MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE
ODESA MECHNIKOV NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

PROSPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT IN EU POLITICS: GLOBAL AND REGIONAL DIMENSIONS

MONOGRAPH

Editors Olga Brusylovska and Igor Koval

ODESA
ONU
2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The modern world as well as worldwide policy changes at an accelerating pace. The depth of these transformations is realized, yet not until their conclusion. However, a change in the international agenda has become a fact already. In a certain sense, we all already live in another political world. With the emergence of another global force (China) and the decline of an interest in many regions of key global actor (the USA), the European Union has ended up in a difficult strategic situation. In August 2019, French President E. Macron, in a performance before a diplomatic body, marked that the epoch of hegemony of the West is fit for an end. In these terms, the EU should follow by more actively searching for a new strategy for the world arising before our eyes.

That is why modern scientists of International Relations are paying increasing attention to the study of prognosis – a science which encompasses the methodology of studying the dynamics and perspectives of the development of various processes and phenomena of international life. Representatives of the Odessa School of International Relations did not go beyond the problem of studying EU's policy perspectives too. For us, deciding on the methodology of foreign policy research – the subject of our many years of research – is decisive for the fact that going beyond the level of forecasting depends on the effectiveness of planning and management, for our country, scientifically sound forecasts are one of the guarantees of predictable development of specific events and international political processes.

Foreign Policy Forecasting makes predictions about subjects, phenomena, and processes in international relations and foreign policy. It is a source of comprehensive information about the overall situation in the world, region, and country; about trends, trends and factors that stimulate certain events; promotes the vision of new opportunities for socio-political development.

Scripting is the most common predictive tool that more or less accurately predicts political developments. With this tool, you can set a logical sequence of events based on an existing or specified situation. The scenario (verbal description of the projected situation) focuses on linkages between events, at critical points where impacts can have a disproportionate impact.

So, the purpose of the collective monograph is to identify the main trends in the prospects for the development of EU's policy by examining its individual regional and global dimensions. Among the tasks are the following: identifying the features of the EU as an international actor in contemporary scientific discourse; exploring the impact of European regionalization on EU integration policy; analysis of the impact of nationalism on EU geopolitical

models; a demonstration of the EU's influence on the transformation of Eastern European countries; exploring the evolution of CSDP in the context of the trans-Atlantic factor; analysis of EU countries' positions on the issue of RSDL; identifying the features of EU mediation and peacekeeping; identification of the main problems of relations between the EU and Russia, the EU – MERCOSUR, the EU – the USA, the EU – Syria, etc. The monograph focuses on those directions of development of the EU's politics prospects, which employees of the Department of International Relations of Odessa Mechnikov National University have spent years investigating in their scientific searches. In accordance with it, this book is structurally divided into three blocks (theoretical, regional, and global), eleven chapters, each of which highlights a separate direction of foreign policy of the EU.

The work is designed for everyone who is interested in foreign policy and international relations – from students to experts.

PECULIARITIES OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AS INTERNATIONAL ACTOR: CONTEMPORARY SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE

Olga Brusylovska

The European Union (EU) is one of the most unusual actors in world politics, and it has generated a great deal of scholarly debate about its power and purpose. Consider the current concepts that are most useful for exploring the main vectors of EU foreign policy and the prospects for their development.

1. Concept of Power

The analysis of global actors' foreign policy cannot be conducted without engaging in scientific discussions about power. This is the category Toms Rostoks examines in his work, exploring EU and Russian policy in the New Eastern Europe (NEE) region. Consider his main arguments.

Definition of Power. Hans J. Morgenthau has asserted that power is the currency of international relations, and "international politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power … whatever the ultimate aims of international politics, power is always the immediate aim." Although some might disagree with this statement, few would go so far as to ignore the importance of power in world politics. Robert A. Dahl emphasized that power has an adversarial element built into it; therefore, he defined power as the ability of 'A' to overcome resistance of 'B' in pursuit of 'A's goals. Thus, power is different from influence because it is about changing other actors' behaviour, being able to resist others, and overcoming others' resistance. Strength is a prerequisite for security and can withstand unwanted external influences. Karl W. Deutsch has defined power both as "the ability to prevail in conflict and to overcome obstacles" and as a "symbol of the ability to change the distribution of results." Although power is most frequently seen as a capability, it is essentially "a psychological relation between those who exercise it and those over whom it is exercised." Leslie Gelb writes that "power is mental arm wrestling" [3, p. 9]. The manifestations of force can only be partially detected by observing visible interactions; they are likely to be just the tip of the iceberg. Moises Naim claims that the current transformations in world politics can be captured through the lens of the "decay of power:" "In the 21st century, power is easier to get, harder to use, and easier to lose ... battles for power are as intense as ever, but they are yielding diminishing returns." If this is correct, then coer-

cive forms of power are going to be much more difficult to use and are also likely to bring only short-term achievements. The decay of power can also be bad news for collective action because "a world where players have enough power to block everyone else's initiatives, but no one has the power to impose its preferred course of action, is a world where decisions are not made, made too late, or watered down to the point of ineffectiveness." Therefore, resolving regional conflicts, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and climate change will be more difficult if at all possible [3, p. 10].

Four aspects of power. As Robert O. Keohane argues, one has to distinguish between definitions of power, and faces or aspects of power. Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz have markedly improved our understanding of the manifestations of strength, while Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall have developed a four-fold typology of power – compulsory, institutional, structural, and productive. *Compulsory power* is the most conventional aspect of power, namely, A's ability to issue threats or provide positive material incentives in order to obtain B's acquiescence. This is also the way in which power is most frequently seen in world politics. Actors with large material capabilities are seen as powerful and are supposed to get their way over materially-weaker opponents. However, superior military capabilities are not always helpful in producing stunning victories (the Soviet Union during the Winter War with Finland, the US in Vietnam, Afghanistan, and Iraq). *Institutional power* is the ability of A to use the power in order to control which issues are going to be part of the decision-making agenda, and which issues are going to be kept off the agenda. And having the right to veto or otherwise derail whatever is being decided by the organization is also an important aspect of power [3, p. 11]. *Structural power* is about the actors' ability to impact other actors' preferences, beliefs and interests. Stephen Lukes hypothesized that "power is at its most effective when least visible." He went on to argue that it was about acquiring beliefs and forming desires consistent with the preferences of power wielders. Barnett and Duvall define structural power as 'structural constitution' – that is, the production and reproduction of internally related positions of super- and sub-ordination, or domination, that actors occupy. *Productive power*, by contrast, is 'the constitution of all social subjects with various social powers through systems of knowledge and discursive practices of broad and general scope.' Barnett and Duvall argue that "basic categories of classification, such as 'civilized,' 'rogue,' 'European,' 'unstable,' 'Western' and 'democratic' states, are representative of productive power, as they generate asymmetries of social capabilities." The use of productive power is likely to be time-consuming because of the nature of social interaction through which actors and categories of actors are 'produced'. But, once produced, such categories are likely to have a lasting effect [3, p. 12].

Power as authority. David A. Lake distinguishes between two types of power – coercion and authority. Under coercion, actor A can issue threats and coerce others to comply with A's demands. Coercion is similar to hard / compulsive power, and it also includes economic power. Despite the common assertion that the international realm is anarchical, Lake claims that, in fact, the international realm is sufficiently hierarchical that political authority can rest on the foundation of 'social contract.' Lake describes social contract as follows: "Relational authority, premised on a social contract, is founded on an exchange between the ruler and the ruled, in which A provides a political order of value to B sufficient to offset the loss of freedom incurred in subordination to A, and B confers the right of A to exert the restraints on B's behaviour necessary to provide that order." Thus, even though states lack formal legal authority over one another, they can and do possess a more or less relational authority, premised on the provision of international order. As a consequence, international politics is a struggle for authority that would provide the possibility to rule through the consent of those that are less powerful. Those actors who are seen by others as having the right to issue orders are likely to have the power because of their ability to create and sustain political order that is acceptable to actors who are part of that order [3, p. 13]. So, the orders of those who have authority are seen as legitimate.

Soft power. Joseph S. Nye, Jr. has been the key protagonist of the soft power concept over the past two decades. According to Nye, hard power includes military and economic capabilities, while the concept of soft power covers other, less tangible, dimensions of power. Nye has defined soft power as "the ability to shape the preferences of others," and this ability rests primarily on the attractiveness of the power wielder. Nye writes that "a country may obtain the outcomes it wants in world politics because other countries want to follow it, admiring its values, emulating its example, aspiring to its level of prosperity and openness. In this sense, it is just as important to set the agenda in world politics and attract others as it is to force them to change through the threat or use of military or economic weapons. This aspect of power – getting others to want what you want – I call soft power." So, the key aspect of soft power is the attractiveness of a country. Edward H. Carr has argued that power over opinion – in addition to military and economic types of power – is one of the key forms of power. Where Nye and Carr differ, however, is in their views on whether propaganda can be an effective tool in securing power over opinion. Nye rejects the usefulness of propaganda out of hand, while Carr insists that propaganda can be an effective instrument of statecraft, at least in the short term. This concept has been embraced by China and Russia. In response to that, Nye has criticized their ability to augment

9

and project soft power because of their lack of attractiveness to the public in liberal democracies [3, p. 14]. Rostoks assumed that Nye has incorporated in his concept of soft power institutional and structural aspects of power, when Nye's hard power is similar to compulsory power (threats and inducements, military and economic capabilities). Janice Bially Mattern, critic of soft power, argues that soft power should be seen as an extension of hard power, rather than a separate form of power: "Soft power should not be understood in juxtaposition to hard power, but as a continuation of it by different means." Carnes Lord is of a similar opinion when he argues that "hard power can be used to generate soft power [3, p. 16]. Leslie Gelb echoes the above arguments by claiming that "soft power now seems to mean almost everything," that soft power now includes not only such elements as leadership, persuasion, and values, but also "military prowess" and "all kinds of economic transactions involving the giving or withholding money for coercive purposes" [3, p. 17]. Despite numerous criticisms of Nye's concept, even realists such as Carr and Morgenthau have admitted that power was not only military and economic. Morgenthau stated that one source of strength was "respect or love for people or institutions," and that force could also be pressured through "the authority or charisma of a person or service." So, in order to influence the behaviour of others, the important elements of power are involvement, influence on public opinion in other countries, the opportunity to be accepted as a figure with authority, to form social categories of subjects of world politics. Therefore, Rostoks proposes to analyze key issues related to each form of soft power.

Attractiveness. Three aspects of attractiveness are of paramount importance. Firstly, when trying to assess attractiveness of an actor, one has to begin by assessing whether attractiveness is passively possessed or actively shaped. Passive attractiveness is about 'being' rather than 'doing'. Sometimes being a 'shining city on a hill' is a viable option for influencing the behaviour of others, but it is increasingly abandoned because most governments understand that they can elevate their international standing by actively shaping their image abroad. Secondly, sometimes attractiveness that is projected abroad is a façade that hardly corresponds to the realities at home. Attractiveness can be genuine when countries are honest about the values that they represent, but it can also be false if it becomes subject to spinning or outright deception. Thus, authoritarian and totalitarian regimes often put on their best face to generate soft power abroad, but for the most part these efforts fail because in the age of information and communication technologies it is difficult to conceal the reality behind the façade. However, it is also possible that the attempts to project a false image abroad may succeed in the short term. Thirdly, to assess attractiveness of a country one needs to ask the question: What is it that makes

this country attractive abroad? Thus, it becomes possible to uncover specific aspects of a country's image that make it either more or less attractive abroad. Here, it is useful to distinguish between a country's economic model, political values, culture, education and other possible sources of attractiveness. Sometimes these elements of soft power may work against each other. So, for a researcher writing about attractiveness, Rostoks recommends asking the following questions: to what extent does the EU rely on its attractiveness in its relations with its eastern neighbours? Has the EU tried to project its appeal abroad? Does it coincide with reality? [3, p. 20].

Power over opinion. Attractiveness allows influencing the society and elite of other states. But there are differences in the degree of influence: the influence can be so powerful that the public will turn against that influence; force can also work only against some part of the population of another country. In such a scenario, there is a possibility of conflict between the countries. Thus, it can be said that the degree of influence is a very important aspect. To assess the power of thought, the researcher must ask the question: has the EU tried to influence the opinion of the population of the NEE? What was used? Is it successful? [3, p. 21].

Authority. Traditionally, great powers have tried to establish regional political orders, either by themselves, or in concert with other great powers. The primary aim of such attempts has been to create stability in great powers' vicinity and to allow for their extended influence. Authority is a concept that is of key importance in the context of external influence of the EU. The Baltic States have largely accepted the external authority of other EU member states in return for having the right to take part in collective decision-making among the 28 EU members. Russia's attempts to establish authority over the Baltic States' behaviour and take part in the formation of the regional political order have been, up until now, largely rejected. With regard to Moldova, Ukraine, and Georgia, relations with EU authority are far from being settled. In order to assess the impact of EU authority, the researcher must ask the following questions: Has the EU sought to establish order in the territories of the NEE? If so, what social contract could he offer? Are these attempts successful? What elements of its order is the EU trying to establish in these territories? [3, p. 22-23].

Institutional power. Exercise of institutional power is often less visible because of its multilateral character. Also, institutional power is sometimes used in such a way that it precludes some issues from being addressed therefore not all instances of institutional power can be easily detected. According to Rostoks, questions can be asked about attempts to influence the behaviour of other actors through multilateral institutions: has the EU used international

institutions in relation to the NEE countries? Were these attempts successful? Which institutions were favoured? [3, p. 24].

Decay of power. The decay of power allows us to investigate the effect of power on the ability of actors. Today, the idea of a decay of power has been divided into two parts. One of them is that the stronger actors find getting the desired result to be more difficult. The second is that the weak actors find it easier to resist the strong ones. There is a widespread belief that the power of Russia is on the rise in Europe because Europe has been hit by the global economic crisis and debt load. The researcher should answer the question: how did this affect the NEE countries? Have Russia's capabilities improved? Has EU influence diminished? [3, p. 25]. In our opinion, the questions formulated by Rostoks when examining EU policy in Eastern Europe also help to explore other areas of EU CFSP.

2. The EU's Grand Strategy concept

Given the broad spectrum of EU policy and the complex demands it faces, Michael E. Smith suggested discussing the EU's role in the context of the Grand Strategy. Firstly, he suggested discussing the EU's activities as a global actor: does it fit into the three basic components of the Grand Strategy: physical security; economic prosperity; and value projection. Secondly, it discusses the content of the EU's grand strategic goals at three levels: intra-EU; regional (or neighbourhood); and global. Thirdly, it discusses the EU's implementation of its strategic goals in the face of competition with other global actors [4, p. 148].

The EU's Grand Strategy is a core agenda that integrates EU policies and resources to protect and promote its core vital interests. Given the high costs of the armed forces compared to other resources, the EU's Grand Strategy is intended to apply them as a last resort and when there is a maximum chance of victory. The EU currently has a wide range of other non-military resources that can support its interests.

They contain various forms of soft power, such as:

(1) Economic power (market access and financial aid, as well as sanctions).

(2) Civilian power (diplomacy, legal/judicial missions, and good offices).

(3) Ethical power (the promotion of human rights, the rule of law, and democracy).

(4) Power of attraction (inspiring prospective member states or serving as an example to others) [4, p. 148].

As we can see in the table, some policies (such as AFSJ, Schengen, and ENP) clearly address multiple strategic goals.

The EU as an international actor has grown compared to the situation 20

The implementation of EU grand strategy (major examples)

	Internal	Regional ('neighbourhood')	Global
Physical security	- Enforcement of EU membership criteria in the accession process; - European Court of Justice (ECJ); - Europol; - Development of the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice (AFSJ); - 'Solidarity' clause to respond to armed aggression;	- Headline goals / battle groups; - ESDP infrastructure; - CFSP/ESDP missions; - European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP); - EU–Russian 'four common spaces' and 'roadmaps'; - 'Solidarity' clause to respond to armed aggression;	- Support for efforts against WMD; - ESDP infrastructure; - CFSP/ESDP missions; - Civilian crisis management actions; - Actions against money laundering, organized crime, and terrorism;
Economic prosperity	- Single European Market (SEM); - Euro programme; - AFSJ; - Schengen; - Stability/growth pact; - Selective protection of certain sectors;	- Selective, conditional market access through the Euro–Med/ENP programmes; - Aid and technical assistance to regional neighbours; - Maintenance of EFTA/EEA; - Bilateral agreements with key neighbours; - EU–Russian 'four common spaces' and 'roadmaps';	- Support for WTO and related trade regimes; - Support for various finance/development regimes; - Lome '/ACP aid; - Strategic partnerships with major powers;
Value projection	- Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union; - AFSJ; - Schengen; - Protection of cultural diversity;	- Political conditionality clause of ENP, action plans and related cooperation agreements with neighbours; - Support for Council of Europe and European Convention on Human Rights; - EU–Russian 'four common spaces' and 'road maps';	- Support for UN human rights policies; - Problem-specific initiatives (climate change, privacy, anti-death penalty, etc.).

Quotation according: M. E. Smith, «Power, purpose and the EU's changing global role», p. 154

years ago. Many elements of EU policy can be seen as part of the EU's overall strategy for existence as a global political entity, or even as considered by M. E. Smith as a great power. The scientist concludes that the EU will face growing problems with other major players, such as the US, China, and Russia, since the Grand Strategy contains global political competition in itself [4, p. 154].

3. Concept of external governance

Currently, of all actors, only the Russian Federation has entered into a direct confrontation with the EU for leadership in the post-Soviet region. Therefore, attention should be paid to the phenomenon of the effectiveness of the EU strategy, which is commonly referred to in the literature as 'external governance'.

Christian Hagemann came out of the axiom that at the international level and especially in partnerships (on the example of the EaP), the nature of the adopted rules (along with the geopolitical situation) is critically important. In order for EU rules to have a significant effect in transitional societies, they must be linked to a reward (to increase the level of responsibilities); requirements for the proper interpretation of rights by both parties; close external observation. In this respect, the OSCE and the Council of Europe are the most important actors for Hagemann.

As for Russia, it is called the main rival, but at the same time Hagemann supports the idea of their interdependence. This idea goes back to R. Keohane and J. Nye (1977), who define it as a situation "where there are reciprocal costly effects of transactions. If interdependence is asymmetrical, less dependent actors can often use the interdependent relationship as a source of power in bargaining over an issue and perhaps to affect other issues." Trade flows, foreign direct investment (FDI), military power, and direct financial or technical assistance are the results of a political trade between the EU and Russia. Hagemann views Moldova's case as an example of Russia's counteraction to the EU's European integration efforts, not for the implementation of its own agenda, but for trade with a view to obtaining certain concessions from the EU in important areas. The EU influences Moldova through the ENP, then the EaP. Russia is coming up with proposals for Moldova that are not limited by the harsh conditions of the EU; at the same time, it applies penalties by military or economic instruments. Thus, Russia is increasing the EU's spending on implementing its action plan. At the national level, the costs will be high if compliance with the rules threatens the political dominance of the entire ethnic group, the integrity and security of the country. The government will adopt the rules only if no adverse effects on its own power are expected

or if the benefits outweigh the estimated costs. As a result, while the end result is in doubt, formal rule-making, effective external governance is fully tied to the gradual implementation of the rules [1, p. 769-771].

Thus, Hagemann proposed his scheme of analysis of relations of global actors, to which he referred to the EU and the Russian Federation:

1) to begin by identifying the parties' main interests;

2) to study their behaviour, expectations and policies to measure their adequacy;

3) to provide a vision for the future that will be shaped by: (a) the policies of the target countries; cultural, political and ideological preferences expressed by their elites and public opinion; b) the neighbourhood factor as a consequence of expansion; c) "Russian factor" in the double scope of influence on the CIS countries and development of EU-Russia relations; e) continued transformation of the EU [1, p. 778].

4. The concept of partnership as an alternative to external governance

In the context of the presented work, an interesting complement to the concept of external governance is the current views on partnerships in EU foreign policy. Based on the work of Elena Korosteleva, one can even speak of well-established partnership concepts, which are conditionally divided into 'partnership as supplementary to EU governance' and 'partnership as a replacement of EU governance.'

Partnership as supplementary to EU governance. In the early 1990s, the EU began to experiment with the use of a new kind of partnership as an additional tool for EU governance relations with third world countries. Emphasis was placed on changing relationships for the benefit of the principles of shared ownership and trust. Therefore, it was a comprehensive approach that outlined the development framework for concerned country. Since then, the partnership has become a means of promoting EU-led reforms. Development partnership has soon become a ubiquitous term in official documentation to identify new ways of approaching less developed countries to promote democracy and reforms. These partnerships thrived in fostering a sense of integrity and responsibility rather than domination. According to Rita Abrahamsen, by shifting her focus to the recipient, the development partnership sought to give them a sense of responsibility in order to create a modern, self-disciplined civil society and state. Anthony Fowler, on the other hand, argued that the partnership failed to achieve this in practice: 'Partnership' may seem innocent, but it can also become a 'terminological Trojan horse,' a tool for deeper, broader, and more effective ways of developing the country... Under the supposed interest, openness, comprehensive harmony, partnership excludes

other options and choices" [2, p. 24]. Thus, in theory, the partnership tool can only be a controversial effect of involuntary governance that drives local commitment to reform. During the 1990s, the partnership proved difficult to put into practice. In an effort to clarify the situation, Neta C. Crawford in 2003 proposed to differentiate between 'instrumental' and 'real' partnerships. The former can be seen as "a tool or means to achieve the goals of the actor... by controlling the activities of hired donor agencies." A real partnership for development involves "creating local agendas from the outset that remain in control all the time." This option offers more potential for transformation. However, as EU experience shows, real partnership is more a desirable rather than a practical concept; it is just a governance tool that involves involuntary rules [2, p. 25]. Criticism dominates the scientific community regarding EU relations with the Caribbean and the Pacific, Indonesia, and Africa.

Partnership as an (involuntary) replacement of EU governance. On the other hand, one can observe the reincarnation of partnership as an autonomous structure of cooperation in EU relations with 'key players in the world.' Called 'strategic,' such partnerships operate under conditions of mutual equality and extraordinary rules. This partnership does not always use the common values format or follow the general principles of the game. Its rationale is to achieve common goals and benefits, and to determine a common future in the commodity exchange process to continue cooperation that can develop into value-based relationships. However, as noted in 2008 by Giovanni Grevi and Alvaro de Vasconcelos, even then the EU seeks to represent this kind of cooperation under the heading 'socialization' of partners in the vision of norms and values. For example, according to Javier Solana, the EU's relations with China are based on the fact that they are both "partners with significant global strengths, capabilities and responsibilities." For the EU, this partnership is primarily aimed at including China in "the kind of international order that the European Union supports" that does not at all coincide with the Chinese government's view. In particular, in 2004, Prime Minister Wen Jiabao defined the content and purpose of the partnership with the EU: "By 'partnership' we mean that cooperation should be equal; mutually beneficial, and win-win for everyone. Both sides should build on mutual respect and mutual trust, seek to bring interests closer, and seek points of contact on the main issues while differences over the other are eliminated" [2, p. 26]. A similar attempt to 'engage' a partner in the EU's international vision was noted in 2009-2010 by Derek Averre and Hiski Haukkala in relations with Russia. They argued for a more pragmatic approach to partnerships with global states based on common interests rather than values, emphasizing the importance of face-to-face reciprocity and equality, which in the long run can create a commitment to

common standards. The 'size' of the partners is determined by their political and economic influence in international relations and acts as a qualifier for the EU. The EU bases partnership on the value of its partners and uses a 'socialization' approach to build relationships with those in power. On the other hand, a more principled approach is based on bringing partners closer to EU norms and values and applies to anyone who has not yet demonstrated a willingness to stick to the 'credible force for good' as expressed in 2007 by EU Solana [2, p. 27].

