceyhan route, or even the Baku-Supsa route, both of which bypass Ukraine altogether. See Chapter Three for elaboration.
- ⁸ Kuchma's 'four-pronged transition' was specified by Volodymyr Cherniak to the VI Congress of Rukh, 29 December 1995 and by Foreign Minister Udovenko to the Royal Institute of International Affairs on 13 December 1995, as cited in Taras Kuzio, 'The Sultan and the Hetman: Democracy Building in Belarus and Ukraine in a Grey Security Zone', Unpublished paper prepared for a research project at the European University Institute, Florence, Italy, 16 December 1997. Copy in author's possession.
- ⁹ For a comprehensive answer to this question, see Bill Bradley, 'Eurasia letter: A misguided Russia policy', in *Foreign Policy*, no. 101, Winter 1995.
- ¹⁰ Such as the transformation to a market economy, privatization of many industries, and the requirement that democratic governmental regimes must be in power.
- ¹¹ Zbigniew Brzezinski, 'The Premature Partnership', *Foreign Affairs*, March-April 1994, vol. 72, no. 2, p. 80.
- ¹² See Sherman Garnett, *Keystone in the Arch: Ukraine in the Emerging Security Environment of Central and Eastern Europe*, Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1997.
- ¹³ Remarks made by Samuel Huntington at the National Institute for Strategic Studies, Kyiv, Ukraine, 18 October 1999. The author was present at this conference.
- ¹⁴ Max Haller, 'The challenge for comparative sociology in the transformation of Europe', *International Sociology*, 1990, vol. 5, no. 2, p. 201.
- ¹⁵ Liam O'Dowd and Thomas M. Wilson (eds), *Borders, Nations, and States*, Aldershot: Avebury Publishing Ltd, 1996, p. 7.
- ¹⁶ N. Hansen, *The Border Economy: Regional Development in the South-West*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981, p. 20. As cited in O'Dowd and Wilson, p. 7.
- ¹⁷ James N. Rosenau, *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Global Governance in a Turbulent World*, Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 4-5.

Chapter Two

- ¹⁸ See Sherman Garnett, *Keystone in the Arch: Ukraine in the Emerging Security Environment in Central and Eastern Europe*, Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1997; S. Garnett, 'Reform, Russia, and Europe: The Strategic context of Ukraine's NATO Policy', in Stephen J. Blank (ed), *From Madrid to Brussels' Perspectives on NATO Enlargement*, Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1997; S. Garnett, 'Europe's New Crossroads: Russia and the West in the New Borderlands', in Michael Mandelbaum (ed), *The New Russian Foreign Policy*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations, Inc, 1998; Tor Bukkvoll, 'Ukraine and NATO: The Politics of Soft Cooperation', *Security Dialogue*, September 1997, vol. 28, no. 3.; Taras Kuzio, 'Ukraine and NATO: The Evolving Strategic Partnership', *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, June 1998, vol. 21, no. 2; Olga Alexandrova, 'The NATO-Ukraine Charter:

Kiev's Euro-Atlantic Integration, *Aussenpolitik*, IV, 1997; and for a Ukrainian outlook on NATO-Ukraine relations, see article by the former Ambassador of Ukraine to the United States, H.E. Yuri Shcherbak, 'A Ukrainian Perspective: Implications for European Security Studies', in Lawrence R. Chalmer and Jonathan W. Pierce, *NATO 1997: Year of Change*, Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1998.

¹⁹ Ian Brzezinski, 'The Geopolitical Dimension', *The National Interest*, Spring 1992, no. 27.; Nikolai A. Kulinich, 'Ukraine in the New Geopolitical Environment: Issues of Regional and Subregional Security' in Karen Dawisha (ed), *The Making of Foreign Policy in Russia and the New States of Eurasia*, Cambridge University Press, 1994 and F. Stephen Larrabee, 'Ukraine's Balancing Act', *Survival*, Summer 1996, vol. 38, no. 2.