Partnership as complementary to EU governance. Partnership within the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), according to Korosteleva, takes a compromise position in the area of partnership governance. It was designed to complement existing EU communication mechanisms with third world countries (governance structures) and to develop its own apparatus to assist in achieving common goals and maximizing mutual benefits. The criteria were to be developed in close collaboration with partner countries "to ensure national responsibility and commitment... To give partners more predictability and certainty in the future," as the European Commission stated in 2003. There is, at least at the level of discourse, an important conceptual shift in the consideration of 'partnership' not simply as an act of unconditional adherence to rules adopted in the image and likeness of EU rules and regulations (as in relations with third world countries), but as an act of discussing additional conditions so that give some freedom and get involved in the process of 'others.' However, this conceptual span of partnership as a complement to governance has become neither a management tool nor an autonomous structure. This added a little clarity to the concept itself and was met with resistance from those involved in the discussion. This type of partnership is contradictory to both the mutual goals / benefits in the spirit of a 'true' partnership (as a substitute for governance) and requires partners to have loyalty and adherence to EU rules and regulations. The incentive structure offered to partners is uncertain because of the lack of prospects for membership, which makes the future uncertain and unclear. Applied studies examining EU relations with ENP neighbours highlight how one-sided and instrumental EU policy towards its partners is [2, p. 28]. Disguised as a human rights work, the EU's strategic security interests are driven by a partnership program. In these circumstances, according to Christine Kausch, partnership is often transformed into a 'controlled observation' and, as a rule, lacks efficiency and legitimacy. Federica Bicchi has suggested that EU relations with neighbours show a desire for governance rather than partnership and can be characterized as "an attempt to promote one's own model through a deep-seated belief that Europe's history is a lesson to all" (2006). According to Laure Delcour and Elsa Tulmets

(2008), "Neighbourhood policy has been designed and implemented as long as it aims at meeting the expectations of the EU and not their neighbours… The EU in its region remains a cunning actor, …an actor of Eurocentrism, building rhetoric based on joint ownership but with exported or enforced standards" [2, p. 28]. According to Heather Grabbe, the method of gradual 'socialization' of partners into EU regulatory thinking is more reminiscent of the process of 'Europeanization' of outsiders (2006), or even of 'Brusselsization' of EU external relations (Michael Zürn, 2000); this method has not been successful in the Middle East, North Africa, nor in Eastern Europe. So, the essence of applying the concept of partnership requires rethinking to ensure greater clarity, legitimacy, and commitment from EU partners.

Conclusions

Thus, among the modern concepts most useful for the study of the main vectors of EU foreign policy and prospects for their development, four were identified, which treat such categories of international relations as power, strategy, partnership, and external governance.

Michael E. Smith has returned to the concept of a grand strategy. He suggested discussing the EU's activities as a global player: does it fit into the three main components of the Grand Strategy, such as physical security, economic prosperity, and the value of the plan. Secondly, he considered it important to discuss the content of the EU's big strategic goals at three levels: internal, regional, and global. Third, discuss the EU's implementation of its strategic goals in the face of competition with other global players.

In the concept of power, the main elements are involvement, influence on public opinion in other countries, the opportunity to be accepted as an authority, and to form social categories of subjects of world politics. Toms Rostoks offered key questions related to each of the forms of soft power. Analyzing the components of force, he came to the conclusion that Nye changed the institutional and structural types of power to 'soft power' and the compulsory type (threats, incentives, military and economic opportunities) to 'hard'. Nay defined soft power as "the ability to take advantage of others;" this ability depends on the attractiveness of the power owner. So, Rostoks recommended the following useful questions to the researcher: To what extent does the EU rely on its attractiveness? Has the EU tried to project its attractiveness abroad? Does it coincide with reality? Has the EU tried to influence the opinion of the population and how? Has the EU tried to establish order (if so, what social contract could it offer)? Has the EU used international institutions? Which institutions were favoured? Are these attempts successful? Has EU influence increased / decreased?

Elena Korosteleva identified three variations of the partnership concept: 1) 'partnership of development' with an emphasis on changing relations in favour of the principles of shared ownership and trust, stimulating reforms, promoting democracy; 2) a strategic partnership option to achieve common goals and benefits; 3) a compromise partnership (a mixture of the two preceding) to assist in the pursuit of common goals and maximizing mutual benefit, with a focus on developing the apparatus of the recipient countries and discussing additional conditions to give them some freedom.

Christian Hagemann pointed out that in order for the rules to have a significant effect in societies built on other grounds, they must be linked to a reward (to increase the level of responsibilities), the requirements to ensure proper interpretation of rights by both parties, and vigilant external observation. Therefore, its research algorithm includes: 1) identifying the main interests of the parties; 2) studying their behaviour, expectations and policies to measure their degree of adequacy; 3) a vision of the future that will be shaped by: a) policies of target countries; cultural, political, and ideological preferences expressed by their elites and public opinion; b) the neighbourhood factor; c) the factor of other great powers; e) continuation of the internal transformation of the country under study.

For these and other major questions, the authors of the monograph have tried to provide answers using the example of EU policy in individual regions and the dimensions of contemporary international relations.

Literature

1. Hagemann Ch. External Governance on the Terms of the Partner? The EU, Russia and the Republic of Moldova in the European Neighbourhood Policy. Journal of European Integration. 2013. N 35:7. P. 767-783. DOI: 10.1080/07036337.2012.732073

2. Korosteleva E. A more ambitious partnership for the neighbourhood? In: The European Union and its Eastern Neighbours. Towards a More Ambitious Partnership?, 20-60. London: Routledge, 2012. DOI: 10.4324/9780203128992

3. Rostoks T. Forms of Russian and EU power in the 'New Eastern Europe'. In: The Different Faces of "Soft Power": The Baltic States and Eastern Neighborhood between Russia and the EU, ed. by T. Rostoks, A. Spruds, 8-29. Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 2015.

4. Smith M. E. A Liberal Grand Strategy in a Realist World? Power, Purpose and the EU's Changing Global Role. Journal of European Public Policy. 2011. N 18:2. P. 144-163. DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2011.544487

CHAPTER 2

THE EU'S POLICY OF INTEGRATION
IN THE CONTEXT OF EUROPEAN REGIONALIZATION

Sergii Glebov

The current stage of European integration appeared to be a business card of the post-bipolar globalization in Europe. It has already targeted various strategic agendas on the basis of so-called "European values." Beyond the initial enlargement of the European Union after Maastricht, the leaders of the EU tended to consider all non-EU European states as part of the on-going process of Europeanization.

The EU-28, which remains the largest integrative community in the world, has been doomed to play an active role in the process of building a multipolar world (the same as it was at the EU-15 stage with its four G7 members and two permanent members of the UN Security Council). The EU would have aim to be a global player in order to successfully accomplish such a mission. But the question "are Europeans ready for global challenges?" remained one of the most acute for political experts inside the European community for quite a long time [20]. After all, the EU itself was created as a regional economic organization in Western Europe in the wake of the separation from the processes of the "old" regionalization of the Cold War era under the auspices of the US and NATO. In addition, the specifics of the development of international relations in the modern world have been determined by two opposing processes – globalization and the fragmentation of the world space. This makes the topic of the EU's global subjectivity after 2013 even more acute, i.e. in the context of a significant imbalance of security parameters in the area of the Eastern Partnership and on the eve of the Brexit.

Globalization, which originally emerged as an economic phenomenon, has (under new conditions) become a value concept, which is fundamental to the EU as a normative power. From the economic category, globalization has become not just a political category, but a primarily ideological one, often associated with Westernization and even Americanization. The importance of the ideological factor when analyzing globalization was noted by one of the founders of the theory of new regionalism Björn Hettne: "Whether its consequences are seen as catastrophic or as the ultimate unification of the world, the concept of globalization is often used in a rather loose and ideological sense" [14].

In order to understand the specifics of contemporary European regionalism and the EU's place in it, it is necessary to address the problematic question

of the interconnection between the global and the fragmentary. In his monograph "Changes in the International System" of 1991, one of the classics of the modern science of international relations, Kalevi Holsti noted the difficult "interaction" of these two antagonistic tendencies and called for a closer analysis of these phenomena [15, p. 60].

The debate around globalization and fragmentation actively unfolded at the turn of the 1980s - 1990s, at a time when these two processes were accumulating the potential for a post-bipolar jump. It was not yet clear which of the two processes would prevail, because the USSR, which began to disintegrate actively, cracked not only through the entire post-Soviet space, but also through those regions of the world which were previously controlled by this superpower. This was when a common euphoria prevailed due to the start of globalization, interdependence, and when integration processes in Western Europe were considered not as an exception, but as a future model of development for others.

Under such conditions, Holsti warned against the underestimation of national separatism, nationalism, and disintegration (however, he also did not rush to overestimate them like Volker Connor, according to Holsti, did, when believed that "the centrifugal forces of national expectations are developing much stronger than the associate-centric force") [15, p. 61]. As a result, Holsti concluded that these two parallel processes are interrelated: "In some cases, disintegration and fragmentation are a response to asymmetric integration and certain types of interaction in dependent and interdependent relationships. These are the answers of those who see in greater interdependence not more opportunities or benefits, but the unfair redistribution of rewards or the emergence of threats to national, ethnic, linguistic or religious identity. In short, the "diminishing world" can lead not to greater consensus and internationalism, but to increased nationalism, leading to the expansion or protection of autonomy" [15, p. 61].

Thus, the problem of fluctuation between globalization and fragmentation does not seem to be simple, as well as the problem of the choice between strategies of universalism and fragmentation in the European political arena.

The expert community drew attention to such a methodological problem even during the Cold War, when concepts such as "integration," "regionalization," and "universalization" (as the conceptual basis of future globalization) were viewed through the prism of the bipolar world. Thus, already in the 1960s, the famous American political scientist Bruce Russet saw a special planetary mission in regionalism that would determine the parameters of the world order in the medium term [19, p. 321]. In particular, Bruce Russet noted: "It is widely accepted that international integration at the regional level is more likely to succeed than establishment of the global powerful political

institute. Regionalism is seen as a successful basis for the world order, as an alternative to fragmentation and universal solutions" [19, p. 321]. In today's context, the question naturally arises as to whether regionalism is a 'by-product' of globalization linked to the objective heterogeneity of economic space, both in the interstate dimension and in the context of states, or an independent phenomenon?" [6]. It is advisable to answer this question in order to properly assess the foreign policy steps of the countries that have formed a "common" region, in the context of their interests, constructive (implied by globalization) or destructive (which are inherent in fragmentation) intentions. It will depend on the duration of the existence of the region as a whole, which may constantly be at risk of splitting due to the multi-vector actions of regional players, during which some will play a role in globalization and others in fragmentation. Such discourse is more than relevant to the modern EU, which began its recent history in the context of simultaneous integration, fragmentation and regionalization in global dimension, and today is experiencing the same trends at the regional level, and, even more importantly, within itself.

Therefore, referring back to the issue of the EU's global subjectivity in the modern world, it should be noted that such subjectivity has been examined by relations with the US, Russia, and NATO since the very beginning of the post-bipolar era. Whether the European Union is a global player (in the sphere of global security first of all) or not – is a debatable question. Particularly in a situation where the EU-28 (because of the tactical preferences) remains a heterogeneous structure as to the sphere of international relations; for the protection of the EU's strategic interests at the global level there are NATO and the US though.

The EU, despite its mutual critical relationship with the US, is interested in continuing its strategic partnership with the White House within NATO. On the other hand, despite the economic sanctions applied to Russia as a result of its military aggression against Ukraine in 2014 (largely after the tragedy with the Malaysian Boeing 777 flight MH17 in July 2014), the EU is interested in stable neighbourly political and economic relations with Moscow, especially in the context of energy security.

Given the opportunities available, the European Union prefers to focus specifically on intra-European issues. However, the EU, a "great" regional power with its "neighbourhood" policy and Common Foreign and Security Policy, through its individual sub-regional "synergies" and narrowly focused "partnership" strategies, direct bilateral links, has a huge impact on pan-European policies and economic processes. Despite attempts by some competitors to weaken the value of the EU, it is the EU that reserves the right to shape the modern configuration of architectural design of the Greater Europe. Should

we attach Russia to the "Greater Europe" today and whether it is necessary to overestimate Brussels military capabilities to act independently from the US – both are rhetorical questions, but the EU's attempts to follow (despite Brexit and other fragmentation challenges) an image of the principal loco-motive of the entire post-bipolar European regionalism looks like a historic mission indeed. And this is not just about the EU's intentions, as of an in-ternational actor, to be an active player at the regional pan-European level (EUFOR peacekeeping missions in Kosovo) and at the sub-regional level (the "Normandy Four" for Ukraine). Ever since the early 1990s, the EU has been interested in integrating into the EU-wide processes certain regional coopera-tion initiatives that have emerged, for example, in the Baltic or Black Sea ba-sins. As a result, the EU has gradually aimed at introducing a soft integration mechanism to strengthen economic and political cooperation, and thus Euro-pean security as a whole. The EU has done so despite the intentions of some major players to oppose the policies aimed at the expansion of democracy. In addition to the desire of the "centre" to Europeanize the European space, the desire for democratic transformations was taken up by the "periphery:" the ideas of European integration were spread in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe immediately after the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Applying the terminology of a system approach, the EU as a political sys-tem, to which a larger part of the non-EU European actors gravitated, has es-tablished structural, functional, and genetic links with its subsystems, which were formed in certain political and geographical sub-regions. Those, as sub-systems, in their turn were in a search of contact mechanisms with the Euro-pean system at a higher regional level.

If, for instance, to take the case of the Black Sea sub-region, the process of cooperation of the Black Sea states has been an integral part of major integra-tion processes in Europe since the idea of the establishment of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) in 1992. The phenomenon of regional (the EU) and sub-regional (BSEC) cooperation, which often takes institutional forms, acts as an important element inside contextual core of regionalism. It is not by chance that, since 2007, the European Commission has been a BSEC observer at the time of launching the Black Sea Synergy, the EU sub-regional strategy toward the Black Sea region. The logic of the internal processes in-side regionalism has been demonstrated by the well-known Greek researcher Charalambos Tsardanidis: "for developing countries, like most of the BSEC states, participation in sub-regional and regional cooperation schemes along-side with more developed and experienced states is a step towards integration into the broader global system. From this point of view sharing experience and mutual support from member countries in intraregional structures adds

complementary elements to their development and helps them adjust to the competitive milieu of globalisation" [21, p. 368].

Thus, in the 1990s BSEC became an element of the European system in a number of other European political and geographical subsystems. The Barents Sea Council, the Visegrad Group, the Danube Basin Group, the Central European Initiative, the Euro-Mediterranean Initiative represented similar in structure centres "of transnational cooperation on the sub-continental level in Central Europe" [18, p. 22]. All of them were "genetically" supplementing the post-bipolar concept aimed at the sustainable development of the European system also known as a concept of the "Europe of the Regions" (was elaborated in the middle of the 1990s by such analytical locomotives of European regionalism as the Foundation for International Understanding (Copenhagen, Denmark) and the European Centre for Ethnic, Regional, and Sociological Studies (University of Maribor, Slovenia). This conception proposed a way for a fundamental transformation of international relations in Europe: each region (locality) would be present in or accessible to the whole Europe (the world), and Europe (the world) with all its diversity would be present in each region (locality) [22, p. 20]. The "Europe of the Regions" concept has been seen as a practical instrument for the reanimation of Charles de Gaulle's well-known thesis of "Europe from Atlantic to the Urals," later developed by Eve la Coste's school of regional geopolitics, by "new rights" with Alen de Benya, who proposed the thesis of "United Europe of Hundred Flags." In this capacity, the Black Sea subsystem and the other subsystems mentioned above are not only affected by the European system, but also influence the system as its elements, determining the movement of the latter. It is in this mutual influence that one of the rules of systemic relations has been expressed [7, p. 29]. Thus, European countries "genetically" "needed" the EU, and the EU "organically" "needed" European countries, even beyond the discourse of accession.

The initial category of post-bipolar European regionalism can act as a category of "needs" of the countries of one region, as expectations from the region of joint activity. These "needs" were called by Jozef Kukulka – the classic of the system approach – as "aspirational" (from the Latin aspiratio (breathing): the desire for something, the passion for something, for example, the desire to achieve a goal, the passion for the realization of ambitious plans, etc.) [5, p. 267]. The very appearance of general "needs" is a peculiar reaction of the countries of one region to "a certain state of dissatisfaction with specific conditions of existence and development" and a "subjective feeling of a certain lack." This is precisely the historical mission of the EU, which the EEC has already presented to the countries of the "new" Europe, – to expand the same "needs" of humanitarian values, and political and economic stand-

ards. Thus, regionalism can act as a concentrated expression of the common needs of the countries of the one region, as "a persistent objective attribute (inclination or affection) which is to preserve or achieve a certain status or purpose" [5, p. 266]. In other words, regionalism itself can act as a "need" for countries in the one region to address the common problems of all. An important conclusion was presented by Kukulka as a final assessment of the category of "needs:" "Needs grow out of the objective conditions of the participants' entity in international relations, and relations between them, creating at the same time prerequisites for the desire to satisfy them" [5, p. 266]. Thus, the primary objective condition of regionalism is the general geographical environment, where the "entity of the participants" of the regional relations grows. "In the initial phase, these so-called needs are primary, unconscious and not articulated, and the desire to meet them is spontaneous" [5, p. 266]. Initially, neighbouring states are doomed to either conflict or cooperate. Both forms of interaction can be either permanent or temporary. "Once they are acknowledged, they take the form of rationalized, directed aspirations and goals, which obey articulation in connection with the existing value system and with the existing ideology" [5, p. 267]. Consequently, "conscious regionalism" sooner or later acquires the common goals of regional organizations, leading to the emergence of regional ideology based on shared values. In the course of such a process, "aspirational" needs are transformed into operational needs (which become interests)" [5, p. 269].

Starting from the practical aspects of regionalism and linking them to the operational needs, it can be assumed that in the course of realizing common needs (interests), all the countries would win whose interaction, according to Robert Gilpin, will find their way out not in the war, but through peaceful cooperation (two possible final options for the interaction of states in the world arena according to political realism) [12, p. 228]. As Hans Morgenthau noted, "if countries pursue their national security interests only ... and respect the vital interests of other states equally, the creation of a basis for compromise and peaceful change will be possible" [17, p. 540].

Nowadays, such approaches have been taken and refined by the neo-realism. Thus, according to the concept of "conditional realism" (at the intersection of structural realism and offensive-defensive neo-realism), rivalry and cooperation are two mutually additional ways of survival of the state [4, p. 135]. As the Russian researcher Valeriy Konyshev notes that in the framework of such approach "the focus should be transferred to studying the conditions under which both policy options are possible" [4, p. 135]. So, under what conditions are both options possible? According to Holsti, "the most obvious answer is that people who share a common identity and polit-

ical tolerance do not quarrel as often or cruelly as those who are divided by linguistic, ethnic, religious, or political boundaries" [15, p. 60]. Regionalism is just working to form kind of a regional identity, which is a step towards understanding and overcoming conflicts. It contributes to preventing them in the future because the common regional field of engagement leaves no chance for a militant aggression and leads to the establishment of a new regional order as part of the formation of a new global one. Therefore, from the beginning it was important for the EU to create a natural pan-European consciousness and identity in European countries. First of all, in those who are ready to share the values of Europeanization on the basis of democratic principles. A meaningful instrument was the EU policy on the promotion of human rights and freedoms, the foundations of a market economy and the rule of law throughout the European space. Integration (optional as to the decision to become a member of the EU) of individual state and non-state actors, the formation of a regional European political-geographical complex of economic cooperation, and security at the borders of geographical Europe appeared as operational mechanisms in the vanguard of spreading of Europeanization. In practice, the slippage in the creation of such a stable, integrated around the democratic rules complex was largely linked to the unwillingness of some European players to follow the rules. Creating the foundations for compromise and for peaceful changes in Europe, at least outside the EU, appeared to be impossible, as far as not everyone was prepared to "equally respect the vital interests of other states." The answer to the question "why?" lies on the surface: not all European communities were ready to "share identity and tolerance", so the path to a post-2013 collision on the basis of "exclusive self-interests" appeared to be almost inevitable. The lack of a common democratic identity has aggravated the distribution of democratic and undemocratic regimes across "linguistic, ethnic, religious and political borders."

For Ukraine, in particular, this meant that at the turn of 2013-2014 it found itself, as a state with common borders with the EU and the Russian Federation, in a grip between the effects of the soft normative Europeanization (in the form of democratic transformations within the country) and the attack of the aggressive "Russian world."

Returning to the theoretical foundations of regionalism and the category of "need" by Kukulka, which was developed in the 1950s by David Easton [11, p. 38], it should be noted that the "needs" listed above reflect only different aspects of this concept, so they may all be suitable for analyzing the individual needs of participants in international relations, especially states and their systems. Needs are external to them but are necessary for: 1) normal internal functioning and development, 2) safe survival in an international environ-

ment (in accordance with the principles of polyarchy and systemic evolution), 3) fulfilment of an appropriate international role (according to one's own position and the expectations of other participants)" [5, c. 266].

Thus, using the systemic terminology of Kukulka, it should be noted that despite the destructive external influence, European regionalism is nevertheless an external phenomenon for a particular state, but the intra-regional process for the countries of the entire European region, gives an opportunity to: 1) form a space of interconnection and realize the intentions of the states towards sustainable development and functioning of the region, 2) lay the foundations for secure survival in the global environment, 3) create a platform for all countries of the region to conduct their foreign policy roles (national interests) in accordance with the interests of neighbouring countries.

The above resultant components are the essence of integration processes in Europe. It is no coincidence that researchers of European regionalism initially focused their attention on developing concepts of cross-border regionalism in the context of the cooperation of integrated border territorial units within the EU member states in the format of Euroregions. As noted by Jan Dees and Alex Lord (University of Manchester), the current debate on European regionalism has developed in the direction of "extraordinary regionalism" and has been dominated "by the growth of interest in European spatial planning over the course of the 1990s" [10, p. 1847]. Such a discussion elaborated on "new regional configurations which now extends across the territory of the European Union." Therefore, in this context, it is essential to understand "the degree to which readings of new regionalist rhetoric have informed both the creation and substance of a number of recently conceived regional entities" [10, p. 1847].

Belarusian researcher Kateryna Domorenok, relying on the definition of the "region" by the eminent theorist of the European integration Ben Rosamond made in his book "Theories of European integration," emphasizes the strong internal connection of the "new European regionalism" with the process of European integration: "In the context of European integration, a region is a territory endowed with an appropriate status for administrative purposes occupying an intermediate position between central and local governments. It can also mean an area that claims political identity, indicated by ethnic, historical, linguistic characteristics, or both. Thus, European regionalism has its own specificity and is closely linked to the EU integration process. It is this process that can be attributed to the manifestation of a "new" regionalism, which received a strong impetus for development in the early 1990s" [1].

Thus, the success of the activity of the Euroregions within the EU is a subject to be implemented within the Euroregions in the EU border countries for

many years. However, there are some challenges to integration and regional-ization processes, both inside and outside the EU, because in a concentrated form, the Euroregion is a form of cross-border cooperation between territorial communities or local authorities of border regions of two or more countries that share a common border, coordinate mutual efforts and take concerted action in various spheres of life in accordance with national law and interna-tional law to address common problems in the interests of people, who inhabit its territory on both sides of the state border [8, p. 151].

As noted by Michael Keating (University of Western Ontario), who is the author of the concept of the "progressive new regionalism," "the last two decades have witnessed the "revival of regional Europe" and have been inten-sified by the debate over the importance of regions and their place in the new Europe and global order" [16]. According to Keating, such a "new regional-ism" is characterized by its complexity and diversity and by its "exit" beyond the borders of the nation-state [16]. It is not an accident that the analysis of the status and importance of regions in Europe, as well as in the structure and policy of the EU, shows that the Euroregion is gradually emerging as a real subject of international relations [3]. Putting together the three key attributes of Keating's "progressive new regionalism" – functional region-alization, institutional regionalization and political regionalism – European regions within the EU "can be seen as places for generating post-national identities and forging social cohesion through the rebuilding of the political space and encouragement of the new forms of socio-political mobilization" [13, p. 125]. Such issues are becoming more relevant in a united Europe; as far as in the EU, the subjects of regional cooperation are the internal regions of the Member States, in connection with which the conceptualization of "Eu-ropean regionalism" is directly linked to the "changing territorial structure of the state." This process touches upon both the territorial dimension of space itself and its political and legal dimensions.

The EU, as a unique union with certain features of the confederation, balances on the brink of national and international discourse on the Euro-pean regionalism. Internal regionalization inside the EU member states dif-fers from the external one outside the EU where the EU members cooperate with the non-EU members on the level of Euroregions as well. In both cases, we acknowledge an inevitable appearance of multinational Euroregions in a cross-border cooperation framework. The principal difference is that the border regions of two or more EU-member states on the top level are being regulated by Acquis Communautaire while Euroregions with the EU and non-EU members are subjects of traditional intergovernmental agreements and/or respectful multilateral agreements on the level of local authorities with-

in their competences and under domestic and international regulations. The effectiveness of the European regionalization between EU and the non-EU counterparts appears to be even less when it touches upon interregional co-operation with entire sub-regions, such as the Black Sea region which was already mentioned. This is why the "external regionalism" in Europe is outside of the EU's monopoly: once the EU is trying to join regional agendas outside its jurisdiction, it loses the monopoly to manage regional integration processes. In connection to this, European experts also complain as to the complexity of adapting the terminology of regionalism into contemporary international contexts. Particularly difficult was the situation in the first half of the 1990s, when post-bipolar regionalism as a phenomenon had only just come under expert discourse. For example, reflecting the difficulties in defining regionalism, Boyko Bukar (University of Ljubljana) stressed in 1995: "The limited understanding of terminology can be explained by the relatively recent emergence of this phenomenon (regionalism – S.G.) and by many forms of international regionalisms" [9].

"European regionalism" traces the steady historical and geographical determinism that leads from the modern processes of regionalization and integration into the centuries of European history. Regarding the European experience of regionalization, Konstantin Zubkov noted that "there are so many amazing examples of how far regional ties can be conditioned by natural and geographical conditions and how powerfully they are able to manifest themselves oppositely to the violently "redraw" socio-political and economic space over time" [2]. In addition, Zubkov, based on the developments of the American expert Darrell Delamaide, gives a partial answer to the question of European experts about the extent to which "readings of new regionalist rhetoric have informed both the creation and substance of a number of recently conceived regional entities" within the EU itself. Thus, a Russian scientist notes that Delamaide, in his essay "The New Superregions of Europe" gives striking facts about how in the context of supranational European integration, the levelling of political and economic barriers that have divided the "nation-states" of the continent for centuries today is leading to a spontaneous "release" of previously repressed historic energy in a form of active policies of trans-border regional socio-economic structures which emerge on a stage today, what in general reproduces the map of the lands and regions of medieval Western Europe up to the era of emerging centralized nation-states. It resurrects regional structures that reflect the historical paths of migration and trade, areas of common ethnic and cultural-linguistic heritage, social traditions and customs, much older than those that reflect the historical experience of European "nation-states" [2]. It is emphasized that "the forces of internal

gravity that feed the processes of consolidation of the new in the modern era and the simultaneously old regional components of a united Europe are of a somewhat different nature than those that led in their time to the formation of nation-states. In the processes of regional creation, the cohesion between the characteristics of the geographical environment ("locality"), the social aggregate belonging to it and its cultural identity is much denser - it is essentially a spontaneously formed organic unity of the environment, society and culture; within the framework of the state organization, the distance between the individual parameters of life of society (economic, political, social, cultural, etc.) is more significant – their convergence and integration into a single structure is more artificial and compulsory, since it is not limited only by the active managerial influence of the state "[2].

Consequently, the EU membership of the European countries followed the historical and geographical determinism of cross-border cooperation. Moreover, the logic of forming an "organic unity of environment, society and culture" from separate regions of cross-border cooperation extends to the entire state. Therefore, the further integration into the EU of such countries as Ukraine, which with its own trans-border regions has been a participant of several Euroregions with the EU member states for quite long, is the way to go. So, the specifics of EU regionalism can be useful in understanding the advancement of European integration with a parallel regionalization towards those who are not even admitted as candidates for EU membership. Following this, both the history of the country and current events in Ukraine only prove the fact that Ukraine and Ukrainians are an organic part of the European environment and an integral element of the European culture.

The progress of integrative regionalism is being hampered or even degraded by the fragmentation trends of a global nature. Moreover, in the early 1990s, countries of the Eastern European Borderland such as Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan found themselves in a "gray zone" which became the product of the global post-bipolar competition for the "needs" of the collective West and Russia. First of all, the West in the form of the NATO and the US, although the prospects for further integration of Ukraine into the EU (especially at the stage of signing the Association Agreement in November 2013) went against the foreign policy interests of the Russian Federation. It should be noted that Russia's strategy for a united Europe (and the individual EU members) is destructively-pragmatic: if not to unbundle, but to at least weaken the unity and overall power of the EU as a regional actor. To pursue such an interest, Russia is playing on contradictions within the EU, what is gradually forming a new trend, opposing integration - fragmentation. The latter relies on different national interests of the EU mem-

ber-states, speculates on the subject of Brexit, uses the narrow preferences of national elites, European populism, anti-migration slogans, economic rationalism, flirtation with local marginals, nationalistic groupings, energo-egoism, tolerance in response to violations of international law and even military aggression. Fragmentation inevitably leads to the collapse of the mechanism of a "new" European regionalism, which gave the world a chance after the Cold War to overcome all the disadvantages of superpower supremacy. Nowadays, Europe faces the challenge of disintegration, both nationally and internationally. This means that the EU and those who share Europe's "needs" should use European regionalization as a tool for integrating, overcoming the demarcation, and preserving the ideology of peaceful coexistence in the context of European value identity, which is passing through a difficult stage of its construction.

Literature

1. Доморенок Е. Концепции «старого» регионализма в контексте Современной Европы. Белорусский журнал международного права и международных отношений. 2002. № 4. http://evolutio.info/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=527&Itemid=53

2. Зубков К. И. Структурный метод в региональных исторических исследованиях. Мульти Медиа Журнал. Проект Ахей. 2004. 30 сентября. http://mmj.ru/history_theory.html?&article=238&cHash=5d39bd48af

3. Кіш Є. Транскордонне співробітництво та регіональна політика Європейського Союзу. У На шляху до Європи. Український досвід єврорегіонів: [Проект Київського центру Ін-ту Схід-Захід.] / Є. Кіш, О. Вишняков, Л. Лендьел та інші. К.: Логос, 2000.

4. Конышев В. Н. Американский неореализм о природе войны: эволюция политической теории. СПб.: Наука, 2004.

5. Кукулка Ю. Проблемы теории международных отношений. М.: Прогресс, 1980.

6. Межевич Н. М. Основные направления региональной политики российской федерации. Ч. 1. Теория регионального развития: Учебное пособие. Современный регионализм: теоретическое содержание. http://www.dvo.sut.ru/libr/history/i299mez1/index.htm

7. Поздняков Э. А. Внешнеполитическая деятельность и межгосударственные отношения. М.: Наука, 1986.

8. Студенніков І. Транскордонне співробітництво та його місце в регіональному розвитку. У Регіональна політика в країнах Європи: Уроки для України / Київ. центр Ін-ту Схід-Захід. К.: Логос, 2000. http://crs.org.ua/ru/11/18.html

9. Bucar B. International Cooperation of European Subnational Regions. Paper prepared for the ECSA annual Conference, May 1995, Charleston, USA. http://aei.pitt.edu/6904/01/bucar_bojko.pdf

10. Deas I., Lord A. From a new regionalism to an unusual regionalism? The emergence of non-standard regional spaces and lessons for the territorial reorganisation of the state. Urban Studies. 2006. Vol. 43. № 10.

11. Easton D. A System Analysis of Political Life. New-York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

12. Gilpin R. War and Change in World Politics. Cambridge, 1983.

13. Harrison J. Re-reading the New Regionalism: A Sympathetic Critique. Space and Polity. 2006. Vol. 10. № 1.

14. Hettne B. Globalization, the New Regionalism and East Asia. In Globalism and Regionalism. Selected Papers, delivered at the United Nations University Global Seminar '96 Shonan Session, 2-6 September, 1996, Hayama, Japan. http://www.unu.edu/unupress/globalism.html

15. Holsti K. J. Change in the International System. Aldershot: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 1991.

16. Keating M. Forging a successful regional development project and inserting the region into the European and Rethinking the Region. Culture, Institutions and Economic Development in Catalonia and Galicia. Paper, presented at ECPR Workshop "Regionalism Revisited. Territorial Politics in the Age of Globalization", Mannheim, March 1999. ECPR. www.essex.ac.uk/ecpr/events/jointsessions/paperarchive/mannheim/w23/keating.pdf

17. Morgenthau H. Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace. N.Y., 1973.

18. Peeters Y. The Development of Trans-National Co-operation on the Sub-Continental Level in Europe since 1990. Regional Contact. 1996. № 11. P. 19-26.

19. Russet B. Delineating International Regions/ Quantitative International Politics: Insights and Evidence / Edited by J. David Singer, 317 – 352. New York: The Free Press, 1968.

20. The Cicero Foundation Seminar "Global NATO, The Riga Summit and European Security. Are Europeans Ready for Global Tasks?" Paris, 16-17 November 2006. http://www.cicerofoundation.org/

21. Tsardanidis Ch. The BSEC: From New Regionalism to Inter-regionalism? Agora Without Frontiers. 2005. Vol. 10 (4). P. 362-391.

22. Zdravko M. "Europe of Regions" in the Context of Micro-Macro Convergence. Regional Contact. 1995. № 10. P. 19-24.

CHAPTER 3

TYPES OF NATIONALISM AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR GEOPOLITICAL MODELS OF THE EU

Yana Volkova

Today, nationalism is widely perceived as a dangerous ideology. Many researchers attach an unduly negative slant to it and link the modern European wave of nationalism to just one phenomenon – the rise of far-right parties in Europe. However, nationalism is a very ambiguous term; it has a lot of types and manifestations. As a basic nation-building principle, nationalism is intrinsic to nearly every nation-state in the world.

The idea of nationalism began gradually spreading across Europe with the French Revolution in 1789. It culminated during the First World War, and it has expanded on a global scale in the second half of 20th century. It is not, however, a self-sufficient principle; since its foundation it has been going hand in hand with different political ideologies. As Andreas Wimmer argues, *liberal nationalism* sprang up in the 19th century; *fascist nationalism* flourished in interwar Germany and Italy; *Marxist nationalism* motivated anti-colonial movements in the "Global South" after the end of the World War II [21].

Today, left, centre, and right political parties all agree with its basic principle: to rule in the name of nation and for the nation. In 1950, the percentage of nation-states was about 35 and in 1990 it was about 70, but nowadays almost all existing countries are nation states [21]. Thus, the principle of the "nation-state" remains the basic foundational principle of political division of the world. Being a cradle of nationalism, the EU remains a union of nation-states, all of which are built on the principle of nationalism. However, nation-states of the 19th century radically differ from modern nation-states. The global development of informational technology and an unprecedented mobility of the population have been transforming the nature of states and, consequently, the nature of the EU.

Although Ukraine has been striving to become a member-state of the EU for a long time, its future in this organisation is still uncertain. In order to develop an efficient strategy toward EU membership, a radically new approach and new thinking are needed. Such an approach needs to be different from the classical modernistic vision of the EU. Therefore, it is necessary to analyse political processes within the EU through the lenses of nation-building, nationalism, and social constructivism.

Types of nationalism. Nations are best described as, using Benedict Anderson's term, socially constructed "imagined communities" [1], whereas nationalism is considered a powerful tool of the continuously ongoing nation-building process. Based on the constructivist approach, nationalism is a construction of social identity – nation, whereas the nation is understood differently by different political actors in each case. In order to illustrate these processes within the EU, we appeal to the typology of nationalism presented by Zcuzsa Csergo and James M. Goldgeier [23]. According to them, nationalism in the EU and its neighbourhood have forms such as traditional, sub-state, trans-sovereign, and protectionist.

Traditional nationalism, which was dominant in Europe throughout the 19th and 20th century, presupposes congruence between state borders and the nation. The idea of absolute congruence between political and cultural borders appears to be difficult in practice – both from the historical perspective in the multinational reality of huge empires and in modern times. In order to achieve homogeneity within the heterogeneous European population, the ruling elites appealed to various techniques to instil a feeling of common identity. As traditional nationalism seeks a homogeneous nation-state, it adopts different strategies for cultural assimilation, either of a soft variety or with more aggressive features such as forced assimilation campaigns and expulsions of the population. Today, traditional nationalism prevails mostly in newly-independent states such as Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Serbia, Slovakia, Macedonia, Ukraine, as well as in Bulgaria and Romania. Remarkably, most of these countries were recently part of previously multinational political spaces – the Ottoman Empire, Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union. It should be noted that this type of nationalism is also referred to as *"nationalizing" nationalism of newly independent states."* Rogers Brubaker argues that his type of nationalism is based on understanding the state as a state of one "core nation," defined in ethno-cultural terms, which was not in power in the previous state. Thus, this kind of nationalism can be described as "remedial" or "compensatory," and is based on contraposition to the previously dominant nation [5]. This explains the anti-Russian character of nationalism in Baltic states which were part of the USSR, Ukrainian nationalism, the anti-Turkish character of Bulgarian nationalism, etc. All these countries, to different extents, contain part of the population which state elites seek to assimilate, and which is regarded as a kin population by the neighbouring state. This type of nationalism represents a nation-building strategy where the nation is viewed in ethno-cultural terms.

Another approach toward nation is a civic form of nationalism. Contrary to the ethnic model of the nation-state, civic nationalism doesn't make an

ethnic identity a key factor in defining citizenship, i.e. membership in a political community. Those states which employ a civic model of the nation-state regard all citizens as part of the nation. In this civic form of nationalism, all citizens are considered members of the nation regardless of their language or cultural background. Such examples include Switzerland, which integrated German-, French, and Italian-speaking populations, into one national community, or the USA, which has always been known as a melting pot of different nationalities. The success of this model lies in the fact that these states have never experienced any ethnic tensions and have never experienced any ethnic movement of secession. This makes it possible for different nationalities to live peacefully with each other and act on behalf of a common nation defined in civic form.

The second type of nationalism – *protectionist nationalism* – is believed to have been stimulated by the recent immigration waves to Europe. It seeks to protect an established national culture in the face of rapid demographic, cultural, religious and racial changes in their society. A range of studies have revealed that the rapid increase in the number of immigrants was one of the factors that has led to the current rise of far-right wing political parties across Europe [8]. This tendency is typical for Western European states which are main destinations for immigrants from Africa and the Middle East – such as Austria, Belgium, France, and Germany. Whereas the governing bodies of the EU have adopted an approach of open borders for the influx of immigrants, nationalistic forces strongly opposed. The issue of immigration has been politicized and securitized using three major assumptions: 1) immigrants damage national labour market by taking jobs away from native citizens; 2) immigrants destroy the national identity of the host society as national cultures are not able to absorb such a huge amount of immigrants, which mostly represent totally different cultures and different values; 3) immigrants raise the level of crime in the host societies.

Another factor that this type of nationalism appeals to is a growing gap between political elites and ordinary people, who feel that "the world works well for a privileged few, but not for them" [20]. Thus, protectionism nationalism has flourished as a response to the social demand of ordinary people to being heard by the elites. Therefore, in order to prevent nationalism from developing into its worst manifestations, rulers should bridge the gap with the ruled. Andreas Wimmer noted: "In order to promote a better form of nationalism, leaders will have to become better nationalists, and learn to look out for the interests of all their people" [21].

Protectionist nationalism in the EU, as well as the other types of nationalism, should be analysed within the context of deepening confrontation on the

West-East line, which reached its peak after Ukraine's shift towards the West with Revolution of dignity in 2014. As the EU tried to develop a common response to this event, it faced internal opposition caused by the reluctance of some member states to impose and then prolong sanctions on the Russian Federation. Those circles of society which have suffered from the sanctions toward Russia the most, particularly business circles that export to Russia, appeal to nationalism as an ideology that will protect their interests. Applying the directives of the governing bodies of the EU is voluntary, and it is with mutual consent that member states surrender a part of their sovereignty to the supra-national body of EU. In this context, according to Carlo Basin, nationalism may be understood as "sovereign-ism," "regaining of sovereignty," or "taking back control" [2] in the state's ability to decide independently of Brussels such issues on which they may not agree: whether to allow immigrants to enter their countries or to impose sanctions. Today, 5 years since their adoption, the voices that call for lifting the sanctions sound louder, predominantly from Italy, France, Greece, Austria, Hungary and some federal states of Germany. It is remarkable, however, these countries that raise their voices against sanctions have barely been affected by them. To the contrary, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovakia and Latvia do not make any opposition to the sanctions, and they are in the top 5 countries most affected by the decrease in exports to the Russian Federation [18]. This reveals that the issue of the sanctions is nothing but a political matter. It represents the political approach of particular European elites that confrontation threatens European security and more benefits can be acquired with reconciliation with the close neighbour, cooperation or at least peaceful coexistence. Because of its sharp criticism of European political elites, representatives of the neo-liberal paradigm also refer to protectionist nationalism as *populism*. Jan-Werner Muller argues that "in reality, the leaders described as 'nationalists' are better understood as populist poseurs who have won support by drawing on the rhetoric and imagery of nationalism" [13].

Sub-state nationalism relates to the groups that assert themselves as regional actors and strive for tight transnational cooperation. It includes regions such as Bavaria, Salzburg, Catalonia and Scotland. Although Csergo and Goldgeier argue that sub-state nationalism doesn't pursue independence, recent years have seen growing secessionist aspirations among these regions, particularly in Scotland and Catalonia. Having held the referendum on independence from Great Britain in 2014 with a negative result, Scotland is planning to hold a second one by 2021 [14]. Brexit has served as a trigger for this endeavour. It is believed it may result in great economic loss for the population of Scotland. With opposition to current British policy growing

among Scottish people, the future referendum is expected to be in favour of secessionists. Unlike the Scottish population, Catalonians voted in favour of independence from Spain during the referendum in 2017: 90 per cent of voters have supported the initiative [7]. Although not as actively as the mentioned regions Bavaria also has a long history of independence movements. A recent poll shows growing support for independence among the Bavarian population [15]. Hence, in a relatively calm political environment, sub-state nationalism develops regional cooperation, whereas in times of crisis it tends to transform into the traditional form of nationalism. Such secessionist movements destabilise the EU, making it focus on internal problems rather than accepting new members.

The most uncommon and most important form of nationalism, in terms of its transformative power, is *trans-sovereign nationalism*. Trans-sovereign nationalism digresses from the principle of one nation within state borders and reproduces the nation across/without state borders. This nation-building strategy appeals to Diasporas / national minorities / emigrants / co-ethnics / kin minorities / citizens abroad that reside in different countries. Diaspora is an incredibly disputable and complicated term, which has numerous approaches and different interpretations. Differences in approaches are particularly felt among politicians and academics. Politicians usually appeal to Diasporas as a community of the population of migrant origin that have strong feelings of social cohesion, self-identification as Diaspora and maintain strong ties with the home-country. Whereas academics follow the constructivist approach, viewing Diasporas as political projects and focusing their research on how Diasporas are created and mobilized. Therefore, Diasporas should be researched as the products of trans-sovereign nationalism, the result of the state-led process of construction of a shared, collective national identity among the population abroad. The target population of this policy can be divided into two types: *accidental Diasporas*, which are usually referred to as national minorities, and the more commonly known *migrant Diasporas*. Accidental Diasporas, using the term of Rogers Brubaker, are those groups of people, which appear to hold minority status as a result of the movement of states' borders or collapse of huge empires. Modern examples of such policies include Turkish policy towards Turks and Muslims at the Balkans, who are regarded as heritage of the Ottoman Empire; Hungarian policy towards Hungarians living in neighbouring states, who were once part of Austro-Hungarian Empire; Russian policy towards compatriots abroad; Romanian policy towards Romanian historical communities (the term is used in the "National strategy for Romanians abroad 2017-2020" [19]), etc. An important factor in this type of nationalism is the economic attraction of the external home-coun-

try. Hungarians in Austria and Slovenia, for instance, are less interested in Hungary than Hungarians in Ukraine.

Whereas accidental Diasporas have long been on the political agenda, many countries have just recently started to pay attention to their migrant Diasporas. Traditionally, emigrants were perceived by the home state as betrayers that leave the motherland. Later, home states set up different strategies directed towards the encouragement of emigrants to come back to their motherland. Today, many countries have realised that emigrants staying abroad can bring many more benefits to the home country than if they come back to homeland. Contrary to being assimilated immigrants in Europe (with the help of home-states) they manage to preserve their national identity and maintain intense ties with their country of origin. Open borders and affordable transportation enable immigrants to pay frequent visits to their home-country. Developments of communication technologies enable them to maintain everyday ties with relatives and friends in the home-state via telephone and internet. What makes a particular contribution is a deliverable policy of the home state towards its emigrants and Diasporas. Not only do the Internet and mass media help immigrants maintain their native cultures, but they keep them inside the informational field of their home-country, which transmits particular political stances and political interpretations of events via local programmes / separate radio / TV channels. The benefits emigrants provide to their home-countries may include political lobby, contribution to the economy via remittances, investments, etc. Thus, the attitude of home countries towards migrants has shifted from predominantly negative to positive. Recent decades have witnessed increasing concern of European countries for their migrant Diasporas. Emigrants just recently started to be included in political programmes and legislative acts, such as national strategies towards co-nationals abroad. Turkey, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Poland are widely appealing to their emigrants working in the EU. Ukraine is no exception. President Volodymyr Zelensky's mention of the Ukrainian Diaspora in his inauguration speech was among recent manifestations of Ukraine's concern, even if only at the level of rhetorical inclusion [25].

Although all five types of nationalism are spread across the European continent, it is possible to state that traditional and trans-sovereign nationalism are more concentrated in post-communist Europe, whereas protectionist and sub-state nationalism are more commonly found in old EU-member states. The interaction between trans-sovereign nationalism and traditional nationalism is particularly antagonistic. Examples of clashes of different types of nationalism abound. It is remarkable that R. Brubaker described the nationalisms of Soviet successor states and the homeland nationalism of Russia as the

most dangerous junction. It is the clash of Ukrainian traditional ethno-cultural nationalism and Russian trans-sovereign nationalism which has major implications on the entire European security system. In his article, the researcher demonstrated this devastating symbiosis by taking Russia and Crimea as an example, and in doing so, the researcher in some sense predicted the future events of 2014 [5]. Romanian ethno-cultural nationalism clashes with Hungarian trans-sovereign nationalism in the case of the Hungarian minority in Romania. Hungarian and Romanian trans-sovereign nationalism clashes with Ukrainian ethno-cultural nationalism in the case of Hungarian and Romanian minority in Ukraine.

Geopolitical models of the EU. Together with other political processes, trans-sovereign nationalism and sub-state nationalism (those which do not claim independence but boost regional development) are challenging the classical model of the EU as a union of nation-states. Christopher S. Browning and Pertti Joeniemmi described three basic geopolitical models of the EU: Westphalia, Imperial and Neo-Medieval [4].

The classical understanding of the EU is based on Westphalia and Imperial geopolitical models. The Westphalia model ascribes to the EU characteristics of a state with statist borders, with power being concentrated at the centre – in Brussels – and spread in equal measure over all the territory of the EU. The manifestations of this model are attributes of the EU such as common border regime, currency, common foreign and security policy, and efforts of the EU to act as a unitary actor in the international arena. In line with this approach, the EU perceives its neighbourhood as a range of insecure and unstable countries that should be kept away from the EU by enhancing security of the EU from inside, restrict visa regime, and provide no chance to enter a new member-state. This makes this model barely attractive to those countries which have been striving for membership for many years, including Ukraine.

The Imperial model stipulates that the power, which is located at the centre, is spread not in equal measure but in declining degrees to the periphery. Such an imperial metaphor manifests itself in the EU's enlargement process, desire for integration of new members, and attempts to promote European culture and values to other states. Like Westphalia, this model also perceives the EU's neighbourhood as a source of insecurity, but instead of distancing itself, it suggests approaching these countries and bringing them stability and security. The EU has developed a particular mechanism for cooperation with its neighbourhood and a list of criteria for the accession of new members. Those countries which express a desire to be a member and successfully implement the reforms are rewarded with membership. After any new wave of enlargement, the EU is confronted with an integration-security dilemma: whether

to continue further accession of new members or to stop and strengthen the foundation of the EU with its already existing members. Although it falls in line with current Ukrainian political interests, this model of the EU is currently reaching a deadlock. Further integration in a centralised manner is likely to result in disintegration. Nowadays, with growing scepticism about the future membership of Turkey, Ukraine, Moldova, and other interested states, the EU is faced with an existential crisis and in need of a new paradigm.