²⁰ See Oleksandr Pavliuk, 'Ukraine and Regional Cooperation in Central and Eastern Europe', *Security Dialogue*, September 1997, vol. 28, no. 3.; O. Pavliuk, 'Polish-Ukrainian Relations: A Pillar of Regional Stability?', in Monika Wohlfeld (ed), 'The Effects of Enlargement on Bilateral Relations in Central and Eastern Europe', *Chaillot Papers* no. 26, Paris: WEU Institute for Security Studies, June 1997.; and Ian J. Brzezinski, 'Polish-Ukrainian Relations: Europe's Neglected Strategic Axis', *Survival*, Autumn 1993, vol. 35, no. 3.

²¹ Tor Bukkvoll, *Ukraine and European Security*, London: The Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1997; and S. Garnett, *Keystone in the Arch*; James Sherr, 'Ukraine's New Time of Troubles', Sandhurst, England: CSRC, October 1998; and John Edwin Mzoz and Oleksandr Pavliuk, 'Ukraine: Europe's Linchpin', *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 1996, vol. 75, no.3.

²² See for example James Sherr, 'Russia-Ukraine Rapprochement?' The Black Sea Fleet Accords', *Survival*, Autumn, 1997; J. Sherr, 'Ukraine in European Security', *Brassey's Defence Yearbook*, December 1997.

²³ Garnett, *Keystone in the Arch*, p. vii.

²⁴ *Ibid*, p. 5.

²⁵ Garnett, 'Reform, Russia, and Europe: The Strategic context of Ukraine's NATO Policy', p. 82.

²⁶ Garnett, *Keystone in the Arch*, p. 99

²⁷ *Ibid*.

²⁸ Taras Kuzio, 'Ukraine and NATO: The Evolving Strategic Partnership', p. 1.

²⁹ The Center for Peace, Conversion, and Foreign Policy of Ukraine, 'Foreign and Security Policy: Ukrainian Expert Poll, October-December 1997'.

³⁰ Kuzio, 'Ukraine and NATO: The Evolving Strategic Partnership', p. 27.

³¹ Tor Bukkvoll, *Ukraine and European Security*, op cit.

³² Balancing being defined as allying with others against the prevailing threat. See Randall L. Schweller, 'Bandwagoning for Profit', in Michael Brown, Sean M. Lynn-Jones, and Steven E. Miller (eds), *The Perils of Anarchy: Contemporary Realism and International Security*, London: MIT Press, 1995, p. 257.

³³ Interview with Borys Tarasyuk in *Transition*, 28 July 1995, as cited in Tor Bukkvoll, 'The Politics of Soft Cooperation', p. 367.

³⁴ Schweller, p. 273.

³⁵ *Ibid*, p. 276.

³⁶ Bukkvoll, 'Ukraine and NATO: The Politics of Soft Cooperation', p. 367.

³⁷ See Chapters Five and Six

³⁸ Ian J. Brzezinski, 'Polish-Ukrainian Relations: Europe's Neglected Strategic Axis'.

³⁹ O. Pavliuk, 'Polish-Ukrainian Relations: A Pillar of Regional Stability?'

⁴⁰ Subregional group consisting of Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, and Moldova.

⁴¹ Oleksandr Pavliuk, 'Ukraine and Regional Cooperation in Central and Eastern Europe', p. 359.

⁴² In contrast to the old politics of the bounded nation-state

⁴³ Thomas M. Wilson, Hastings Donnan (eds), *Border Identities: Nation and State at International Frontiers*, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 1.

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, p. 2.

⁴⁵ Malcolm Anderson, 'European frontiers at the end of the twentieth century', in Malcolm Anderson and Eberhard Bort (eds), *The Frontiers of Europe*, London: Pinter, 1998, p. 3.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, pp. 3-4. See also Chapter Two on buffer states and the geographer's perspective.

⁴⁷ As cited in JRV Prescott, *Political Frontiers and Boundaries*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1987, p. 159.

⁴⁸ Huntington, p. 48.

⁴⁹ Defined as a border territory organized on a semi-permanent military system to defend a frontier.