Some scholars argue that this new understanding of the nature of states and state power in the EU bears resemblance to the territorial organisation of the medieval period, and they have introduced the term "Neo-Medievalism" [17]. These transformations involve changing the very nature of nation-states with contemporary meanings of basic concepts such as boundaries, territoriality, power, and sovereignty.

The collective identity of a nation is socially constructed by the construction of boundaries. Particularly with the postmodern turn in the late 1980s and 1990s, boundaries are viewed not only in their spatially identifiable nature as physical borders between states, but in their symbolic meaning as invisible borders in people's mind. These boundaries are discursively constructed and are to be understood not as lines but as imaginary boundaries that separate others from inners (*us* versus *they*) and are expressed in various social practices. Creation and destruction of these boundaries is the key element in all forms of nationalism. A. Paasi establishes an analytic framework of discourses that construct collective identities through the inscription of boundaries. He identifies four discourses: we / here, other / there, we / there, we / they. In traditional nationalism, nation-building is based on two major discourses: *we / here and other / there.* Whereas *we / here is* used for integration within territorial units such as the nation-state, *other / there* is based on the process of 'other-ing' that is utilized to separate one nation within one nation-state and the other within the other state. These discourses unite the population within the boundaries of a particular territory, creating a national identity and its attachment to a particular territory-centre. The discourse *we / there* is a characteristic of trans-sovereign nationalism and is intended to integrate social groups beyond borders, such as diasporas and national minorities, etc; The distinction *we / they* within a territory is utilized in protectionist nationalism in order to designate refugees and in order to designate *others* in traditional ethno-cultural nationalism within the territory of a nation-state [16].

As well as boundaries, territories should be also perceived through social practices. Trans-sovereign nationalism has stretched social relation across territorial space. Analysis of the process of territory formation, illustrated by Paasi, reveals that the construction of a population correlates with the con-

struction of a territory. Paasi has introduced four stages of the formation of territory. First, there is the acquisition of a territorial shape through the construction of boundaries. Second, there is the creation of the symbolic shape through discourses and social practices. Third, there is the institutional shape – creation of institutions such as administration, economy, and culture. Lastly, there is the acquisition of a territorial identity that helps distinguish a territory from others [16]. This principle of acquiring territories has been working for centuries: a state conquers territory, creates the discourse, institutions and, finally, identity. The era of wars with the aim to acquire territory has passed whereas globalisation has enabled the construction of social identities which reside in the other states. By engaging with its Diasporas, states construct its identity: 1) via discourse of a single nation dispersed across borders; 2) via institutions that deal with Diasporas, cultural centres, which promote its language and culture, etc. In Diaspora construction policy, these stages are used in a different order: discourse, institutions, identity, and finally territory. Having implemented these three stages of territory formation, the last stage (which was previously the first one) – the construction of physical territory – remains just a matter of political will and geopolitical considerations. That is why in the areas where a national minority compactly resides there always exists a fear of irredentism.

Construction of social boundaries and territories relies on the concept of power, particularly symbolic or discursive power (using the term of French philosopher Michel Foucault) [10]. Symbolic power, according to Pierre Bourdieu, contains the act of official denomination, i.e. the power of a state to assert what a thing or a person is. In this sense, the symbolic power can be described as "the power to make things with words" [3]. The act of official naming (person / event / social group, etc.) is an expression of a state's official point of view, and as such is considered legitimate. Such subjective perception is articulated by the representatives of a state and can vary according to political stances and national interests. In the EU, the discourse of one nation dispersed across state borders is actively articulated by Hungary, Romania, Poland, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Turkey, etc. However, this power is exerted not only at the political level, like political speeches etc., but via academia. Knowledge cannot be readily separated from power. Knowledge is always situated in specific historical-intellectual contexts and power relationships within society. Therefore, the term Diaspora is not neutral, because it is an expression of a particular subjective vision and political attitude. Besides the tool of discourse, the process of identity-construction is enacted through institution-building – the creation of a corresponding governmental apparatus that deals with the Diaspora; cultural incorporation – a form of soft power,

which stipulates different cultural activities that are organised by mentioned institutions; and juridical fixation – a policy of citizenship, i.e. granting of different forms of citizenship (classical or extraterritorial).

The flourishing type of foreign policy – whether it is called Diaspora construction policy or state-led trans-nationalism – question the traditional understanding of the state as a depository of sovereignty over a particular territory and the population that inhabits it. In society, political power used to be organized territorially within the boundaries of the state, but nowadays, it is operating outside the state, at the territories, where the target social groups reside and which is under jurisdiction of the other state. In other words, Diaspora or national minority is a projection of a home-state's power. This projection of state power, and hence sovereignty, over the territory of a foreign state meets with the other state's power and sovereignty. Such overlapping sovereignties enable researchers to talk about the process of 're-territorialization' of the European political space.

The case of dual loyalties of Diaspora populations can best be illustrated by the recent scandal with German football players of Turkish origin. In May 2018, Mesut Ozil and Cenk Tosun, who are of Turkish origin and play for the German national football team, were criticised for meeting and taking a picture with the Turkish president Recep Tayip Erdogan. It was made against a background of deteriorating German-Turkish relations and growing criticism by Western countries of Erdogan and his authoritative style of government. In fact, it is a matter of identity and political loyalty not only of Turkish immigrants but of the migrant / Diaspora population in general. This very accurately illustrates the motto of the main Turkish institution for Diaspora engagement: "We are everywhere where a Turk is" [22]. However, it is not the truth that all migrants necessarily must be disloyal to the host country. But the case is that (with an active effort of the home country) the identity of an immigrant is more likely to preserved, that paves the way to a range of his possible political decisions which would be more likely in favour of his home state.

In many cases, a state's engagement with its Diasporas / co-ethnics abroad is a rather acceptable practice, which doesn't bring controversies in bilateral relations between home and host states. Protection of the rights of national minorities is an integral element of European values, on which European states have agreed by signing The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. However, in some cases, it may cause the deterioration of bilateral relations. Hungarian policy is a good example. In 2001, Hungary adopted the Status Law, which grants certificates of Hungarian origin – Hungarian Cards – to ethnic Hungarians in neighbouring states. After

adopting the Law, Hungary was accused by its neighbours of violating their sovereignty and interfering in internal affairs. Romania and Slovakia were strongly opposed to such a policy of certification [11]. Hungarian policy towards its Diaspora has caused diplomatic tensions in Hungarian-Ukrainian relations. Due to the fact that dual citizenship is prohibited in Ukraine, Hungary was accused of granting citizenship to Ukrainian citizens of Hungarian origin. Consequently, the Hungarian consular in Ukraine was expelled in October 2018 [9].

This changing relationship of state territory, expanding membership in the nation and state power reflects the process of 're-territorialization' that is currently taking place in the EU and its neighbourhood. Thus, it is possible to think of the political space of the EU through the social practices – in functional rather than territorial terms: territories as a historical process maintained by social practices; boundaries in their symbolic meaning; power as soft, discursive, or symbolic power; identities as malleable, and sovereignty as multiple and overlapping. According to this logic, those countries that managed to control their population within and outside its borders would be able to successfully implement its geopolitical and foreign policy goals. Examples abound across the globe. The growing geopolitical and economic power of China is accompanied by the presence of Chinese people all over the world, even in the EU, despite its geographical distance. India, another rising power, has long been implementing extensive Diaspora strategy towards millions of Indians abroad. Jewish Diaspora is among classical examples and is particularly famous for its lobby influence in host countries. Economic contribution to the well-being of its home country is remarkable in the case of Armenian Diaspora.

Trans-sovereign nationalism in Europe views the EU not as union of states, but as union of nations – regions with multiple centres of power and multiple loyalties [24]. As mentioned above, such an understanding best fits in the third possible geopolitical model of the EU – Neo-Medieval Europe. This model presupposes that unlike in the Westphalia or Imperial models, governance and authority in the EU are dispersed among the regions rather than being fixed at the centre. 'Regionality,' thus, is viewed as the core constitutive organising principle of European political space [4]. This vision of 'regionality' stipulates that regions may transcend the EU's borders, making close cooperation of member and non-member states possible. The social dimension of this cooperation is of great importance. Western Ukrainian borders are already becoming less visible with growing social interaction; there is a constant in- and out-flux of Ukrainian migrants working in Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, and other countries of the EU. What will enhance this process is making it reciprocal, i.e. ensure the flux of European citizens into Ukraine.

It is remarkable that the ideas of the Medieval model of the EU have been most widespread in northern Europe. The North bears important symbolic meaning which may help to transcend East-West divides. In line with the neo-medieval paradigm for the EU, Jan Zielonka suggests the following recommendation for the EU: 1) abolishing the state monopoly on integration, allowing regions, cities, professional associations, and NGOs to act freely; 2) moving from territorial to functional integration, developing different networks in fields such as energy, trade, human rights, security; 3) replacing the hierarchical structure of the EU with one that is polycentric, initiating decentralisation and the devolution of power [24]. What is more important is that due to this model, the nature of cooperation between the EU and non-members is not subordinate, like in the Imperial model. It envisages cooperation based on an approach of equal partnership. A kind of integration such as this, which rejects hierarchical features and recognizes local/regional needs and conditions, may be more effective than classical one. As Jan Zielonka states, "effective governance would be more about bargaining and networking among multiple actors and less about implementation of commands coming from a European centre" [24]. To lead a dialog as an equal partner may be much more appealing than being a neighbour desperately knocking on the European door. As such, this model may be a more effective way of integrating Ukraine into European structures.

Conclusions and forecasts

There is no doubt that nationalism will remain as a basic uniting tool of particular political communities and the nation-state will remain a principal political division of the EU and of the world. Having described different types of modern nationalism and their implications on geopolitical models of the EU, it is possible to highlight three possible scenarios of future political development of the EU.

First, the EU will follow the Imperial model and pursue further enlargement. This would inevitably raise the question about the capacity of the organisation. It is unclear how many more countries it is capable to accept and where the final line of enlargement lies. Moreover, this will have major implications on the European security system. Countries of the regions where the interests of the EU meet with the interests of the Russian Federation, i.e. the Balkans and post-soviet countries, would continue developing traditional anti-Russian ethnic nationalism in their national strategies. Therefore, accepting new members will further deteriorate the EU's relations with the Russian Federation and deepen global East-West confrontation.

The second possible scenario, Westphalia, is raising protectionist national-

ism and scepticism within the EU towards further enlargement. Instead of accepting new members the EU, would focus on its internal issues and strengthening internal cohesion. This will enhance the organisation's capacity to act as a unitary, coherent actor in international arena. However, the Westphalia geopolitical model, with its narrow and strict understanding of borders and sovereignty, doesn't respond to the modern, fluid, globalised world.

Mainstream discussions about the future of the EU have always been between advocates of the Imperial and Westphalia models. Although they remain the core line of the debates, in our opinion, the Neo-Medieval model is not only more beneficial than these two, but even inevitable. Modern technologies – instruments of manipulation of mass consciousness – provide states with new tools for controlling their populations, for more effective nation-building strategies, and more effective foreign policy. The flow of people and information into and out of the EU will blur the line between internal and external matters and will result in a political space of the EU where multiple identities, multiple authorities, and multiple sovereignties can coexist. Control over people is equal to the control over territory, making biopolitics and the social dimension of foreign policy key elements of geopolitics. Rather than perceiving nationalism negatively, Europe should deaden the negative traits of nationalism and develop those types that best suit the global political environment – substate and transsovereign. Thereby, the EU as a union of modern nation-states gradually transforms into the union of post-modern nation states and even a union of regions. As Csergo noted, "Europe may lead the way to a postmodern world as it did to the world of the traditional nation-state earlier in history" [23].

Literature

1. Anderson B. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. 1983. 240 p.

2. Basin C. Secular divergence: Explaining nationalism in Europe. https://sep.luiss.it/sites/sep.luiss.it/files/Secular%20Divergence%202.pdf

3. Bourdieu P. Social space and symbolic power. Sociological Theory. 1989. N 7. P. 14-25.

4. Browning C. S., Pertti J. Geostrategies of the European Neighbourhood Policy. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/37143809_Geostrategies_of_the_European_Neighbourhood_Policy

5. Brubaker, R. Accidental diasporas and external 'homelands' in Central and Eastern Europe: past and present. https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/handle/document/24655

6. Calance, Madalina. The resurgence of nationalism in the European Union. https://www.academia.edu/2333957/THE_RESURGENCE_OF_NATIONALISM_IN_THE_EUROPEAN_UNION

7. Catalonia independence referendum: Final results show 90% backed secession from Spain. https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/catalonia-independence-referendum-final-results-90-spain-madrid-barcelona-catalan-latest-a7987026.html

8. Davis L. and Sumit S. D. Immigration and the rise of far-right parties in Europe. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322732593_Immigration_and_the_Rise_of_Far-right_Parties_in_Europe

9. Diplomats thrown out in Ukraine-Hungary passport row. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-45753886

10. Foucault M. The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse of language. 1969. 245 p.

11. Hungary: Status Law Causing Dispute With Neighbors. https://www.rferl.org/a/1097612.html

12. Kovacs E. Post-Socialist Diaspora Policies: Is There a Central-European Diaspora Policy Path? http://bgazrt.hu/_dbfiles/blog_files/7/0000017387/book_hjms_06_kovacs.pdf

13. Muller J. False flags. The myth of the nationalist resurgence. Foreign Affairs. 2018. N. 2. P. 35-41.

14. Nicola Sturgeon calls for new Scottish independence vote. https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2019/jul/25

15. One in three Bavarians want independence from Germany, poll shows. https://www.thelocal.de/20170717/one-in-three-bavarians-want-independence-from-germany-poll-shows-bavaria

16. Paasi A. Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness: The Changing Geographies of the Finnish-Russian Border. 1996. 376 p.

17. Popescu G. Transborder state reterritorialization in Eastern Europe: the Lower Danube Euroregion. https://fsu.digital.flvc.org/islandora/object/fsu%3A168614

18. Sanctions against Russia don't damage the EU. But Italy, Hungary, and Austria might try to get them scrapped. http://euromaidanpress.com/2018/12/11/sanctions-against-russia-dont-damage-the-eu-but-these-three-countries-want-them-scrapped/

19. *Strategia Națională pentru Românii de Pretutindeni pentru perioada 2017 – 2020.* Ministerul pentru Românii de Pretutindeni, 2017. http://www.mprp.gov.ro/web/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Strategia-Nationala-2017-2020_site.pdf Accessed 22 July 2019.

20. TEXT-Key excerpts from the leadership launch of Britain's Theresa May. https://www.reuters.com/article/britain-eu-may/text-key-excerpts-from-the-leadership-launch-of-britains-theresa-may-idUSL8N19X3G9 Accessed July 30, 2019.

21. Wimmer A. Why nationalism works. Foreign Affairs. 2018. N.2. P. 27-34.

22. Yurtdışı Türkler ve akraba topluluklar başkanlığı. https://www.ytb.gov.tr/haberler/ytb-olarak-abdye-ayri-bir-sayfa-aciyoruz

23. Zcuzsa C., Goldgeier J. M. Nationalist strategies and European integration. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/231890449_Nationalist_Strategies_and_European_Integration

24. Zielonka J. A new narrative for the EU: a neo-medieval Europe of societal networks. https://www.clingendael.org/publication/new-narrative-eu-neo-medieval-europe-societal-networks

25. Полный текст речи Зеленского после инаугурации. https://strana.ua/news/202052-polnyj-tekst-rechi-zelenskoho-vo-vremja-inauhuratsii.html

CHAPTER 4

THE EU INFLUENCE ON THE EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES' TRANSFORMATION: REALITIES AND PROSPECTS

Alina Zadorozhnia

The prolonged break in the enlargement of the European Union (EU), caused by a change in the geopolitical map of the world, ended in 2004, when the countries of the post-communist camp joined the organization. The Visegrad countries and the Balkan Slovenia, which differed greatly from other countries of the peninsula, became new EU members. In turn, the "old" Europe had to learn their mental characteristics, perception of historical reality, religious consciousness, develop a weak market economy, etc. Not having time to relax from the fifth wave of enlargement, the countries with less mature democracies – Bulgaria and Romania – joined the recruits. The European Union met its 50th anniversary in a circle of 27 Member States with borders extending to the territory of the Ukrainian state. After six years of adaptation (in 2013), the Commonwealth joined another post-Yugoslav Republic – Croatia.

The enlargement to the East began the most difficult phase of EU development. Insofar as it is the turn of the rest of the Eastern European states, which have also declared their desire to return to the bosom of Europe. Finally, long-term reform of the countries helped to gain official candidate status for Albania, the Republic of Northern Macedonia (RPM), Serbia and Montenegro. Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H) was recognized as a potential candidate. It should be noted that Kosovo has received a similar status. Although, it still hasn't applied for a membership by reason of problems with state recognition. In turn, the Ukrainian state has also managed to advance in its foreign policy intentions – to sign The Ukraine-EU Association Agreement (2014, entered into force in 2017). It made it possible to move from Ukraine-EU partnership and cooperation model to political association and economic integration one.

The relations of Eastern European countries with the European Union were most often considered in modern literature by analysts or public figures to fall into the following groups: 1) the EU member states of the Visegrad Four – Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Czech Republic and the country of rapid transformations – Slovenia (M. Bruggmann, J. Wisniewski, H.-P. Siebenhaar, E. Emilevich, T. Michel, I. Morawski, O. Sushko); 2) intermediate member states – Bulgaria and Romania (however, for many years, the frontier of socioeconomic development with their "pioneer" neighbours has been erased),

Balkan Croatia referred to the sixth wave of enlargement, or the country completing the first stage of EU enlargement to the East (E. Brok, G. Verheugen, S. Lene); 3) the rest of the Former Yugoslav Republics and Albania – official or potential candidates of the EU (M. Emerson, F. Mogherini, J. Hahn, J.- C. Juncker). Ukraine, which has a different past from other Eastern European countries, had a better chance for full-fledged European integration since its independence. However, the main obstacle became neighbouring Russia (O. Moldovan, O. Rudyk, T. Snyder). In view of the fact that it has a separate chapter, the Ukrainian factor is considered tangible during the application of the comparative approach for reflection of a more complete picture of EU enlargement to the East.

Undoubtedly, the issue of further integration of these countries is the main agenda of the Community. Adherence to European principles of life including democracy, the rule of law, equality, respect for human rights, and peace are the main goals of the New Democratic countries, arising from the crisis of the socialism. As a result of their chosen path, their domestic and foreign policies developed in a pan-European context immediately. In contempt of today's realities, the eastern neighbour – an ideological ally in the past – Russia was not going to join the global processes, and therefore it defended its old spheres of influence by any means. It's not a discovery that the latent presence of the Russian Federation in the region was turning countries, through the means of manipulation, into victims of their dirty "game." However, the EU was moving forward against today's challenges, improving the methods of the integration process.

Features of the Eastern European countries' development after EU enlargement. It was difficult to make positive predictions about the absorption efficiency of the Eastern European countries at the end of the last millennium. However, both sides were convinced that such action was necessary. As a result, this heterogeneous region (with tiny Montenegro with half a million inhabitants and one of the largest countries in Europe with nearly forty million people – Poland; with former empires and satellites still with vendettas; with high-tech and semi-agrarian countries where the Internet is a special achievement) moved closer to the achievements of the developed "Old" European countries relatively quickly, and in some cases caught up with them.

The country saw the first fruits of its labour after 15 years of hard preparation. However, it recently felt the real results. After three years of its existence in the EU, the economic indicators of the countries have almost doubled, the dynamics of foreign trade have greatly changed. Whereas the old member states couldn't enjoy such success. In 2010, the French Press Agency (AFP), referring to the research of the Vienna Institute for International Economic

Research (WIIW) scientists, proved that "most of the Central and Eastern European countries have overcome the global economic crisis. …economic growth rates in some countries in the region exceeded similar rates of the euro area countries" [12]. Researchers have awarded the title of "model country" to Poland, where even in times of crisis, economic growth reached 1,7 %. During the years of its membership, the situation has changed significantly in the labour market. A Polish scientist, writer Janusz Wiśniewski, remembered: "Many Germans then perceived Poles as poor people coming to Germany to steal their jobs and enjoy the benefits of their social system. And now I invite my German colleagues to go to Poland to see how similar these two countries have become and how the centre of Warsaw looks like the centre of Frankfurt. I know many Germans who emigrated to Poland to work there" [8].

Although the Balkan countries also expressed a desire to enter the EU at the start of independence, their successes were less visible. The reasons were self-evident: centuries of slavery and the impoverishment of peoples, which affected the mental characteristics of the population; economic underdevelopment and, importantly, geographical distance from the EU centre.

On the one hand, the achievement of the European goal by the "Eastern European octet" was entirely dependent on the success of internal transformations. On the other – on large amounts of the EU financing. German analysts Mathias Bruggmann and Hans-Peter Siebenhaar presented critical material in the daily business newspaper "Handelsblatt" about the effectiveness of such support. The article mentions that the new EU members have received more than 365 billion Euros (until 2020 inclusive) since the start of enlargement. The researchers added that it (inflation-adjusted) was far more than a payment by the Marshall Plan created by the United States to support Western Europe after World War II. One way or another, Poland was recognized as the most solid recipient of such European assistance. Living under the roof of the EU for 10 years now, it has received more than 100 billion Euros under the programs aimed at improving the standard of living and competitiveness of the Polish economy. The next seven-year budget involved almost 106 billion Euros in the country [9].

At the same time, the Minister of Entrepreneurship and Technology in Poland's government Jadwiga Emilewicz noted that the West also benefited from the transfers' billions, as 80 cents went back to Western European companies for every euro invested in Eastern Europe by EU funds. Certainly, the results from the significant contributions to various spheres of life were felt by the population after all. Their role in the EU was sometimes evidenced by banners, stickers, stations, decorated with EU star symbolism, colours and thank-you notes for a thing or service with the Union Fund money. Poland

was particularly grateful. Even in the ordinary train bright letters testify here that it was acquired with the Cohesion Fund money. In the same way, Bulgarians or Romanians expressed their appreciation. Some countries prefer bilateral relations (such as Slovenia) in implementing joint projects. Despite their pickiness, the German authors were still certain that the extension has benefited everyone without exception [18]. Former European Commissioner for Enlargement Gunter Verheugen made a similar conclusion: "It has been known in advance that there was a deficit of democratic culture in Romania and some other countries. In some way, their accession to the European Union was the right decision. It is the only chance to influence positively their development" [23].

During their membership in the EU, the countries have succeeded in reduction of unemployment, raising of GDP, improving trade policy, positively influence on the development of medicine and education, fighting against gender inequality, etc. According to Eurostat (*see table 1*), Eastern European countries (joined the EU in 2004 and 2007) approached to 18 % of the EU average of GDP per capita. Currently, these indicators have increased to 84 %. Among the most stable leaders are the Czech Republic and Slovenia. Poland's indicators are also impressive. In addition, the countries have brought down unemployment rates (Poland and Bulgaria have distinguished themselves) and improved macroeconomic indicators (Poland). Since than the real wages of newcomers have grown on average by 50 %.

Regarding labour productivity, Eastern European member-states (except for Slovenia) comprised half of the national average in the EU. Ignacy Morawski, director of the SpotData Analytical Centre in Warsaw, confirmed that the EU enlargement was mutually advantageous, as Western Europe has significantly increased the geography of the sales market. And logistics bases in the Eastern European countries and suppliers have become an integral part of the value-chains of Western European companies [18].

The Balkan neighbours were close to the achievement of the pioneers by quick steps. The results of B&H and Montenegro were particularly notable. Montenegro, Serbia and the North Macedonia (further– Macedonia) were the leaders in increasing GDP. Countries also reduced unemployment significantly. Macedonia, B&H, Albania have considerably improved export-import relations.

Close attention was paid to the humanitarian aspect (*see table 2*). We take comfort in the fact that the increase of population was positive in some countries. However, this wasn't about Croatia, B&H and Macedonia. A positive example for these states was the EU Member State – Slovenia. Especially dynamic was the situation of external migrants. The highest percentage of such

Table 1

General information & Economic indicators [27], [14]

Country	Population (000, 2018)	Surface area (km²)	GDP per capita (US$ current)		Unemployment rate (% of labour force)		International trade: exports (million current US$)		International trade: imports (million current US$)	
Year			2005	2018	2005	2018	2005	2018	2005	2018
Czechia	10 625	78 868	13 257	18 406	7.9	3.5	78 209	180 010	76 527	162 058
Hungary	9 689	93 024	11 207	12 900	7.2	4	62 272	113 382	65 920	104 284
Poland	38 105	312 679	7 980	12 332	17.8	4.2	89 378	221 308	101 539	217 279
Slovakia	5 450	49 035	9 069	16 489	16.3	16.8	32 210	84 525	34 226	82 994
Slovenia	2 081	20 273	18 206	21 517	6.5	6.7	17 896	28 773	19 626	28 192
Bulgaria	7 037	111 002	3 857	7 465	10.1	5.9	11 739	30 182	18 162	34 149
Romania	19 581	238 391	4 652	9 439	7.2	5.1	27 730	70 627	40 463	85 318
Croatia	4 165	56 594	10 374	12 159	12.6	9.2	8 773	15 732	18 560	24 513
Albania	2 934	28 748	2 615	4 054	17.5	15.1	658	2 262	2 614	5 826
B&H	3 504	51 209	2 968	4 808	29.8	26	2 388	6 367	7 054	10 444
Montenegro	629	13 812	3 697	6 958	30.3	16.4		421		2 611
Serbia	8 762	88 499	3 528	5 426	20.8	13.1		16 959		22 146
The RNM	2 085	25 713	3 038	5 163	37.2	22.8	2 041	5 670	3 228	7 719
Ukraine	44 009	603 628	1 903	2 099	7.2	9	34 228	43 428	36 129	49 439

Table 2

Social indicator [27]

Country	Population growth rate (average annual, %)		International migration rate (000, % of total population)		Refugees and others of concern to UNHCR (000)		Infant mortality rate (per 1000 live births)		Health: current expenditure (% of GDP)		Education: government expenditure (% of GDP)		International homicide rate (per 100 000 pop.)		Seats held by women in National Parliament (%)	
Year	2005	/18	2005	/18	2005	/18	2005	/18	2005	/18	2005	/18	2005	/18	2005	/18
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**
Czechia	-0.1	0.1	322.5/ 3.1	433.3/ 4.1	2.7	6	**3.9**	**2.5**	6.4	7.3	3.9	4	1.1	0.6	17	22
Hungary	-0.3	-0.3	366.8/ 3.6	503.8/ 5.2	8.9	6	7.4	4.9	8	7.2	5.3	4.6	1.6	2.1	9.1	*10.1*
Poland	-0.1	0	**722.5/** **19**	640.9/ 1.7	6.3	25.7	7.1	4.5	5.8	6.3	5.4	4.9	1.4	0.7	20.2	28
Slovakia	0	0.1	130.5/ 2.4	184.6/ 3.4	3.1	2.5	7.3	5.7	6.6	6.9	3.8	4.6	1.7	1	16.7	20
Slovenia	0.1	**0.3**	197.3/ 9.9	244.8/ 11.8	1.2	*0.9*	4	**2.5**	8	8.5	**5.6**	**5.3**	**1**	**0.5**	12.2	36.7
Bulgaria	*-0.8*	-0.6	61.1/ 0.8	153.8/ 2.2	5.2	27.7	12.7	8.3	6.9	8.2	4.1	4.1	2.6	1.1	**26.3**	23.8
Romania	-0.6	-0.6	*145.2/* *0.7*	370.8/ 1.9	2.7	3.8	16.9	8.7	*5.5*	*5*	3.5	*3.1*	2.1	1.2	11.4	20.7
Croatia	-0.2	-0.4	579.3/ 13.2	**560.5/** **13.4**	10.9	13.4	6.5	3.9	6.9	7.4	3.8	4.6	1.6	1	21.7	18.5

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Albania	-0.3	-0.1	64.7/ 2.1	52.5/ 1.8	*0.1*	7.7	*21.1*	*14.6*	6.3	6.8	*3.2*	3.5	*5*	2.7	*6.4*	27.9
B&H	0.1	*-1*	47.3/ 1.3	*37.1/ 1.1*	199.5	156.4	9.9	7.6	**9.1**	**9.4**			1.9	1.3	16.7	21.4
Monte-negro	0.1	0.1		71/ 11.3		13	11.6	4.1	7.7	6			3.6	*4.5*		23.5
Serbia	-0.6	-0.4	845.1/ 9.2	801.9/ 9.1	**486.9**	**254.3**	14.1	9.8	8.7	**9.4**		4	1.6	1.4		34.4
The RNM	**0.2**	0.1	127.7/ 6.2	131.0/ 6.3	4.4	1.2	12.9	9	8.4	6.1	3.3		2.1	1.6	19.2	**37.5**
Ukraine	*-0.8*	-0.5	5050.3/ 10.8	4964.3/ 11.2	76.9	**1845**	14.8	8.8	6.1	6.1	**6.1**	**5.9**	6.5	6.3	5.3	12.3

visitors was observed in Poland, Croatia, Slovenia, Montenegro and Serbia. It should be noted that the last two countries still hear the echo of the painful dissolution of the Yugoslav Republic. It should be mentioned that the majority of refugees were particularly evident in unstable Serbia and B&H.

It's sad to know that the level of health care was relatively low in the Balkan countries and this was reflected in infant mortality rates. Citizens of Albania, Serbia and Macedonia experienced the bitter consequences of scant government financing. Romania and Bulgaria were not too far off. In addition, the healthcare item of expenditure in Romania was even lower than in non-EU countries. It is gratifying to note that Slovenia and Poland take proper care of the level of education. Moreover, the Czech Republic and Hungary solidly paid for research expenses lately.

It seems the Albanian police were concerned with criminal cases, because Albania was on the top of the list of homicide rates. It should be emphasized, that it has significantly improved its indicators over the decade (second to Montenegro). But Slovenia proved to be a good crime fighter. In relation to gender inequality, both the candidate Macedonia and EU member Bulgaria were leading in terms of the number of women seats in parliament. Hungarian and Slovak parliaments decided the country's fate with a mostly male team.

With regard to infrastructure development, the new EU member states were able to compete against the West (*see table 3*). They have managed to build or repair 3 400 km of the railway tracks, 24 400 km of motorways, to realise 17 000 research projects, and to provide broadband Internet access to over 9 million users just on The Union Funds [18].

The comparative analysis shows that Hungary was the most active Internet user. Bulgaria and Albania were the least "advanced" users, but with such good potential. After all, over the past 13 years, the number of users has grown tenfold. Regarding the protection of the environment, far from all countries were able to significantly increase their Bioresources. If almost all of them (the leader was Slovenia, Albania reduced their forest plantations) were able to green the country lately, then not every country was able to save threatened species. Poland was recognized as the most hospitable, and Macedonia and B&H were the least.

Contrary to the good results of the states of the region, some of their citizens were wary of past mistakes, and they were "disappointed that the improving living conditions have not been achieved faster and most of the Eastern European countries have lost most of their population in Western Europe," said research of the Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies Richard Grieveson [18].

Table 3

Environment and infrastructure indicators [27]

Country	Individuals using the Internet (per 100 inhabitants)		Research & Development expenditure (% of GDP)		Threatened species (number)		Tourist/visitor arrivals at national borders (000)		Forest area (% of total land area)	
Year	2005	2018	2005	2018	2005	2018	2005	2018	2005	2018
Czechia	35.3	76.5	1.2	1.9	45	*53*	9 404	12 090	34.3	34.5
Hungary	39	79.3	0.9	1.4	51	66	9 979	15 255	22.1	*22.9*
Poland	38.8	73.3	0.6	1	46	58	**15 200**	**17 471**	30	30.8
Slovakia	**55.2**	**80.5**	0.5	1.2	48	54	1 515	2 027	40.2	40.3
Slovenia	46.8	75.5	**1.4**	**2.2**	**74**	143	1 555	3 032	**61.7**	**62**
Bulgaria	20	*59.8*	0.4	1	44	104	4 837	8 252	33.6	35.2
Romania	21.5	59.5	0.4	0.5	63	104	5 839	10 223	27.8	29.8
Croatia	33.1	72.7	0.9	0.9	57	**176**	7 743	13 809	34	34.3
Albania	*6*	66			37	130		4 070	28.6	28.2
B&H	21.3	69.3	*0*	*0.2*	40	91	217	777	42.7	42.7
Montenegro	27.1	69.9	0.9	0.4		98	272	1 662		61.5
Serbia	26.3	67.1	0.4	0.9		71	453	1 281		31.1
The RNM	26.4	72.2	0.2	0.4	*29*	110	*197*	*510*	38.3	39.6
Ukraine	*3.7*	*52.5*	1	0.6	55	102	**17 631**	13 333	*16.5*	*16.7*

56

It should be added that the so-called "The Three Seas Initiative" (Black, Baltic, Adriatic seas) group, which included the participants of the 5-th enlargement together with Austria, has undertaken to improve the infrastructure in this part of Europe. Among their tasks were the creation of the North-South Expressway – Lithuania-Greece through the Carpathian Mountains – and the liquefied natural gas infrastructure with maritime terminals in Poland and Croatia. Analysts suggest that members of the alliance can play an important role in lobbying NATO/EU issues such as security, the defence policy against the Russian Federation, and in confronting North Stream-2 [5]. The benefit of Ukraine in this group was also related to security issues.

On the whole, the study of the main components of the region showed that Eastern Europeans have significantly improved their position during the preparation for accession to or membership in the EU. However, the economic aspect demands more attention. Environmental protection, these countries have never considered under the priority. During the last European Parliament elections, the low level of the Greens' support has proved their passivity in environmental issues, compared to Western Europeans. This will be discussed below.

A European perspective for the Balkans as an impetus for internal transformation. Research on the main aspects of development required a particular attention for further EU enlargement for the account of the Balkans. At present, it was one of the key issues on the organization's agenda. It wasn't an easy task to put together all the details of European civilization in a single puzzle and not undermine the EU economy. That was the Balkans High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Federica Mogherini considered an integral part of Europe. She considers enlargement to be an irreversible process on the way to reuniting the Continent: "…we share the same history, the same geography, the same cultural heritage and the same opportunities and challenges today and in the future. We have a common interest in working more and more closely together to guarantee to our people economic and social development, and security" [25].

Let's not forget that Croatia's accession to the EU (this state suffered from the military conflicts at the beginning of its formation) has become an example of commitment to democratic values and a guarantee of the effectiveness of enlargement policy. Elmar Brok, the chairman of the Parliamentary foreign affairs committee, gave assurances this country was a part of the ongoing enlargement ("10+2+1" format), and not part of a future enlargement round, including other countries that might not be ready to join [20]. In spite of this, he doesn't remove the rest of the Balkan states and Ukraine from the records. He considered the fact that a great deal of time was lost by the last country to

be a disadvantage of the EU: "That such countries should have a European perspective is in our interests and not only in theirs… but it has to be clear to us that, if we enlarge the EU, despite making no headway in its internal development, we will end up with an inner circle, with members of the European Union being divided into first and second class" [21].

A new EU strategy for the Western Balkans was intended to adjust strategic aspirations. It aimed to find the main steps in preparation for the next stage of enlargement, while retaining influence in the Balkans and restoring confidence in European integration. First of all, it deals with the support of the countries negotiating actively for membership – Serbia and Montenegro. Cooperation was planned on the following aspects: the rule of law, security and migration, socioeconomic development, transport and energy, as well as digital technologies, reconciliation and good neighbourly relations [24]. The program included considerable financial investments, which would increase in stages as its tasks were completed. And this is in spite of the fact that the Western Balkans have received assistance of 9 billion Euros for ten years. Material support reached 1.07 billion Euros in 2018 year [24].

Officials hope the new strategy will be a peaceful response to the challenges of aggressive Russia, as well as an instrument for securing defence policy. Although Ukraine's membership was not a part of the EU's new strategy, proposals have been made to deepen its integration. It could become closer to the EU through participation in the "European Energy Union, joining the digital single market (abolishing mobile roaming, developing broadband Internet), entering into the Schengen zone..." [2].

At the same time, the European Commission didn't leave the rest of the countries of the peninsula on their own. European partners have drawn up recommendations to open the EU membership negotiation process for Albania and Macedonia. The Commission was going to consider the application for B&H membership soon. Kosovo had similar chances, however, in view of the Stabilization and Association Agreement implementation. Johannes Hahn, Commissioner for European Neighbourhood Policy and Enlargement Negotiations, stressed: "Today we confirm that the door of our Union is open for the Western Balkans, which is already an enclave surrounded by the EU, and that our offer is sincere" [25]. Jean-Claude Juncker, the President of the European Commission, expressed interest in a stable Balkans as potentially part of the EU: "Investing in the stability and prosperity of the Western Balkans means investing in the security and future of our Union… With a strong political will, real and sustained reforms, and definitive solutions to disputes with neighbours, the Western Balkans can move forward on their respective European paths. Whether this is achieved will depend on their objective merits.The European Commission will be rigorous, but it will also be fair" [25].

It is worth noting that in June 2019, thirteen EU member states prepared an informal document aimed at restoring confidence in the enlargement process involving the Western Balkans. Albania and Macedonia have finally received an official recommendation to open the negotiation process. The Czech Foreign Ministry Tomas Petricek supported them: "I will be a strong supporter of giving the green light to both countries" [26].

The analysis of Michael Emerson, the representative of the Centre for European Political Studies, is of interest. He presented in its three tiers of European integration. Thus, the author classified the potential EU member states as the Wider Europe, political values and the single market as the Core EU, states that wish to be integrated through such initiatives as the Euro and Schengen he classified as Avantgarde [17]. The Wider Europe (the Wider European Economic Area (WEEA) is the full name), the author considers as the third level of the European future, which has replaced the 15-year the European Neighbourhood Policy. Vacancies in the project were offered to both Balkan and associated members.

It is wrong to believe that Russia's aggressive policy would have an impact only on the fate of border Ukraine. Think about how in February 2017 Montenegro, which was preparing to join NATO, issued a statement condemning Russia in coup attempt during the parliamentary elections. Recently, in a report of the research centre "Foreign Policy Research Institute" (published in "Newsweek") referred to establishing a platform for a greater armed conflict in B&H seeking EU membership [10]. Or rather, to the fact that in the neighbouring Republic Srpska, there were actively stockpiled weapons, rebuilt military infrastructure and organized military training camps. As much as the Bosnian Serbs had no right to form their own army, this was done under the supervision of Russian advisers. It was claimed that the Kremlin also decided to fund Serb opponents – nationalist Bosnian groups. In addition, Macedonia has also suffered from Russia's "attention" regarding the name change on the eve of the referendum. Public officials accused the Russian billionaire, State Duma deputy Ivan Savvidi, living in Greece, and other Macedonian businessmen, of involvement in the preparation and financing of provocations in the country. The Russian allegedly transferred more than 300,000 Euros to opponents of the renaming of Macedonia. This, in turn, should prevent its entry into NATO. In the view of Maria Kucherenko, project leader of the Centre for Civil Society Studies, this behaviour of the Kremlin is the path to a corrupt system in countries, disorder and conflicts: "Russia has paramilitary groups in the Balkans, and it will unlikely back down in the near future. But I very much hope for the mind and foresight of the Balkan authorities and peoples precisely because they are perfectly aware – the European Union and NATO are the way to a normal life" [4].

Western analysts stress that border issues should be faced together. Timothy Snyder, professor of History at Yale University, specializing in the history of Central and Eastern Europe, in particular the history of Ukraine, Poland, as well as Russia's, notes with concern that "at present, any European country choosing a path toward a 'nation state' outside the EU is doomed to be within Russia's sphere of influence." He describes nation states as weak by nature, incapable of surviving without the markets and relations of colonies or integration. The scientist is convinced that the West was really successful not because of consolidated nation-states, but because of access to the colonies' resources, and the EU was an approach to live in Europe without colonies. Russia, however, never existed as a nation-state, and now aims for the imperial goals that Germany was once trying to achieve. Therefore, the entry the Visegrad Four, also the Baltic States, to the EU would be a guarantee of their security and prosperity. In the opinion of Snyder, Ukrainians living in "one of the most colonized countries in the world" clearly understand what they need the EU for, just as their western neighbours understand [16]. And if the EU "wishes to continue its existence, then it needs to be enlarged and to accept new countries including Ukraine" [3].

"Reloading" the EU political system. The change in EU priorities was evidenced by the recent elections to the European Parliament (23-26 May 2019). Polish journalist Jakub Korejba noted in his conclusions that the results of the recent elections summarize the prolonged, conceptual and technological crisis of the EU and to define new dynamics for the future: "This dynamic can be constructive and give a new meaning to this unique format of cooperation in the human history, and it can be destructive and became the beginning of the end. This would be logical, since it has become clear that the EU has exhausted itself and, in order to solve problems, is creating them" [15].

The results of the vote by the East Europeans (the highest turnout was in Romania, Poland, and Hungary) were proof of a non-indifference to their future in the EU and the desire to draw the attention of "old-timers" to their own priority tasks (*see table 4*). While the new members may vehemently disagree over Russian's aggressive actions, their views toward the three leaders of the political race were identical. Stefan Lehne, an Austrian diplomat and expert on the Balkans and Central Europe, agrees that the perception of the external situation in the countries differs contrary to the common goal: "Despite a single history as part of the Soviet empire and relatively small per capita income, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe have little in common" [23]. The author notes that, for example, Poland (in contrast to Hungary and Slovakia) more strongly condemned Russian President V. Putin's policy and considered it extremely dangerous. At the same time, Poland neglects to improve the

EU's climate policy and instead prioritizes its coal industry. Nevertheless, the Visegrad states have joined forces to resolve immigration issues related to the free movement of their working citizens. Less developed Bulgaria and Romania have focused on internal problems (fighting against corruption and crime).

It's not surprising that the general domestic atmosphere of the countries has affected the results of the European Parliament elections. Moreover, East European deputies supported each other in the electoral body: "Many Bulgarian, Czech, Slovak, Slovenian, Polish, Croatian and, of course, Hungarian MEPs are resisting attempts to show more cruelty towards Hungary for rejecting the state's legal standards adopted by the EU. The European Parliament is also monitoring the situation in Poland with criticism" [23]. This will be discussed later, but here, it's needed to study the moods during the election process.

The results show that the highest number of the EP seats went to Poland and Romania, which preferred the European People's Party (EPP). Obviously, the Poles were the most confident in the European Conservatives and Reformists Group (ECR). They received the highest number of seats (26) among the all votes of the East Europeans. At the same time, the new Allies were far less concerned with the environmental issues of the Greens. The Czech Republic was an exception. By the way, these were the political forces (EPP, ECR, Greens) that have condemned the Kremlin's actions against Ukraine and its violation of international law. The Hybrid War and being in the neighbourhood with a state engaged in armed conflict initiated by Russia were the major threats of the ruling party. And the construction of the Nord Stream-2 instead of economic interests in relations with the Russian Federation were hard theses of Leader of the European People's Party Manfred Weber. In addition, his colleagues from the EPP have seen the Balkans as the next EU members: "We cannot leave the Western Balkans to the authoritarian influence of Russia, the Gulf States, Turkey, China" [1].

In their program, the Greens make a strong statement in support of deepening cooperation with eastern neighbours too. Bas Eickhout, one of the leading candidates, considers it inappropriate to look at Ukraine's EU membership in the short term. Instead, he has found it necessary to consolidate forces against the biggest external enemy – Russia – and to focus on the implementation of existing agreements by Ukraine, primarily in the fight against corruption. Moreover, "The green energy transformation program of his party is intended not only for the EU, but for Ukraine too" [1]. The single political force that recognized the prospect of Ukraine's membership alongside the Western Balkans in the program was Renew Europe. She also supported the democratically elected government in Ukraine. But the commitment of the Poles to this

Table 4

European election results [19]

Country/ Political group	EPP	S&D	Renew Europe	Greens/ EFA	ID	ECR	GUE/NGL	NI	Total	Turnout by country (%)
Czechia	5		6	3	2	4	1		**21**	29
Hungary	13	5	2					1	**21**	43
Poland	17	8				26			**51**	46
Slovakia	4	3	2			2		2	**13**	23
Slovenia	4	2	2						**8**	29
Bulgaria	7	5	3			2			**17**	33
Romania	14	10	8						**32**	51
Croatia	4	3	1			1		2	**11**	30
EU	**182**	**154**	**108**	**74**	**73**	**62**	**41**	**57**	**751**	51

political force was zero. Identity and Democracy (ID), supported by Czech citizens, criticized sanctions against Russia. It even offered to grant 1 billion Euros of aid to Ukraine EU farmers as "hostages to sanctions." The Progressive Union of Socialists and Democrats (S&D), which was most favoured by Romanian and Polish voters, weren't criticizing Russia's actions as harshly as the EPP and the Greens. Socialists acted as if they supported the imposition of sanctions, but they were against strengthening them. Meanwhile, the leading candidate (S&D) Frans Timmermans called Putin, together with D. Trump, "the greatest threats to our security" [1].

Their consolation is that none of the new EU members (except for the Czech Republic – one mandate) supported the left-wing, who openly opposed sanctions and were "for" a dialogue with Russia. Moreover, among their slogans were "the dissolution of NATO and the creation of a new 'peace and security system' in dialogue with Russia" [1].

Explicitly, the results of the vote will have a significant impact on the realignment of forces in Europe. Some changes are noticeable at present. Contrary to the high prosecution by the EU leadership of Jaroslaw Kaczynski, the leader of the ruling Party of the RP "Right and Justice," for secretly contracting business in tandem with an Austrian businessman, of Czech Prime Minister Andrei Babis – for fraud with a Euro-subsidy, of Prime Minister of Hungary Viktor Orban – for turning Hungary into a "mafia state," where the fullness of power belonged to its surroundings (from the FIDESZ party), for the authoritarian management style and "slave" labour standards established by the new legislation and also of the Romanian socialists – for corruption schemes. At the same time, the ruling parties of Bulgaria, Croatia and Slovakia were saved from the condemnation of Eurosceptics, first and foremost, due to their desire to avoid conflict with Brussels. However, these leaders received mandates in the European Parliament.

Probably, such open neglect of European values led to the absence of a place among the EU leaders for Eastern European representatives. It is known that during the negotiation marathon in the fight for the seat of the European Commission's head, the Visegrad Four countries tried to prevent the election of Social Democrat Frans Timmermans – a supporter of the sanctioned procedure against Poland and Hungary under Article 7 of the EU Treaty, non-observance of which leads to a violation of the EU values due to the limit of freedom of speech and independence of the judiciary [7]. Finally, the Polish Donald Tusk was succeeded as the head of the European Council by Belgian Prime Minister Charles Michel.

The results show that the loss of a centrist majority in Parliament has led to the transition of power from conservative forces to liberal ones. Executive

Director of the International Renaissance Foundation Oleksandr Sushko emphasized that "the greatest risk of the new European Parliament, and of the political field of Europe on the whole in the next few years, will be not so much the strengthening of the right-wing and populists (that didn't happen) as the synchronous radicalization 'at the poles' with a parallel simultaneous of a prudent political centre that will make it difficult to reach the necessary consensus for effective implementation of policies and confidence-building. There is likely to be more situational coalitions on separate issues, more space for political manoeuvre and bargaining, less predictability" [13]. Reloading the European Parliament would undoubtedly adjust the decision-making mechanism, which in turn would influence the fate of enlargement policy.

The EU's future in the region of the former Eastern Europe. European researchers' scenarios generally balance from the status-quo to a partial or collective change of the methods, directions and priorities of cooperation within or outside the EU.