⁵⁰ Refer to extensive discussion of historic and contemporary buffer states in Chapter Two of this project.

⁵¹ An example could be Britain's strategy in the Indian subcontinent, which involved the maintenance of a system of small, weak states between British India and Russia, France, and China.

⁵² As a result of the EU's Schengen Agreement which allows for border crossing without formal customs or passport checks

⁵³ Peter-Christian Muller-Graff, 'Whose responsibility are frontiers?' in M. Anderson and Eberhard Bort (eds), *The Frontiers of Europe*, London: Pinter, 1998, pp. 11-12.

⁵⁴ See Malcolm Anderson, *Frontiers: Territory and State Formation in the Modern World*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996, p. 1, and M. Anderson, 'European frontiers at the end of the twentieth century', in Malcolm Anderson and Eberhard Bort (eds), *The Frontiers of Europe*, 1998, pp. 4-6.

⁵⁵ See the 1978 Vienna Convention on State Succession.

⁵⁶ M. Anderson, pp. 4-6.

⁵⁷ M. Anderson and E. Bort, *The Frontiers of Europe*, p. 5.

⁵⁸ B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, New York: Verso Publishers, 1991.

⁵⁹ M. Anderson, *Frontiers: Territories and State Formation in the Modern World*, p. 2.

⁶⁰ R. Strassoldo, *From Barrier to Junction: Towards a Sociological Theory of Borders*, 1970, Gorizia: ISIG.

⁶¹ *Ibid*, p. 8.

⁶² Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1976.

⁶³ James N. Rosenau, *Along the Foreign-Domestic Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 239-240.

⁶⁴ *Ibid*.

Chapter Three

⁶⁵ Parts of this chapter were published previously in my article entitled, 'Ukraine's Ties to the West', *Problems of Post Communism*, March-April 2001.

⁶⁶ See arguments made by James Sherr, 'Ukraine's New Time of Troubles', Sandhurst, England: CSRC, October 1998.

⁶⁷ Interview with Natalie Melnyczuk, Director of the NIDC, Kyiv, Ukraine, 22 October 1999.

⁶⁸ Interview with LTC George Bachman, Military Liaison Officer, NATO Liaison Office to Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine, 21 October 1999.

⁶⁹ 'Ukraine to send peacekeepers to Kosovo by 23 August', *Moscow ITAR-TASS*, 13 August 1999.

⁷⁰ 'NATO chief promises to help Ukraine solve problems', *Moscow ITAR-TASS*, 1 March 2000.

⁷¹ 'NATO chief welcomes foreign forces accord with Ukraine', *Moscow ITAR-TASS*, 1 March 2000. In accordance with SOFA any serviceperson or civilian taking part in a measure, in the event of an unforeseen situation (accident, commission of a crime) should face trial in his own state and not in the state being visited.

⁷² See 'Ukrainian parliament ratifies Open Skies Treaty', *Moscow Interfax*, 2 March 2000.

⁷³ 'Ukraine ready to extend relations with NATO', *Moscow Interfax*, 1 March 2000.

⁷⁴ Interview with J.R. Hoag, US Mission to NATO, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, Belgium, 13 October 1999.

⁷⁵ Interview with Sergey Khomchenko, Deputy Head of the International Department, Ukrainian Ministry of Emergencies, Kyiv, Ukraine, 19 October 1999.

⁷⁶ Interview with Christopher Donnelly, Special Advisor to the Secretary General for Central and Eastern European Affairs, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, Belgium, 14 October 1999.

⁷⁷ Interview with Colonel Leonid Golopatyuk, Chief of Department, General Staff of the Ukrainian Armed Forces, Kyiv, Ukraine, 18 October, 1999.

⁷⁸ Interview with Christopher Donnelly, op cit.

⁷⁹ Informal discussion with Ukrainian MFA official from the Department for European and Trans-Atlantic Integration, December 1999.