The White Paper on the European Commission "The Future of Europe. Prospects and scenarios for the EU-27 by 2025" drew attention to the EU reforming, but little was written about enlargement. Analysts have presented five scenarios for the development of the organization in the short term (carrying on; nothing but the single market; those who want more do more; doing less more efficiently; doing much more together) [28]. Oleksandr Rudik, an expert on European integration of the Dnipropetrovsk Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, argued that any of the above-mentioned scenarios that would lead the EU to success would be beneficial to Ukraine [11]. Thus, in relations with Ukraine, the development of the organization under the first scenario fundamentally changed nothing. The second scenario, which focused on the Single Internal Market, on the one hand, reduced the volume of EU legislation to which Ukraine must adapt, and on the other hand, cooperation in the fields of security and defence, would almost entirely take place on a bilateral basis. Under the third scenario, relations would be multilateral with the "vanguard." Narrowing down the areas of activity was foreseen in the fourth scenario. At the same time, the efficiency of the development of the remaining directions would be improved. The researcher is convinced that the foreign policy partner was able to respond to the challenges quickly and decisively, and this was especially important for Ukraine in times of internal reform and confrontation to the aggressor. The fifth scenario would probably require a revision of the bilateral relations format.

Antonio Estella, Jean Monnet Professor of Law and European Economic Governance at the University of Carlos III (Spain), presented at once six sce-

narios of EU, among which noticeable negative prospects were also included (termination; variable geometry; status-quo; Incremental integration with variable geometries; incremental integration without variable geometries; political union). The fate of Europeans, according to the author, depends on such basic variables as: enlargement, economic growth, immigration, exit(s). The study shows that the scientist paid the least attention to enlargement, calling the process frozen and without a major upheaval in this area for the next 10 years. This means that "diversity and heterogeneity of interests will not increase in the Union, which, at least, will not put a further brake on European integration" [22].

Alexei Moldovan, director of the Centre for Political and Economic Initiatives of EU Strategy (Ukraine), outlined the EU's future steps towards the Balkans with the following thesis: the threat of EU collapse was falling; Brexit was useful; three-speed Europe; Balkans "in", Turkey "out;" and there wasn't still place for Ukraine in the EU [6].

In view of the proposed scenarios and taking into account current developments in the Eastern European states, their future would look "in" or "out" of the EU as follows.

Scenario 1. Convergence of European civilization. The existence of the EU in such a scenario would almost be completed, because the purpose of political unification is to bring together the destroyed parts of this ancient civilization under one roof. It stipulates that the countries of the first stage of enlargement to the East have fully integrated into the structures of the Commonwealth, and that Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia, focusing on internal reforms, have improved economic performance and brought the standard of living up to the EU average. After all, they fulfilled the criteria for membership in the Schengen area. All new member-states, as well as Slovakia and Slovenia, have changed money to the single currency. Montenegro, having gained independence later than the others (in 2006), successfully prepared for membership and entered into the EU with Serbia. The latest, for its part, resolved disputes with Kosovo and rid itself of the Russian monopoly in energy. The Republic of Northern Macedonia would be in the queue for the EU membership. Changing the name, the country would have resolved disputes with Greece in this regard. Albania, with intensive reforms aimed at reducing the socioeconomic disparities, and B&H, with reviewing Dayton agreements toward reviving governance mechanisms, would be behind. On the other hand, the intensified work of European funds, aimed at the development of depressed territories, would threaten to deepen the integration processes and undermine the EU economy. Issues of security, border control, and protection from cyber-attacks would require consolidation of the efforts

of EU members. Foreign policy would be characterized by a revival of economic relations and decision-making in defence of international law. With such a vision, Ukraine was becoming an EU candidate, alone or in a triumvirate with Georgia and Moldova, that it was unlikely. In advance, its focused efforts, securing broad international support, on fighting corruption and on de-escalating the Russian-led military conflict. At the same time, of course, for the benefit of the country, would be the litigation of the Crimean issue at the final stage. However, there would be a levelling of Russian influence on decision-making by Europeans.

Scenario 2. End of "batch" extension. This scenario seems more realistic and would provide the involvement of the rest of the European countries in the EU step-by-step. Perhaps Serbia and Montenegro become the last countries to join the organization in tandem. Although this practice would accelerate the process of Europeanization, it would make it less effective. A single "takeover" would be characterized by a special approach to each of the candidate countries, located at different stages of internal transformation. This scenario contains a clearer hierarchy of countries with different degrees of integration (centre, periphery, prospective members). Neighbouring EU members would increasingly play the role of intermediaries able to vote "for" the arrival of a European future to the Balkan Peninsula. It's unknown whether the EU would stop its policy of eastward enlargement after the Balkan accession to it. One way or another, the dialogue with the new democratic states would continue. Ukraine would be one of the first to have a chance to move beyond the European Neighbourhood Policy. Another step towards the EU would be the signing of the Association Agreement. Of course, this wouldn't offer any guarantees of membership, but it would provide some preferences for "building Europe at home."

Scenario 3. "EU-28" Status-quo. Croatia would be the final country of EU enlargement to the East. The process of accession for the rest of the Balkan states to the EU would be "frozen" until improvement in its rate, reduced by anti-Russian sanctions and the support of new members. Taking into account the limited resources, there would be a reduction in the areas of cooperation. The standard of living of the new member states would increase (GDP, the lowest salary, etc.). Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia would strengthen their positions. Actions to change the single currency and its stabilization would become tangible. Border controls with new members would relax. They become an integral part of the Schengen area. At the same time, the EU's external borders would be more controlled. Much attention would be paid to immigration issues. All of them join a single database with biometric information on criminals, in particular under the counterterrorism programs. In addition,

countries would concentrate on creating a single energy and IT market. On the periphery, the EU would focus on the main actors of the Western Balkans Strategy – Serbia and Montenegro. Eastern European MEPs, interested in stable borders, would continue lobbying for the Western Balkan candidate countries. In turn, Albania, B&H and Macedonia would overcome internal crises without large-scale support from EU funds. On the one hand, farmers would have the opportunity to be on-line involved in satellite crop management systems, and on the other, to farm without strict obligations to the EU. Russia and its representatives would continue to influence the decisions of the political forces of the peninsula countries. The Balkan states, together with Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine would be a range of states that continue to aim for European goals but would still be too weak for full integration into EU structures. The membership topic for Kiev, according to researchers, would have been closed for 15-30 years. Poland will have stayed Ukraine's best friend in the EU. The war launched by Russia still would have destabilized the country and demonstrative reforms would be unable to fight corruption. In the EU border countries, pro-Russian sentiments with slogans of the territorial division of the country would still be felt. Such a scenario would be the least likely, but its implementation would depend on both the domestic situation in the country and the Russian factor.

The three scenarios presented may be conventionally defined as completed, positive, and negative. In contrast, there was theoretically the worst prospect connected with the termination of the EU's existence. However, such a prediction hasn't been confirmed due to the lack of a sufficient number of factual materials.

Finally, attention should be paid to whether new EU residents were satisfied with achieving their goal, whether they were happy citizens of sovereign states ruled by law, where human well-being was the basis of society. In the results of the World Happiness Report-2019 [29] which was proposed by scientists at Columbia University in 2012 (under the UN auspices) and more about this. The formula of happiness was obviously approximate and too complex, but the researchers had taken into account the main factors: GDP per capita, healthy life expectancy, social support, freedom to make life choices, generosity (desire or ability to spend to charity), and the perception of corruption. So, in 2018, the Czech citizens (20-th place) were the happiest in the region, Slovaks (38), Poles (40), Slovenians (44) and Romanians (48) were less satisfied. High levels of corruption and low level of charity of the Hungarians (62), Serbs (70), Montenegrins (73), Croats (75), Bosnians (78), Macedonians (84) and Bulgarians (97) occupied lower positions. Among the 156 countries of the rating, only one East European state – it was Albania (107) remained outside the top 100 most satisfied.

Note that in the 2012-2014, the decade after the first phase of enlargement to

the East, none of the researched countries were in the top 30 most happy. The leaders of the region at the time were the Czech Republic (31), Slovakia (38); below position were taken by Slovenia (55), Poland (60), Croatia (62), Montenegro (83), Romania (86), and Serbia (87). Albania (95), with immature democracy, has taken its place near Macedonia (93) and B&H (96). Low social support and purchasing power (GDP) pushed the Hungarians (104) and Bulgarians (134) back to the most disadvantaged.

Meanwhile, the Ukrainians ranked 133 in 2018, as compared with 111 in the pre-war rating. Ukraine, which wasn't a member state or a potential candidate of the EU, was in the worst position. The country suffers from destabilizing actions by Russia and the corrupt practices of "governance" and cannot count on similar support, capable of improving the economy, overcoming the difficult financial situation of the population by the case of the Eastern Europe countries.

It was true that, Russia's neo-imperial ambitions were a major obstacle to expansion. Eastern Europeans or short-sighted MEPs could "facilitate" it. We could say for sure, that till 2014, no average Ukrainian had any idea about the occupation of the Crimea or the hybrid war in the east by the Kremlin. Therefore, it was naive to believe that the Eastern European state, especially the Balkans, wouldn't appear in the same situation. Thus, there was a rather serious threat to European security.

The results showed that life in the care of the old democratic states would bring benefits to all the Eastern European countries. The goal of a new EU strategy would be a peaceful, prosperous Balkans. Therefore, in the near future we would be witnesses of the emergence of Europe with borders on both shores of the Adriatic. However, such a scenario would be possible only with sustainable development. Various factors could affect the situation, including the following: 1) a clear and timely implementation of the proposed plan by the Balkan candidate countries, the main points of which are spelled out in the new EU strategy; 2) despite the fact that Brexit was a political, but not an economic process, the future of the EU depends on the conditions of "divorce" with the UK and on whether it happens, as well as similar commitments of its other members; 3) intensifying the cooperation of the Balkan states with the neighbouring member states, which would focus on the EU tasks after accession; 4) a strict policy of the European Parliament, in particular on security, and defence of international law.

Therefore, the present task of the Eastern European countries, in particular the Balkan countries, should be a strengthening of democratic sentiment in order to implement European values, totally reject corruption and eradicate territorial conflicts. Such actions could fully consolidate European society in the face of modern challenges and in the cause of peace and prosperity in one of the world's most populous regions.

Literature

1. Вибори у ЄС: яку політику щодо України і Росії пропонують партії та кандидати. Deutsche Welle (DW). 24 травня 2019 р. https://www.google.com/amp/s/amp.dw.com/uk/

2. Лавренюк А. Розширення ЄС: спочатку «проковтнути» Балкани. Мультимедійна платформа іномовлення України «Укрінформ». 8 лютого 2018. https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.ukrinform.ua/amp/rubric-world/2399094

3. Манучарян Д. Снайдер: Почему Украине нужен Зеленский и право на русский язык (Лекция американского историка Тимоти Снайдера о феномене президента Зеленского, европейском популизме и будущем Украины «Украина и будущее Европы», Киев, 20 июня 2019 г.). ЛІГА. Бизнес. 23 июня 2019 г. https://www.google.com/amp/s/biz.liga.net/amp/pervye-litsa/all/article/

4. Марія Курченко: ЄС і НАТО - це шлях до нормального життя, Росія - це шлях до безладу і конфліктів. UA: українське радіо. 17 липня 2018 р. http://www.nrcu.gov.ua/news.html?newsID=80077

5. Міхель Т. «Ініціатива трьох морів». Проблеми, потенціал і перспективи для України. Майдан закордонних справ. 15 березня 2019 р. https://www.mfaua.org/uk/publications/initsiatyva-trokh-moriv

6. Молдован О. Куди рухається ЄС: п'ять тез про майбутнє Європи. Чому Євросоюз відновлюється після кризи і як Brexit пішов на користь. Mind. 26 березня 2017 р. https://mind.ua/publications/20170656

7. На главных должностях ЕС – ни одного представителя Восточной Европы. Eurotopics. 5 июня 2019 р. https://www.eurotopics.net/ru/222776/

8. Немецкий польский. Януш Вишневский о том как опыт Польши в ЕС может помочь украинцам. Фокус. 12 февраля 2016 р. https://focus.ua/world/330624

9. Польша за 10 лет получила от ЕС более 100 млрд евро помощи. Уніан. www.unian.net/economics/finance/amp-934342

10. Росія готує новий конфлікт у Європі. Факти. ICTV. 22 березня 2018 р. https://fakty.com.ua/ua/svit/20180322-rosiya-gotuye-novyj-konflikt-u-yevropi/

11. Рудік О. ЄС в 2025 році: сценарії майбутнього Союзу та їх значення для України. ЛИЦА. 31 травня 2017 р. http://www.litsa.com.ua/show/a/36284

12. Степовик М. Эксперты: Восточная Европа преодолела кризис. Deutsche Welle (DW). Global Media Forum. 4 березня 2010 р. https://www. www.dw.com/ru/эксперты-восточная-европа-преодолела-кризис/a-5319301

13. Сушко О. «Європейський Союз – це важливо»: про що кажуть вибори до Європарламенту? Дзеркало тижня (ZN,UA). 29 травня 2019 р. https://dt.ua/international/

14. Територія України. Інформаційно-довідковий сайт «Україна». http://proukraine.net.ua/?page_id=20

15. Чаленко А. Польский эксперт: Выборы в Европарламент показали, что ЕС нужен оздоровенческий шок. Украина. Ру. 27 мая. 2019 г. https://www.google.com/amp/s/ukraina.ru/amp/interview/20190527/1023704063.html

16. Щур М. Європейці забули, для чого їм був потрібний Євросоюз, а в Кремлі пам'ятають – Тімоті Снайдер. Радіо Свобода. 29 листопад 2018 р. https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.radiosvoboda.org/amp/29626384.html

17. Эмерсон М. Три уровня евроинтеграции: как ЕС изменит видение своего будущего. Европейская правда. 14 июня 2019 г. https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/rus/articles/2019/06/14/7097339/

18. Brüggmann M., Siebenhaar H.-P. Die EU-Osterweiterung ist ein Erfolg – trotz wachsender Zweifel. Handelsblatt. May 23, 2019. https://app.handelsblatt.com/politik/europawahl/europa

19. Constitutive session (19 July, 2019) (European election results-2019). European Parliament official web-site. https://election-results.eu/

20. Elmar Brok gives assurances that Croatia is part of current enlargement cycle, Franz Fischler calls for break in link between negotiation process with Croatia and Turkey. Europe Daily Bulletin No. 9191. Agence Europe. May 13, 2006. https://agenceurope.eu/en/bulletin/article/9191/9

21. Enlargement strategy and main challenges 2006-2007 – The institutional aspects of the European Union's capacity to integrate the new Member States (debate, 13 December, 2006). European Parliament official web-site. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20061213&secondRef=ITEM-004&language=EN&ring=A6-2006-0393

22. Estella A. EU scenarios for 2027. Elcano. Royal Institute. October 8, 2018. http://129.35.96.157:10040/wps/portal/rielcano_en/contenido?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/elcano/elcano_in/zonas_in/europe/wp19-2018-estella

23. Moritz H.-J. EU-Osterweiterung: Mogel-Fischstäbchen, Schlaglöcher und ein Rätsel in Budapest. FOCUS-Online. May 1, 2019. https://amp.focus.de/politik/ausland/europawahl/15-jahre-danach

24. Strategy for the Western Balkans (Weekly Meeting, February 6, 2018). European Commission official web-site. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/news/strategy-western-balkans-2018-feb-06_en

25. Strategy for the Western Balkans: EU sets out new flagship initiatives and support for the reform-driven region (Strasbourg, 6 February, 2018). European Commission official web-site. http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-18-561_en.htm

26. Thirteen members prod 'old EU' to respect enlargement, support Skopje, Tirana. EURACTIV Network. June 11, 2019. https://www.euractiv.com/section/politics/news/

27. UN data. A world of information. UN official web-site. http://data.un.org

28. White paper on the future of Europe. Reflections and scenarios for the EU-27 by 2025 (1 March, 2017) European Commission official web-site. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/white_paper_on_the_future_of_europe_en.pdf

29. World Happiness Report 2019. https://worldhappiness.report

CHAPTER 5

EU-RUSSIA RELATIONS:
MAIN ISSUES AND FORECASTS

Olga Brusylovska

1. The state of relations between the EU and the Russian Federation for today: a general characteristic

Since the end of the Cold War, the European Union (EU) has become the main structured pole of international relations on the European continent. The appeal of this pole was very strong that was reflected by the desire of 20 countries in Northern, Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe to join the developed countries club. The EU has responded partially to these aspirations, but not fully. Nowadays, not all Balkan countries are in the EU, some are still restricted by the framework of the Stabilization and Association Process. Also, the EU did not make any promises to countries that had left the Soviet Union (except the Baltic states) because it linked its general strategy to a "strategic partnership" with Russia (June 1999); with others, for example, with Ukraine similar intentions were signed only afterwards (December 1999).

Due to its historical experience of state building as an absolute power and desire to restore the status of a great power, Russia is actively interfering in CIS affairs and therefore restricts their independence and sovereignty. Ukraine's and Moldova's applications for association with the EU are difficult to reconcile with Russia's concept of Europe's future. The Russian Federation has always sought to achieve the structure of the continent, based on two pillars – Brussels and Moscow.

After 2013, the EU and the Russian Federation have experienced the sharpest cooling of relations since the end of the Cold War. In addition to bilateral issues, it has affected primarily the post-Soviet countries, which have become the very battlefield of the EU's and Russia's interests.

The EU's main interest is to have stable and economically prosperous neighbours on its eastern borders, with which it would maintain non-conflict relations. The benefits of the economic prosperity of its neighbours are obvious: their wealth will create markets, help to avoid the emergence of pockets of poverty, help to avoid unwanted migration to the EU, and help to avoid the spread of crime and corruption. According to T. Rostoks and D. Potjomkina, stability is a more complex factor. Firstly, it has a foreign policy element: strengthening the sovereignty and independence of the countries concerned, without unjustified interference from outside. In practice, this means Russia's influence. The EU, however, has never been interested in tension between the

CIS countries and Russia, and has always acknowledged the historical and geographical reasons for Russia's influence on its neighbours. Therefore, the EU does not consider the policy of the Russian Federation and its own in the post-Soviet space as a zero-sum game, although it is difficult to accept that for Russia. Secondly, stability has an internal political and institutional element: the consolidation of state institutions and the rule of law. This is necessary to avoid the establishment of governments that protect group interests, whether domestic (oligarchy) or foreign (Russia); to prevent the growth of criminal networks of all kinds; to create an environment conducive to foreign investment, which is so important for economic development and reforms. In view of the EU's interests, it is important to create systems of "good governance" – publicity and accountability of state institutions, and improved legal and judicial systems. That is, for the EU, a certain degree of CIS westernization, for Russia as well, is considered necessary. Thirdly, stability also has an ethno-political element: the elimination of threats of ethnic irredentism (the examples of Transnistria and Gagauzia in Moldova) [45, p. 244-245].

T. Diez believes that the notion of "normative power of Europe," which the EU obviously seeks to achieve, is not an objective category at all, but rather a "practice of discursive representation" that involves "building oneself through others." Thus, the EU as "the power of good" on the international arena can only be strengthened by such programs as the Eastern Partnership (EaP). The stalling of this policy is due to the European Commission's difference of opinion, that perceives the EaP as an opportunity to "act rather than simply provide assistance" to detach these countries from Russia, and the European Parliament and Member States that have been more cautious and in recent decades have considered Russia their strategic partner [25, p. 615]. For M. Smith, their position is clear in view of the fact that almost all tasks related to the implementation of the EU's "grand strategy" (physical security; economic prosperity; importance of the plan) cannot be accomplished without a consensus with the Russian Federation [48, p. 148].

The development of relations between Russia and the EU after the Cold War can be roughly divided into three stages. The first stage (1992-1994) was characterized by relative optimism and the establishment of cooperative structures.

The second stage (1994-2000) can be described as the "times of uncertainties," full of demoralizing failures with Russia, which led to introspection in the EU. This was reflected in the strategic decisions made by the EU in the late 1990s. The first one was an internal strategic document prepared by the Commission on Russia (1995). The second one was the Common Foreign and Security Policy (1999) [31]. They demonstrate the EU's persistence that

European values are the basis for further cooperation, including possible integration with Russia. Although relations have become more conditional, the desire for cooperation has not disappeared.

The Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA), which entered into force on 1 December 1997, established the legal basis for relations between Russia and the EU. Within the framework of the agreement, the leaders of Russia and the EU have defined four "common platforms" (economy, freedom, security, science). Cooperation instruments have been established: the EU-Russia Summit (twice a year), the Permanent Partnership Council Russia-EU (at the level of relevant ministries), regular consultations on human rights, meetings of the EU-Russia Parliamentary Cooperation Committee (several times a year), expert meetings etc.

The third period (2000-2014) can be described as a hybrid era, which began on an optimistic note but turned into an era of mutual disappointment, culminating with the conflict in Ukraine [31, p. 26]. In May 2005, the parties highlighted the importance of strategic partnership between Russia and the EU, and in 2010, the modernization partnership was launched. But at the same time in 2008, S. Medvedev [38, p. 216] argued that a "stalemate is the most appropriate definition of the present situation in the EU-Russia relations." F. Lukyanov [36] described them as "misleading relations." The strong evidence of difficulties is the fact that despite several years of negotiations, the parties are still unable to replace the PCA after its expiration in December 2007. Also, the issue of visa free travel, initiated by Russia, has not been resolved. Thus, the Putin era has demonstrated a growing chasm between Russia and the EU. There have been some reasons for that.

First of all, during the years of intense interaction between the two countries, the difference of the EU's and Russia's worldviews came to the fore. H. Haukkala described these two decades of relations between Russia and the EU as a learning process, within which both the EU and Russia learned about themselves, about each other and about their relations [30]. Even some of the hardest to reach achievements, such as Russia's accession to the WTO in August 2012 after 19 years of gruelling negotiations, was ultimately a disappointment. Secondly, the EU and Russia indeed have substantially incompatible interests. Putin's Russia does not consider things that the EU offers and requires to be necessary. Russia doubts the role of the EU as a viable model. Instead of embracing the values and models of the EU, Putin views the Western Europeans and the EU as morally degenerative organizations that, according to him, have rejected "their roots, including the Christian values laying the basis for Western civilization" [13]. Thus, before the events in Ukraine in 2014, Russia-EU relations had already become a source of mutual disappointment, heightening tension between the parties [31, p. 32].

After the Euromaidan, the US was a leading force in the imposition of sanctions against the Russian Federation, and the EU followed their lead. However, because of some concerns about the chosen policy vector, the EU has not developed an optimal response to Russia's actions. As a result, the EU has used a three-tier sanctions strategy against Russia. The first response was to ignore Russia at international meetings. Then, the sanctions were imposed on those responsible for and / or close to President Putin, minimizing damage to European economies. These had been before the shooting down MH-17 flight on 17 July 2014, what forced the EU to take a firmer stance. The EU introduced a third level of sanctions, moving from sanctioning people to the imposition of sanctions on key sectors of the economy. That restricted Russia's access to the EU capital markets, banning the purchase or sale of bonds and capital as well as services. The import and export of weapons were prohibited. Turning to previous criticism of the EU, sanctions banned exports of dual-use items as well. The constant imposition of sanctions has succeeded in disequilibrium with Moscow. For example, the Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov, during his visit to Finland in June 2014, characterised the EU's position as "dishonest and vengeful" [44]. Russia responded to targeted punitive measures. Russian sanctions included food import ban from the EU in August 2014, as well as the constant threats of more significant measures in case of the EU's increased pressure on Russia.

Another aspect of the EU's response was the decision to accept the new Ukrainian authorities and to speed up signing of the Association Agreement with Ukraine. On 21 March, just a few days after the annexation of Crimea, the political part of the Association was signed, and the economic part of the Agreement was signed four months later on 27 June. The mutual ratification of the Association by the Verkhovna Rada and by the European Parliament on 16 September 2014 [17] was a powerful symbol of the determination to bring Ukraine closer to the EU. All these actions can be regarded not only as an attempt to show support for Ukraine, but also as a signal to the Russian Federation that the EU considers its actions to be unacceptable. Thus, at the current stage, which began after 2014, we can say that EU-Russia relations are stagnating, what will prevail by the time Russian Federation will return Crimea to Ukraine, that is, indefinitely.