⁸⁰ See arguments made by James Sherr in 'Ukraine's New Time of Troubles', Sandhurst, England: CSRC, October 1998

⁸¹ This problem was discussed at the conference 'Ukraine: Continuing Challenges of Transition', sponsored by the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, US Department of State, and the National Intelligence Council, Washington, DC, 30 June 1999.

Chapter Four

⁸² James Sherr, 'Ukraine's New Time of Troubles', Sandhurst, England: CSRC, October 1998.

⁸³ Parts of this chapter were published by the University of Ottawa in proceeding from the conference entitled 'Towards a New Ukraine III', October 2000.

⁸⁴⁸⁴ 'Kuchma speaks against economic isolation of Ukraine', Kiev UT-1 Television Network, 10 September 1999, obtained through FBIS.

⁸⁵⁸⁵ See Hryhoriy Nemyria, 'Roadway into the Future: Roadway to Europe- Ukraine's European Integration', Center for European and International Studies, Kyiv, Ukraine, 2000.

⁸⁶ Russia, Moldova (which have taken effect), and Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, and Belarus (which have not yet taken effect).

⁸⁷ As the PCA covers matters of Community, of national and of joint competence, it must be ratified not only by the three European Communities (The European Community, the European Coal and Steel Community, and the European Atomic Energy Community), but also by all of the member-states.

⁸⁸ 'Relations between the EU and Ukraine', Dr. Fraser Cameron, paper presented at the Kennan Institute, Washington, DC, 18 May 2000.

⁸⁹ See Official Journal of the European Communities, Council and Commission Decision of 26 January 1998, 98/149, 'On the conclusion of the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement between the European Communities and their member-states, on the one part, and Ukraine, of the other part', Vol. 49, 19 February 1998.

⁹⁰ See report by Oleksandr Pavliuk entitled, 'The European Union and Ukraine: The need for a new vision', Policy paper published by the East-West Institute (Kyiv, Ukraine) on the study of the current state and prospects of relations between the EU and Ukraine, July 1999.

⁹¹ Ukraine is not officially a member of the CIS, having never signed the CIS Charter. Yet Ukraine participates in CIS meetings, and is a member of the CIS Interparliamentary Assembly (the legislature of the CIS).

⁹² T. Kuzio, 'Ukraine: Strategic options and obstacles', paper presented at the conference, 'Ukraine: Continuing Challenges of Transition', sponsored by the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, US Department of State and the National Intelligence Council, Washington DC, 30 June 1999.

⁹³ Huntington's thesis discussed previously supports this argument.

⁹⁴ Interview with Elizabeth Franey, Ukraine Desk Officer, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium, 29 September 2000.

⁹⁵ 'Ukraine-EU links after the Helsinki Summit: Cooperation of integration?' Olivier De Laroussilhe, External Relations DG, European Commission, paper given at the Wilton Park Conference (UK) entitled, 'Ukraine: What Does the Future Hold?' 17-20 February, 2000.

⁹⁶ Though it should be pointed out that on 11 October 2000 the EU Council of Ministers recognized Ukraine as a country with a market economy. This news is important, first and foremost, for business circles that may wish to invest in Ukraine as explained in, 'Ukraine receives market economy status from the European Union', *Kiev Ukrainian Television* UT2, 11 October 2000.

⁹⁷ Oleksandr Pavliuk, 'The European Union and Ukraine: The need for a new vision', Policy paper based on the study of the current state and prospects of relations between the EU and Ukraine, The East-West Institute (Kyiv), July 1999. Copy in author's possession.

⁹⁸ Interview with Klaus Schneider, Deputy Head of Unit for Relations with Ukraine, Moldova, and Belarus, European Commission DG 1A, Brussels, Belgium, 12 October 1999.

⁹⁹ 'Ukraine on the verge of EU integration', *Moscow Interfax*, 27 July 2000.

¹⁰⁰ Interview with Carl Hartzell, Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit for the Former Soviet Union, EU Council of Ministers, Brussels, Belgium, 29 September 2000.

¹⁰¹ 'Foreign Minister on cooperation with EU' (Interview with Borys Tarasyuk), *Kiev Uryadovyy Kuryer*, 22 July 1999, p. 3.