2. The main problems of relations between the EU and the Russian Federation at the present stage

Energy. In the economic field, the energy sector has become the most conflicting issue in EU-Russia relations. Although the EU has important industrial and economic indicators, the fact that it is a modest energy supplier makes

Brussels vulnerable to external fluctuations in oil and gas production, as well as geopolitical change. The EU depends on external sources of energy, so energy issues are an important part of the EU's security agenda. Brussels is pursuing an efficient diversification of energy sources. Today, however, the energy interdependence between the EU and its suppliers is a reality. The Russian Federation is among the most important energy partners of the organization's member states. Regarding natural gas imports to the EU countries from Russia in 2012 it reached 32 % of total EU imports [32, p. 495].

Post-Soviet Russia openly declares itself as a great power and seeks to act accordingly. Its status is perceived not as a position or condition, but as a property owned by Russia because of its huge size, resources, culture and history [46]. The considerations for Russia and its energy resources have played a particularly important role in this struggle, as since the mid-2000s Russia's international ambitions have been embodied in the paradigm of the "energy superpower" [34, p. 59]. In fact, Russia has no other area to claim its leadership. Russia has taken a defensive stance on relations with the EU, insisting on an equal partnership. According to Lavrov, this is the cause of "major accusations from those who do not like strong Russia" [3].

According to the Levada Centre polls, 78 % of Russians support the idea of Russia's restoration as a "great empire" [9] and 56% express nostalgia for the USSR because of "the lost sense of belonging to the great power" [14]. Another poll, which studies the opinion of the Russian public on the role of energy in national identity, shows that 64% of Russians agree (29 % strongly agree and 35 % tend to agree) that Russia is an energy superpower [47, p. 75].

In December 2005, at the meeting of the Security Council of the Russian Federation, Putin stated that Russia should become one of leaders and "trendsetters" in world energy. According to him, Russia's energy and natural resources are a "naturally competitive advantage, which in the 21st century will not only be a locomotive pulling Russia's economy forward but will also help Russia to improve its position on the international arena" [11]. Vladislav Surkov put it even more bluntly: "If you have strong legs, you should jump, not play chess" [16]. By the end of his second presidential term (2004-2008), Putin had regained full state control over the national energy complex and explicitly used energy resources as tool of Russia's foreign policy [20, p. 178].

The Putin regime presents the energy sector as a solid basis for mutually beneficial cooperation with the EU while deliberately consolidating Russia's energy championship. A striking illustration is Putin's speech at the Investors Forum in Germany: "For some reason, the German public does not like nuclear power ... But I do not understand what you will heat with. You do not want gas; you do not develop nuclear power. Will you use firewood? But for firewood you will have to go to Siberia as well" [12].

Russian politicians emphasize mutual vulnerability to portray Russia-EU energy dialogue as relations based on symmetric interdependence, to describe them as partnership [6] and sustainable [7].

That is why the beginning of the new EU energy policy, the provisions of the Third Energy Package, were marked by Russian politicians as unwise [4], immodest, myopic [6; 13], ineffective [8] and unfair [13].

In fact, in March 2007, the European Commission drafted a legislative provision on "the sale of gas on equal terms and without discrimination" by guaranteeing efficient distribution. This proposal became a binding directive for the EU member states in 2009 and was incorporated into national law in 2013 [34, p. 62]. Based on the logic of Russia, the EU started moving in the opposite direction from the partnership. In fact, the EU has begun to prepare several oil and gas pipelines. Since 2009, the focus has been on the Nabucco project (the Caucasus – Central Asia – Europe), and Russia has announced a competing South Stream project, which was arranged for transfer of Russian gas across the Black Sea to the EU member states (through Russian, Turkish and Bulgarian seabed to the Bulgarian mainland) to the countries of South-Eastern and Central Europe [43].

Russia's contribution to world production in 2014 was 16.7 % and 12.7 % of natural gas and oil, respectively. Although there has been a downward trend from 2013 to 2014, this should be attributed to the investment cycles inherent in the energy business. A significant amount of oil is shipped to the US, Europe, and China, while the EU exports gas mainly through transit Ukraine, Belarus, and Turkey. One of the most important aspects that deserve special attention at this stage is that gas trade between Russia and the EU is carried out through pipelines (networks) that directly connect the supplier to the consumer. This, in turn, adjusted the natural gas market to long-term contracts (NTUS) (15-20 years), accompanied by a guarantee of the return on investment needed to build the networks (take-or-pay principle) [43].

The Crimean crisis has created tension between the EU and Russia. Despite the fact that the EU badly needs energy from Russia, the annexation of the peninsula has created unexpected obstacles to the continuation of bilateral cooperation. The EU is in a state of disarray: meeting the energy needs of its internal market/consumers and fulfilling its obligations as a subject of international law-based relations have come into conflict. On 20 March 2014, the EU member states noted the need to diversify energy supplies and routes and discussed its implications for foreign policy and strategic energy choices. The strategy, published in May 2014, aims to ensure a stable and sufficient supply of energy for EU citizens and market. Following the cancellation of the EU's financial support for the implementation of the Bulgarian part of

the Russian project in early December, Russia announced the abolition of the South Stream. In response, the European Commission has begun discussing alternative proposals to succeed in securing its gas markets with foreign gas supplies. The modified version of the project proposed the extension of the pipeline to the European coast of Turkey. Later in 2014, M. Sefcovic, the new EU Energy Commissioner, visited Azerbaijan to discuss the replacement of the South Stream with an alternative project that could bring Azerbaijani gas to Europe without crossing Russian territories. Therefore, due to the annexation of Crimea, relations between Russia and the EU will be frozen for an unspecified period [2].

Democracy. In the field of politics, the core of the conflict between the EU and Russia are the values of democratic rule. The state of democracy in Russia, the rule of law, the protection of human rights and freedoms, transparent and fair elections, etc. have always been a source of misunderstanding between Russia and the EU. The cases of former Yukos chairman Mikhail Khodorkovskiy and Platon Lebedev hampered relations between Moscow and Brussels. In May 2011, Catherine Ashton, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, expressed deep concern over Moscow City Court's ruling confirming the second conviction for fraud. 24 members of the European Parliament called for economic and visa sanctions on those who were involved [1].

Another case was concerned with Sergei Magnitskiy, a partner of Moscow-based Firestone Duncan firm, who died at Moscow detention centre in 2009 as a result of being denied in proper medical care. On 23 November 2010, the European Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs approved the amendment to the draft of annual report on human rights, which called for visa and economic sanctions against 60 Russian officials involved in the Magnitskiy Case. On 17 February, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on the rule of law in Russia, in which it condemned the situation regarding the second conviction of Khodorkovskiy and Lebedev, cases of journalists - Anna Politkovskaya, Natalia Estemirova, and Anastasia Baburova, arrests of opposition leaders, persecution of civil and human rights activists, intimidation of non-governmental organizations and the media [27, p. 10].

However, the Russian political elite perceives such EU actions as political pressure and interference in Russia's internal affairs. The 2012 Decree "On measures to implement the foreign policy of the Russian Federation" clearly defined the Russian position. The document emphasized the need "to counter attempts to use the notion of human rights as a tool of political pressure and interference in the internal affairs of the state" [10].

The EU has been critical of election campaigns in Russia. For example,

on 16 February 2012, the European Parliament adopted resolution "On the upcoming presidential election in Russia", emphasizing that the elections to the Duma on 4 December 2011 "did not fully respect free and fair election standards" and noted "convergence between state and governing party including the lack of independence of the election administration, partiality of the media and state interference at different levels". The following resolution of the European Parliament (15 March 2012) criticized the presidential elections in Russia, which as it was said "not free and right". Martin Schultz was concerned about the fact that "the majority of media clearly stands for one candidate" [27, p. 10].

Also, Russia does not accept the "all-embracing" element in relations that Germany is primarily promoting. This stands for the necessary involvement in a dialogue of civil society, individuals and democratic movements on the issues of state's foreign policy. That contradicts the Kremlin's official policy. As J. Dempsey writes, the Partnership for Modernization should not only focus on technological change, but on social change as well [18, p. 291].

Clashes in the post-Soviet space. In the foreign policy domain, the earlier limited EU activities on the post-Soviet space can be explained by the following factors. Firstly, it is an extremely busy EU agenda. Secondly, the lack of a clear identity of these countries in the Western understanding of this definition, both in terms of their existence as independent states and their "Europeanness." Thirdly, the EU requires agreement on its specific project and its clear rules, commitments and restrictions, which cools the enthusiasm of the candidates. Finally, the fourth factor is that Russia restricts EU activities in the East of the continent. Disorders in Russia or Russia's hostility can have serious implications on Europe, so "getting Russia on the right track" has always been of greater priority than relations with other countries in the region. R. Dragneva and K. Wolczuk revealed a correlation between the dependence on Russia and insufficient progress in the ENP Action Plan with Ukraine: the stronger the interdependence between the EU and Russia is in a certain area, the weaker the EU's influence is there; that is, in the period after the Cold War, there was some kind of Russian "veto" [26]. On the other hand, taking into account the weight of Russia in Eurasia, the collective West found it helpful to strengthen Ukraine's sovereignty and its ability to pursue integration policy independent of the Russian Federation, possibly even including EU and NATO membership. Another matter is that US policy has always been more consistent than EU policy in this regard.

However, the enlargement of the EU in 2004-2007 brought it to the borders of the post-Soviet space. Today, the EU is actively involved in the development of its vision for the future of the region through a range of in-

struments such as the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), the Eastern Partnership (EaP), the Black Sea Synergy (BSF) and other foreign policy instruments (EU Strategy for the Danube Region; Association Agreements; Integrated Maritime Policy; TRACECA and INOGATE Programs; Energy Charter Treaty; Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area Agreements with the European Union; the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI); cross-border cooperation; the Euronest Parliamentary Assembly, European Foundation for Democracy, The European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI)). The establishment of the European External Action Service, the role of the EU Special Representatives and the various CSDP missions in the region to strengthen the EU's ability to act through the development of civilian and military capabilities in conflict prevention and crisis management confirm the EU's involvement in the region.

The EU enlargement has had a detrimental effect on Russia-EU relations. On the one hand, the accession of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe has sharpened its attitude towards Russia within the framework of the EU's Eastern policy [24]. On the other hand, countries located between the EU and Russia have become the object of contention and even competition between the two strategic partners [31, p. 30].

For example, when the EU expressed increased interest in Moldova, relations with Russia deteriorated sharply. Russia is the largest wine trading partner of Moldova (about 80 % of Moldovan products are exported to Russia) and the largest energy supplier (98%). From 2006 to 2007 these levers of pressure were repeatedly applied by Russia to wine products and sometimes to other agricultural products, claiming that they did not meet sanitary and epidemiological standards. Analysts believe that it is nothing more than a punitive and sanctioning measure to strengthen its own position, which pushed Moldova to eventually embark on the Western path of development [29, p. 770]. The same conclusion can be drawn from the speech of the Chairman of the CIS Affairs Committee of the Russian State Duma Andrei Kokoshkin who questioned the status of Moldova as a strategic partner of the Russian Federation in case of its rapprochement with the EU [33, p. 252].

The embargo has shown that Russia will impede the European integration of its neighbours, increasing the cost of implementing Western standards as part of its aggressive policy. In a situation where pressure is extremely high, the backsliding of governments in the European integration process could be expected. However, this behaviour did not force Moldova to refrain from further steps toward the EU, but instead caused Russia's economic instability and worsened its perception in the EU as an unreliable and unwanted partner.

In addition, the EU became Moldova's main trading partner in 2005, the EU-BAM was established, and the EU Delegation was opened in Chisinau.

Consequently, since Russia did not take the EU neighbourhood very seriously at first [53], after the creation of the so-called Eastern Partnership in 2009, the EU has increased rates and changed the nature of its relations with Russia. On the one hand, this process has forced Russia to weaken its grip on several key post-Soviet states, including Ukraine. On the other hand, the potential success of a systemic transformation under the EU model in Eastern Europe could lead to a situation where the Russian system may suffer an unfavourable comparison with its western neighbours and suffer potentially catastrophic consequences for the reputation and legitimacy of the Russian elite. In the light of these developments, it is not surprising that Russia has repeatedly expressed its dissatisfaction and begun to work actively to counter EU policy in the region [31, p. 31].

The establishment of the Eurasian Customs Union (EACU) between Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan in 2010, and the desire to quickly transform it into a full-fledged Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) in 2015, should be interpreted as a step intended to combat the growing presence of the EU in the Post-soviet space [41]. In political terms, EAEU seeks to build an alternative pole for bipolar force deployment in Europe. This can be seen as Russia's attempt to define its own privileged spheres of influence or interests on a solid and institutional basis [50].

At the beginning of 2013, Russia, which remained relatively calm about EU policy in the East, began to build up its political and economic power to prevent the signing of documents at the Vilnius Summit [52]. The first goal was Armenia, which was quickly dissuaded from joining the Association. Moldova was sent a clear signal early in the fall when Moscow declared an embargo on imports of Moldovan wine, regarding health concerns. Also, Moscow sent Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin to Chisinau. He informed the Moldovans that he sincerely hoped that they would not freeze in the winter. But Russia's real goal was Ukraine. By the end of the summer, Russia began to apply economic sanctions, pointing to the negative economic implications that the "European choice" would cause. The ban on Ukrainian chocolate was introduced; there were various violations of customs operations at the border. In addition to use of the stick, Russia tried to influence Ukraine with the carrot as well: in exchange for the delay of the AA signing for an undefined period, Moscow offered substantial discounts on natural gas, as well as preferential loans and other trade concessions totalling $ 17 billion [52]. To the EU's surprise, Moscow's proposals were accepted by Yanukovych on the eve of the Vilnius summit. The EU was forced to settle for

Georgia and Moldova. But in February 2014, the escalation of the conflict between Ukraine and Russia, as well as Russia-EU relations plunged into a deep crisis without any positive end in sight [31, p. 33].

The reintegration of former Soviet countries under the Russian scenario is one of Russia's top foreign policy priorities. Moscow considers this region a zone of its "privileged interests." The main documents, which are the Concept of Russian Foreign Policy and Russia's National Security Strategy for 2020, define the expansion of cooperation within the CIS as one of the main priorities of Russia's foreign policy [28; 15]. The same has been stated more than once in the annual Presidential Address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation [19]. For Russia, the Customs Union is the core of economic integration, and the CSTO is a mechanism for responding to military threats.

In the implementation of the EU enlargement plan, the EU goes further into the post-Soviet region of Eastern Europe and the Caucasus, which Russia considers to be the sphere of its privileged interests. This is the main problem of relations within the EU – EaP countries – Russia format [45]. The central element of this tripartite format is in the relations between its key players, the EU and Russia. One of the main issues of their relations is the lack of a precise formula for cooperation on the post-Soviet territory, which would be based on a common development model for former Soviet countries.

The brutality of Russia's response to the disaster of the Yanukovych regime in Ukraine is clear, given the key role that Ukraine plays in Russia's plans to build reliable poles in the EU and in Eurasia: without Ukraine this dream will be impossible. However, despite the clarity of Russia's strategic goals, it is unclear whether Russia has the economic and political means to achieve what it intends to.

3. Scenarios for the development of EU relations with the Russian Federation

The framework of a new stage in EU-Russia relations has just begun to emerge, but instead of conclusions, some observations will be given to demonstrate what this stage could be.

To describe the scenarios for the development of relations between the EU and Russia, it is suggested to use the scheme proposed by Ch. Bretherton and J. Vogler. Their analysis is based on the notions of presence (neighbourhood); opportunity, which denotes factors in the external environment / context constraining or enabling actor's actions (in our case the EU); capability of the EU to respond to challenges that are affected by internal factors, and the suitable foreign policy tools [22, p. 377]. This scheme greatly facilitates the overall assessment of the efficiency of the country's foreign policy.

Presence: according to the authors "with 15 missions on three continents, the EU generally proved its ability to defend itself better than the sum of its parts," and third-party perception of its involvement and effectiveness, which is an important aspect of its presence, has grown [22, p. 378].

Opportunity: in the author's view, the EU's empowerment was first demonstrated by entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol in 2005 and the EU ranked first in GDP ($14.82 billion in 2010). At the same time, the reduction in opportunities is illustrated by Russia's role in the Caucasus and Central Asia, where it "effectively prevents the EU," and even with impunity intervened in Georgia, a member of the EU Partnership, in the summer of 2008 and recognized, despite strong opposition from the EU, separatist regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia [22, p. 381].

Capability: the central component of the actor should be seen as: firstly, an ability to formulate priorities and develop policy; secondly, the availability and ability to use policy tools [22, p. 385]. The tools of foreign policy are political (diplomacy / negotiations), economic (incentives / sanctions), and military. The Union has access, albeit to varying degrees, to all three types of instruments. Also, it has developed the potential for deploying police forces and courts beyond the EU [22, p. 387]. According to theorists, the unique character of the EU poses particular difficulties in formulating policies, which we call coherence problems: the Eastern enlargement has greatly increased these issues and reduced the efficiency of existing EU's tools.

Based on the above, we could consider three hypothetical scenarios for future relations between Russia and the European Union.

Scenario 1: Return to the strategic partnership.

Presence (neighbourhood). EU relations with the Russian Federation have had a strong economic component especially since 2001, when the concept of the Common European Economic Area was adopted. Brussels does not abandon energy dialogue to ensure access to reliable energy sources in the long run and to obtain satisfactory investment conditions for Western capital in the Russian gas and oil market. Russia, in turn, seeks to secure a market for itself, attract the investment needed to modernize its energy sector, which remains obsolete and unable to produce highly transformed and exportable products. The capital investment needs of Russia's energy sector by 2020 are estimated at $ 460-600 billion, an amount that goes far beyond Russia's own resources. That requires painful reforms, including the adoption of Russian guarantees for foreign investors, including the ratification of the European Energy Charter and the restructuring of Gazprom's monopoly. EU governments, as well as gas companies including Gaz de France, Ruhrgas (Germany), and Snam (Italy) (the first two are also Gazprom's partners in the acquisition of controlling

stake in the Slovak gas network) have shown interest in the new Yamal – the Western European gas pipeline running through Belarus instead of Ukraine. Belarus has geographical advantages, offering shorter transit and lower fees. Thus, the status of Belarus in the East-West dialogue can be strengthened. And it is obvious that there are many forces on both sides lobbying for lifting sanctions and returning to "regular business".

Opportunity (external context). Russia will face a choice between two foreign policy strategies in coming years: influence through attraction (soft power strategy) and coercion (hard power strategy). Although events in Ukraine demonstrate that Russia does not avoid the use of hard power, it remains to be seen whether this tendency will continue, because the use of hard power will bring more problems than gains in the future. It is more profitable for Russia to become a natural attraction for the countries of the "near abroad". In order to be attractive, Russia should actually allow them to leave. It is a long-term strategy that requires a lot of skills and efforts from the political elites. This position will eliminate all the conflicts with the EU and other Western democracies. However, is the Kremlin ready for that nowadays? On the other hand, emerging civil society provides for the democratic alternative in Russia, which in the future will give new opportunities to renew the EU's strategic partnership with Russia.

Capability (internal context). The EU faces a difficult choice: should it become more active in the East? Should it take active steps to neutralize Russia? The EU has many soft power tools that should be utilized: the perspective of visa liberalization; securing unilateral concessions in trade; dialogue with civil society. It is clear to everyone that the EU's development model is better than Russia's. However, the EU must act with caution. Will it (and its 28 member states) be able to maintain stability in the East? It would be better initially to create an alliance with a strong political identity in order to have more coherent and stable policy than one which remains an amorphous grouping of cooperating states on a more or less voluntary basis. The EU needs to define more clearly the notions of "values" and "tools," to overcome the contradictions, and only after that could the implementation of regional politics be improved. Institutional restructuring within the EU under the Lisbon Treaty should be completed, leaving the decision-making process unambiguous and clear.

Scenario 2: The victory of pragmatism.

Presence (neighbourhood). "The policy of the Russian Federation and China turned them into "normative black holes" in the EU's perception [54, p. 256]. Relations with Russia and China are a real test of the European character. These countries today are the most frequent violators of human rights

and international law which are the most important values to the Union. At the same time, the EU lacks levers of influence on the regime in Russia, and their number is constantly decreasing, that pushes the EU to give serious consideration to the ways of breaking the deadlock. There is a need to engage to have an impact.

Opportunity (external context). Two major factors – the Schengen border and the interest of new members in promotion of the EU Eastern Partnership policy – determine the further activities of the EU in the area of common interest with Russia. The EU cannot leave this area because it is directly linked to border security and the socio-economic impact of the NEE countries on border settlements is very strong. For example, in the Eastern voivodeships of Poland, 30 – 40% of small and medium-sized enterprises operate solely due to trade with Ukraine, and lots of socially significant areas will not be secured without workers from the East.

Capability (internal context). At present, Europe is not going to use force in its relations with Russia. Thus, as S. Mäkinen points out: "There is no doubt that the EU considers itself capable of waging war, but not against Russia or China" [37, p. 87]. The EU should find *modus vivendi* (conditions for coexistence) between promoting its norms, values and geostrategic imperative. According to J. Greve, "strategic vision and policy flexibility must go hand in hand" [54, p. 248]. The pragmatism of the EU member states under the pressure of internal imperatives is still a decisive factor of EU foreign policy. However, "the events of recent years have made it possible to conclude that in the future the EU countries will change their energy consumption and sources to reduce dependence on Russia; will insist on reciprocity in trade and investment; will be able to use the boycott as a tool to influence the policy of the Russian Federation, and will refuse to supply technologies and expertise in which Russia is vitally interested" [54, p. 248].

The EU will inevitably work on the efficiency of its CFSP and CSDP, as they play a role in the ensuring of "stability, security and prosperity" across the European continent regardless of integration or fragmentation processes. The EU will inevitably revise its outdated European Security Strategy (ESS), which was adopted in December 2003, and will overcome differences between the main EU member states in defence and strategy.

The EU and NATO, as well as national governments, recognize the importance of further work on improving coordination of efforts to analyse and respond to emerging threats, including hybrid and digital ones (cyberspace), and including sanctions against those who threaten European democracies. It is quite realistic to achieve greater information transparency in technology sectors and social media to increase resistance to hostile invasion. The Euro-

pean Code of Practice against disinformation is an ambitious initial measure that will be improved by encouraging the exchange of information and providing informative progress reports against disinformation. In regions vulnerable to Russian disinformation, such as the Western Balkans, local media often access Russian news content, spreading stories that are damaging to Europe. European philanthropists and governments have intensified work with local and independent media to build their resistance to Russian information sources.

The work on addressing the financial sector vulnerability, which is used by authoritarian entities to incite local organizations, launder corruption proceeds and interfere with the European affairs, is urgent and has already begun. The creation of the Central European anti-money laundering body and the full implementation of existing pan-European anti-money laundering legislation will provide for more effective oversight and enforcement of the European financial sector. In addition, existing supervisory bodies should impose stricter penalties on European entities that contribute financially to the armed activities of authoritarian regimes. The new EU-wide Foreign Investment Screening Mechanism is the first step in addressing the vulnerability of the Union, but it will be strengthened by additional measures enforcing the European Commission's regulations on information gathering. Also, member states will be obliged to adopt screening mechanisms that meet the EU requirements and improve their own collection of foreign investment information [21, p. 6-8].

In the future, it is possible for Germany to become more active as a generator of new Eastern policy that will focus on direct dialogue with civil society in Russia. The framework of the old Eastern policy indicates the change in relations between Russia and Germany, as well as Russia and Europe. According to J. Mischke and A. Umland, "If the West's confrontation with Russia deepens, Germany will have to abandon its traditional understanding of Eastern policy with a focus on conflict prevention by means of constant communication. Germany can get rid of the fear of conflict with Russia, suppress doubt about "the modern Western capitalist society" and put an end to divergence from position of the United States on how to deal with Russia" [39].

Scenario 3: "Europe Island".

Capability (internal context). Continuing confrontation objectively reinforces all the negative trends in the development of the EU and Russia. Since the mid-2000s, there has been a decline in the efficiency of the EU as a participant in international relations; in 2007-2008, its role in the international arena began to decline. "The EU is not a diplomatic superpower; it is militarily irrelevant; and it is deeply divided on many of the key issues that will determine the strategic landscape for the next decades: defence (including

nuclear deterrence), Russia, China, migration, EU enlargement, the Balkans, and Turkey" [49]. D. Triantaphyllou added to this discussion that above all "The EU seems to lack a strategy – a strategic vision, even though it possesses more instruments, initiatives and policies than ever before" [51].