¹⁰² 'Government approves concept of adapting to EU laws', *Kiev Intelnews*, 19 August 1999.

¹⁰³ Informal discussion between the author and an official from the EU Delegation in Washington, DC, May 2000.

¹⁰⁴ 'Ukrainian president decrees EU integration program before leaving for Paris', *Kiev Ukrainian Television UT2*, 14 September 2000.

¹⁰⁵ 'EU, Ukraine hail Russian determination to reform', *Paris AFP*, 15 September 2000.

¹⁰⁶ Official Joint Statement of the EU-Ukraine Summit, Paris, France, 15 September 2000.

¹⁰⁷ 'President Kuchma says Ukraine-EU Summit constructive', *Kiev Ukrainian Television UT2*. 15 September 2000.

¹⁰⁸ Interviews with the Ukraine Mission to the EU and with Elizabeth Franey, Ukraine Desk Officer, European Commission, Brussels, 29 September 2000.

¹⁰⁹ 'Poll shows 57% of Ukrainians want to be in the EU', *Kiev Ukrayina Moloda*, 29 April 2000.

¹¹⁰ 'Ukraine- Foreign Minister proposes moves to improve integration into Europe', *Kiev Den in Ukrainian*, 30 August 2000.

¹¹¹ Dr. Oleksandr Zadorozhnyi, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, comments made at the conference 'The European Union and Ukraine: Consolidating Constituencies for Integration', the East-West Institute, 1-2 October 1999, Kyiv, Ukraine.

¹¹² Ireland is a good example in this regard since the US until recently required tourist visas for Irish citizens but Ireland did not reciprocate.

Chapter Five

¹¹³ For a more detailed account of the GUUAM subregional organization, see Taras Kuzio, 'Geopolitical Pluralism in the CIS: The Emergence of GUUAM', *Problems of Post-Communism*, vol. 47, no. 3, May-June 2000.

¹¹⁴ See GUUAM website (www.guam.org), 'History and Principles (of GUUAM)', November 2000.

¹¹⁵ GUUAM as a fully-fledged institution would likely have had the following attributes: clearly defined empirical objectives, a legal charter, a secretariat, a standing committee comprised of representatives for all of the member states, and an economic coordination council charged with drafting a plan of action for 2001.

¹¹⁶ Kuchma was accused of ordering the murder of a leading independent journalist in Ukraine, Georgi Gongadze.

¹¹⁷ 'Opinion poll shows only 6 percent support for president', *Kiev Ukrayina Moloda*, 16 March 2001. The poll was conducted between 26 February and 7 March of over 2000 people by the Ukrainian Center for Political and Economic Research.

¹¹⁸ 'New political aspects of GUUAM development', *Center for Peace, Conversion, and Foreign Policy of Ukraine, Report #45, December 2000*.

¹¹⁹ For a more detailed discussion on military cooperation in GUUAM, see 'GUUAM and the Future of CIS Military Cooperation', Flemming Splidsboel-Hansen, *European Security*, vol. 9, no. 4, Winter 2000.

¹²⁰ 'GUUAM attacked by Moscow ahead of the Group's Summit', *Jamestown Monitor's Fortnight in Review*, 2 February 2001, vol. VII, no. 3.

¹²¹ 'Azeri agency downbeat about GUUAM alliances future', *Azerbaijani News Agency*, Baku, 2 March 2001.

¹²² *Zerkalo Nedeli*, 17 February 2001.

¹²³ *Nezavisinya Gazeta*, October 2000.

¹²⁴ 'Azeri agency downbeat about GUUAM alliances future', *Azerbaijani News Agency*, Baku, 2 March 2001.

Chapter Six

¹²⁵ Rosenau, *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Global Governance in a Turbulent World*, Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 8.

¹²⁶ Eberhard Bort, 'Mitteleuropa: The difficult frontier', in M. Anderson and Eberhard Bort (eds), *The Frontiers of Europe*, London: Pinter, 1998, p. 101.