The alternative proposed by the Russian Federation is not attractive. F. Lukyanov's states that we are facing a period when the desire to reduce costs and risks will dominate: "The EU is moving to a secure position. It is not isolationism, but pragmatism, which means a revision of the ideological base and a sharp decrease in the desire to project power, including soft one. Several recent and unconnected events presage a new phase of development for Europe. What that phase will look like, no one can predict, but it's clear that the era is over of building an all-Europe house using blueprints devised immediately following the Cold War. The migration crisis with the optimistic words of Angela Merkel "we will cope" has set in motion nationalist segments of the European societies, that has revealed itself at present after the peak has long been in recession. It was not possible to cope the way it was planned. The EU expects a full-fledged transformation, and not necessarily a systematic one; a lot will change spontaneously and on its own. The deconstruction of the "European home" means a different situation in Europe, much more chaotic" [5]. The European Union is about to delve into solving its internal problems for years.

Opportunity (external context). According to Lukyanov energy, desire, and resources for dealing with its external configuration will be significantly diminished. "The main task now is to the minimize risks and expenses coming from the neighbourhood – from the South as well as from the East where the EU is not an actor. That is the source of the listed changes. Ukraine will be encouraged, as far as possible, to establish a less confrontational status quo with Russia. The EU has already drawn economic dividends from the association with Kyiv and political ambitions are almost gone ... It seems that Romania is finally assigned to deal with neighbour, that is important to them, not to other ... Georgia is something geographically remote, not a priority ... Under the logic of the greater Europe idea, the "EU neighbourhood" countries were a significant part of the project considered important for the unswerving expansion of the Eurosphere. This resulted in a drawn-out battle with Russia, which was constantly reacting – increasingly sharply – to what it perceived as being driven further and further back into the depths of Eurasia. Now the motivation has changed. The EU is taking up a defensive position, using the language of its transatlantic ally: "EU first!" [5]. However, in our opinion, such a scenario is likely to lead to further destabilization of Ukraine by direct or indirect intervention of the Russian Federation; then Moldova,

which depends on the stability of the neighbour (economic cooperation, border management, energy security, conflict resolution, etc.) [23, p. 58], and subsequently the whole region.

Presence (neighbourhood). The EU's self-restraint, its transformation into "Europe island" – closed to the problems and calls of the outside world – will inevitably lead to a narrowing of the policy space available to the Union. The EU will remain an important global actor, but its ability to influence other nations, which was at the top during the Post-Cold War era and has declined since the mid-2000s and will continue to decline by the time of loss of important defence instruments of the "EU first!" itself.

Literature

1. Європейський суд з прав людини не знайшов політичної складової в справі Ходорковського. Finance.ua. 31.05.2011. https://news.finance.ua/ua/news/-/240302/

2. Інтерв'ю з Пламеном Дімітровим (Одеса, 20 травня 2019 р.).

3. Лавров С. Сдерживание России: назад в будущее? 18 ноября 2007 г.

4. Лавров С. Выступление в ходе встречи с представителями Ассоциации европейского бизнеса в РФ, 8.10.2012.

5. Лукьянов Ф. Европа без дома. Какой будет новая эпоха в отношениях ЕС и России. https://carnegie.ru/commentary/79443

6. Новак А. «Развитие мировой энергетики и политика», 10 пленарная сессия 21 Всемирного нефтяного конгресса, Москва, 19.06.2014.

7. Новак А. Энергетика Евразии: путь в будущее, 13.04.2015.

8. Новак А. Интервью немецкой газете Handlsblatt, 2.07.2015.

9. Особый путь и Российская империя. Левада Центр. Levada.ru, 9 февраля 2011 г. http://www.levada.ru/old/09-022011/

10. Подписан Указ «О мерах по реализации внешнеполитического курса Российской Федерации». Президент России. 7 мая 2012 г. http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/15256

11. Путин В. Совместная пресс-конференция по итогам переговоров с премьер-министром Бельгии Ги Верхофстадтом, 3.10.2005.

12. Путин В. Стенографический отчет о встрече с представителями деловых кругов Баварии, 11.10.2006.

13. Путин В. Пресс-конференция по итогам рабочего заседания глав государств и правительств стран-участниц Форума стран-экспортеров газа, 1.07.2013.

14. Распад СССР в российском общественном мнении. Левада Центр. Levada.ru, 1.12.2014. http://www.levada.ru/old/01-12-2014/

15. Стратегия национальной безопасности Российской Федерации до 2020 года. Президент России. 13.05.2009. http://kremlin.ru/supplement/24

16. Сурков В. Суверенитет – это политический синоним конкурентоспособности. Политнаука, 7.02.2006. http://www.politnauka.org/library/public/surkov.php.

17. Угода про асоціацію. Урядовий портал. https://www.kmu.gov.ua/ua/diyalnist/yevropejska-integraciya/

18. Acikmese S. A., Triantaphyllou D. The Black Sea Region: The Neighbourhood too Close to, yet still Far from the European Union. Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies. 2014. N 16:3. P. 279-285. DOI: 10.1080/19448953.2014.928533

19. Ambrosio Th., Vandrovec G. Mapping the Geopolitics of the Russian Federation: The Federal Assembly Addresses of Putin and Medvedev. Geopolitics. 2013. N 18:2. P. 435-466. DOI: 10.1080/14650045.2012.717554

20. Baev P. K. From European to Eurasian energy security: Russia needs and energy Perestroika. Journal of Eurasian Studies. 2012. N 3. P. 177–184.

21. Berzina K., Kovalcikova N., Salvo D., Soula E. European Policy Bluprint for Countering Authoritarian Interference in Democracies. 2019. N 18. 68 p.

22. Bretherton Ch., Vogler J. A global actor past its peak? International Relations. 2013. N 27(3). P. 375-390. DOI: 10.1177/0047117813497299

23. Cenusa D. Post-Vilnius Moldova: Between Reform Shortcomings and Geopolitical Dilemmas. In Eastern Partnership: On the Way to the Riga Summit. Latvian Interests in the European Union. 2015. № 1. P. 47–62.

24. David M., Gower J., Haukkala H. National Perspectives on Russia: European Foreign Policy in the Making? London: Routledge, 2013.

25. Diez T. Constructing the Self and Changing Others: Reconsidering Normative Power Europe. Millenium. 2005. N 33 (3). P. 613-636.

26. Dragneva R., Wolczuk K. Eurasian Economic Integration: Law, Policy and Politics. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2013.

27. EU – Ukraine – Russia Relations: Problems and Prospects. Razumkov Centre. National Security & Defence. 2012. N 4-5. 54 p.

28. Foreign policy concept of the Russian Federation (approved by president of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin on November 30, 2016). http://www.mid.ru/en/foreign_policy/official_documents/

29. Hagemann Ch. External Governance on the Terms of the Partner? The EU, Russia and the Republic of Moldova in the European Neighbourhood Policy. Journal of European Integration. 2013. N 35:7. P. 767-783. DOI: 10.1080/07036337.2012.732073

30. Haukkala H. The Impact of the Eurasian Customs Union on EU–Russia Relations. In Eurasian Economic Integration: Law, Policy and Politics, ed. by R. Dragneva and K. Wolczuk, 163–178. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2013.

31. Haukkala H. From Cooperative to Contested Europe? The Conflict in Ukraine as a Culmination of a Long-Term Crisis in EU–Russia Relations. Journal of Contemporary European Studies. 2015. N 23:1. P. 25-40. DOI: 10.1080/14782804.2014.1001822

32. Johnson C., Derrick M. A Splintered Heartland: Russia, Europe, and the Geopolitics of Networked Energy Infrastructure. Geopolitics. 2012. N 17:3. P. 482-501. DOI: 10.1080/14650045.2011.595439

33. Korosteleva E. A. Change or Continuity: Is the Eastern Partnership an Adequate Tool for the European Neighbourhood? International Relations. 2011. N 25 (2). P. 243-262. DOI: 10.1177/0047117811404446

34. Kuzemko C. Ideas, Power and Change: Explaining EU–Russia Energy Relations. Journal of European Public Policy. 2014. N 21:1. P. 58-75. DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2013.835062

35. Lavrov S. State of the union Russia–EU: Prospects for partnership in the changing world. JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies. 2013. N 51(S1). P. 6-12.

36. Lukyanov F. Russia–EU: The Partnership That Went Astray. Europe–Asia Studies. 2008. N 60 (6). P. 1107–1119.

37. Mäkinen S. Geopolitics Teaching and Worldviews: Making the Future Generation in Russia. Geopolitics. 2014. N 19:1. P. 86-108. DOI: 10.1080/14650045.2013.847430

38. Medvedev S. The Stalemate in EU–Russia Relations: Between 'Sovereignty' and

'Europeanisation'. In Russia's European Choice, ed. by T. Hopf, 215–232. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

39. Mischke J., Umland A. Germany's New Ostpolitik: An Old Foreign Policy Doctrine Gets A Makeover. Foreign Affairs. April 9, 2014. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/western-europe/2014-04-09/

40. Smith M. E. A Liberal Grand Strategy in a Realist World? Power, Purpose and the EU's Changing Global Role. Journal of European Public Policy. 2011. N 18:2. P. 144-163. DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2011.544487

41. Popescu N. Eurasian Union: The Real, the Imaginary and the Likely. Chaillot Paper. 2014. N 132. Paris: The EU Institute for Security Studies. http://www.iss.europa.eu/publications/detail/article/

42. Putin V. Vladimir Putin Meets with Members the Valdai International Discussion Club. Transcript of the Speech and Beginning of the Meeting, September 20, 2013. http://valdaiclub.com/politics/62880.html

43. Raptopoulos N., Sotiriou St. Between Cooperation & Competition in Energy Issues with the Major Client/Partner: A Comparative Study of Russian and Turkish Foreign Policies towards EU in the PostCrimean Crisis Era. Giardini Naxos, 23-26 September 2015.

44. Rossi J. Russia Foreign Minister: Russia Doing Everything It Can to Resolve Ukraine Crisis. The Wall Street Journal. 2014. June 9. http://online.wsj.com/articles/

45. Rostoks T., Potjomkina D. Soft Power of the EU and Russia in Eastern Europe: Soft Power vs (not so) Soft Manipulation? In The Different Faces of "Soft Power": The Baltic States and Eastern Neighborhood between Russia and the EU, ed. by T. Rostoks, A. Spruds. Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 2015. P. 243 -255.

46. Russia Before and After Crimea: Nationalism and Identity, 2010–17, ed. by Kolstø P., H. Blakkisrud. Edinburgh University Press, 2018. 232 p.

47. Rutland P. Petronation? Oil, gas, and national identity in Russia. Post-Soviet Affairs. 2015. N 31(1). P. 66-89.

48. Smith M. E. A liberal grand strategy in a realist world? Power, purpose and the EU's changing global role. Journal of European Public Policy. 2011. N 18:2. P. 144-163. DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2011.544487

49. Techau J. EU Foreign Policy? Let's Talk European Interest! June 24, 2019. http://brussels.gmfus.org/blog/2019/06/24/

50. Trenin D. Russia's Spheres of Interest, Not Influence. The Washington Quarterly. 2009. N 32(4). P. 3–22.

51. Triantaphyllou D. The European Union and the Black Sea Region in Search of a Narrative or a New Paradigm. Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies. 2014. N 16:3. P. 286-299. DOI: 10.1080/19448953.2014.928534

52. Wierzbowska-Miazga A., Sarna A. The Moscow Deals: Russia Offers Yanukovych Conditional Support. OSW Analyses. 2013. December 18. http://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/analyses/201312-18/

53. Wiegand G., Schulz E. The EU and Its Eastern Partnership: Political Association and Economic Integration in a Rough Neighbourhood. In Trade Policy between Law, Diplomacy and Scholarship, ed. by Ch. Herrmann, B. Simma, R. Streinz, 321–358. EYIEL Special Issue. Springer, 2015.

54. Wood S. Pragmatic power EUrope? Cooperation and Conflict. 2011. N 46(2). P. 242 –261. DOI: 10.1177/0010836711406420

CHAPTER 6

EU-MERCOSUR RELATIONS: INTERCONTINENTAL DIALOGUE

Kateryna Vakarchuk

1. Current state of EU-MERCOSUR relations: general characteristics

On 28 June 2019, the long-running negotiations for the creation of one of the largest free trade areas in the world between the European Union (EU) and the South American Common Market (MERCOSUR) were concluded. The name of the organization comes from Spanish Mercado Común del Sur, meaning "The Southern Common Market".

Even before the establishment of MERCOSUR in 1991, relations between the two continents had been preceded by the introduction into the region of European values and views. The successful post-war reconstruction of European countries served as good example for some Latin American countries (LAC) to follow. The creation of the EU pushed for integrative processes in LAC, leading to the establishment of various organizations, which over time changed the names, members, even ideological directions. Only in the 1990s was the structured institutional grouping of MERCOSUR formed, with which the EU (along with other LAC countries and dozens of regional organizations) has continued to build strategic relations.

At the G20 Osaka summit, agreements were reached between the EU and four South American countries that are members of MERCOSUR (Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and Paraguay). Following the ratification of the agreement, the path will be opened for exports from MERCOSUR member states to the EU market, and vice versa.

Jean-Claude Juncker, the European Commission President, called the event a "historic moment" and C. Malmström, the European Commissioner for Trade, said that the agreement establishes a free trade area covering 760 million people, brings two continents closer, and leads to openness and cooperation due to the long-standing historical links between them [11].

It is worth noting that in modern Latin American countries (LAC), there is a common historical past, because the socio-cultural and religious systems were formed under the European influence, although they were attuned to the natural and geographical conditions of the Latin American countries. Integrative factors such as religion, faith, and culture cannot be ignored, as the forced Christianization of the indigenous population during the period of colonial rule completely destroyed the collective consciousness of the local population. Thus, long-standing colonial dependence led to dependence on

the European economy and a desire for integration with European countries in the future. The processes of land consolidation in South America had been declared in times of S. Bolivar's national liberation revolution but were not implemented. Therefore, when this issue was raised in the middle of last century, it was limited to the establishment of economic and customs unions. The establishment of the EU pushed Latin American leaders to accomplish something similar.

Prerequisites for strategic relations at EU-MERCOSUR level. The relations between the leading European and Latin American countries became political and diplomatic in the 1970s; before that, links between them had been sporadic and random. The political tour of French President Charles de Gaulle, who in 1964 visited more than 10 countries in the region, can be considered the breakthrough that established dialogue between the European Economic Union (EEC) and LAC. Positive economic and social indicators of rebuilding post-war Europe became an example of overcoming economic problems, including poverty and underdevelopment in the majority of the regional countries [7, p. 21]. Support for regular contacts between the continents was initiated, and institutions with headquarters in Latin America and in Europe were established. They facilitated the promotion and provision of information on the potential of the two continents.

During the same period, the legal basis of the EEC's relations with Latin American countries was laid, a system of generalized preferences for Ibero-American countries was developed, as well as the first bilateral agreements ("first generation" agreements) with Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, and Mexico were signed. In the 1980's, relations with Latin American countries were deepening; the EEC signed "second generation" agreements [7, p. 24].

A major integrating factor in LAC was the Falkland War in 1982, which put the European countries in an uncomfortable position in their relations with LAC. At the same time, it pushed them to take more decisive steps toward integration, but without the US involvement.

The accession of Spain to the EU in 1986 had a huge effect on relations with LAC. In the early 1990s, agreements of the "third" and "fourth" generation on cooperation in economic, humanitarian, legal, environmental, and other spheres were signed.

In the region during the period from 1980s to 1990s, in line with the world trends there was a departure from the paternalistic role of state as a multifunctional centre, conditions were created for the free distribution of functional communication systems, especially economic ones. In the globalized world of Latin American economies, which are not competitive enough, they faced down a rather aggressive and highly organized world market. In 1989, Eng-

lish economist J. Williamson, senior fellow member of the Peterson Institute for International Economics, provided recommendations to Latin American countries on a new economic policy. These recommendations summarized the position of the US government and major international financial institutions (IMF, the World Bank), whose headquarters are located in Washington, and were called the "Washington Consensus" [8, p. 114].

Thus, the transition of LAC to a new paradigm of neoliberal economic development model was completed, and this positively influenced the establishment of economic relations with the countries of the European Union. The result of the economic upgrade was the establishment of the Southern Common Market, MERCOSUR, by the presidents of Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay and Paraguay in 1991. The agreement was signed on the basis of the Treaty of Asunción, which provided for the elimination of tariff restrictions between the countries of the bloc, the establishment of a common external customs in relation to third states, the co-ordination of a common macroeconomic, fiscal, and monetary policies [20].

In 1994, the Treaty of Asunción was amended and supplemented by the Protocol of Ouro Preto, which defined the final structure of MERCOSUR. Since then, MERCOSUR has become an international organization, new functions have been defined, and more stable institutions established. The highest body of MERCOSUR is The Council of the Common Market. MERCOSUR acquired legal personality and recognition in international law with the signing of the Protocol of Ouro Preto [13].

The aim of creating the bloc was purely market-based; its basic values are the liberalization of network trade through the general reduction of basic tariffs. The borrowed MERCOSUR integration model had some peculiarities and differences from other Latin American regional groupings. This organization was established on the basis of more closed regionalism; the difference from the EU was that no supranational institutional structures were created.

For the first time in the region MERCOSUR countries deviated from the EU model and chose an intergovernmental institutional model, whereby integration was based on interaction between governments, and limited powers were delegated to the integration bodies, which defined complexity, amorphousness, and weak governance of institutional structure [6, p. 15].

The first stage of relations (1995-2003). For a better understanding of the EU-MERCOSUR dialogue, K. Dubek identifies historical institutionalism as a major factor in relations between the two unions. Firstly, it is the membership of Spain in the EU and its role in shaping EU policy towards Latin America. Secondly, it is the choice of liberalism as an economic model on both sides of the Atlantic which inspired LAC to integrate and establish competition policy with the EU [14].

The negotiation process between these two powerful regional groupings lasted for two decades. One can define several stages of the negotiation process. The first stage was rather passive; despite the great number of meetings, summits, the necessary arrangements, the results were not achieved.

In the development and reformation process, the EU acted within the framework of regional cooperation between the two blocs and set up a special LAC department in the EU; the Maastricht Treaty defined the European policy for cooperation with LAC. The EU has prepared a number of programs and projects on cooperation with LAC in trade, economy, energy, education, social development, information technology, civil society development, and poverty reduction.

The second stage (2004-2010) was unproductive for the two unions, and a number of programs were suspended because the EU was concerned with its internal problems, including the accession of new members. There was a change of power and regimes in Latin American countries, namely accession to power of centre-left regimes in Brazil and Argentina, changing the situation.

At this stage serious differences arose regarding the unification of agricultural products within the WTO Doha Round. The cause was also the global economic crisis of 2008-2009, accession of Venezuela to the bloc, change of Brazil's foreign policy priorities, accession to the BRICS, rapprochement with Russia, China, and India. Brazil signed a number of new trade agreements with the Southern African Customs Union, India, Egypt, and Morocco. The United States' relations with Brazil and Argentina intensified during this period. All these developments did not contribute to the positive dynamics of the EU-MERCOSUR negotiations.

2. The main problems of EU-MERCOSUR relations on the way to the Free Trade Agreement

MERCOSUR was transformed into a customs union; the organization succeeded in the development of the countries` economies and in initiation of joint projects for its development and improvement in 1995. Bolivia and Chile became associated members. The total area of MERCOSUR is about 72 % of the South American territory, which is equivalent to 12.8 million sq. km. Its overall population is 69.5% of the population of the entire continent – about 290 million. The regional bloc comprises 76.2 % of the South America's GDP [21].

The Framework Agreement for Cooperation between MERCOSUR and the EU was signed in December 1995 with the aim of establishing a "political and economic association." The agreement provided for additional opportuni-

ties for the development of EU-LAC relations, created additional conditions for political dialogue at the level of countries' presidents, ministers, expert groups, trade, scientific, technical, and economic cooperation [16].

The first Rio de Janeiro Summit, held in 1999, can be considered the beginning of the EU-MERCOSUR Strategic Partnership. This event was a starting point for the negotiation process for the EU-MERCOSUR Free Trade Agreement. The Framework Agreement was signed, which later has become a useful tool for the intensification of the two-region partnership between MERCOSUR and the EU; its peculiarity was that it did not include trade preferences.

Representatives of both regions confirmed that they were natural allies with strong historical, cultural, and economic ties. On this basis, they decided to develop close cooperation at the international level and to maintain intense political dialogue at both regional and subregional levels. It was stated that the two parties were committed to strengthen relations through the establishment of a strategic partnership, although the agreement did not define the goals and content of the partnership based on "special relations" [12].

The Interregional Framework Cooperation Agreement was ratified by all members of the two blocs in 1999; at the same time an additional Joint Declaration was signed, confirming the common goals of continuing cooperation in the establishment of interregional association and closer political dialogue. The Declaration laid the basis for regular political dialogue at the level of heads of state, ministers, and senior civil servants.

Both Spain and Portugal played a significant role in strengthening contacts with European countries, initiating the rapprochement of the EU and Latin America, and organizing Ibero-American summits. Spain, when it became a member of the EU, claimed the role of a bridge between the two regions, since the concept of Spain's foreign policy at this time reinforced the importance of the Ibero-American direction. This added a new dimension to its foreign policy. Progress in EU-LAC relations had a direct impact on improving Spain's image and interests, calling for the Ibero-Americanization of EU foreign policy [2]. Portugal, also as an EU member, strengthened its ties with Brazil. Cooperation with other countries increased as well. Transnational corporations strengthened their positions in the economies of the majority of regional countries, which was a manifestation of the general globalization trend. Along with TNCs came new technologies, accelerating the process of modernization [8, p. 115].

The second EU-LAC Summit was held in Madrid under the Spain's European Parliament presidency in 2002. The agenda included further steps towards The European Union-MERCOSUR Free Trade Agreement. The final

declaration was adopted in which both sides condemned trade protectionism, and the EU-Chile Partnership Agreement was signed. Important and strategic documents were not adopted because during this period leftist regimes in Brazil came to power, and as well as in Argentina a bit later; these regimes did not share the approaches declared by the previous presidents.

About 10 rounds of the EU-MERCOSUR negotiations on the establishment of the FTA were held during the period from 1999 to 2003. A prerequisite for the negotiations was adherence to the principle of "single undertaking," which meant accepting the agreement on the establishment of FTA "as a whole" or its rejection. This approach was necessary for the investigation of issues raised on each sector of the economy. Negotiations on the elaborated sectors of relations with MERCOSUR were conducted at the EU-MERCOSUR sub-regional level, and discussions were separately held with each country on sectors without common position within the bloc. The main "stumbling block" in the establishment of the FTA was the reluctance of Europeans to allow agricultural products from LAC to enter into their market at reduced tariffs, because they could compete with the agro-industrial products of the EU countries; the main opponents to this were France and Iceland [10].

The entire EU-LAC Summits, which were held since 2002, became an important mechanism for cooperation between two regions, reflecting the intention to broaden and deepen interaction between the blocs in political, economic and social spheres [1].

However, the European Commission adopted a package of documents on the renewed strategy "The European Union and Latin America: Global Players in Partnership," prioritizing the development of regional integration and the adoption of the agreement with MERCOSUR in 2009. A resolution of the European Parliament and the EU Council secured the financial instruments for cooperation – the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) and the Latin America Investment Facility (LAIF), providing opportunities for attracting additional investment in LAC [16].

In 2010 MERCOSUR adopted the Customs Code, the Program of Liberalization of Trade in Services, and a new concept of block development through the policy of "open regionalism." In 2010 the MERCOSUR Summit was held in Argentina. From then on, the organization acquired features of the Customs Union and opportunities to expand trade integration with the EU. Negotiations on the establishment of the EU-MERCOSUR Free Trade Area were actually restarted during the 2010 EU-LAC Summit in Madrid, at which Spain played an active role. New forms of cooperation were generated. The European Union-Latin America and Caribbean Foundation (EU-LAC) was established by heads of state and governments of the European Union and

the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC) member states in 2010. The Foundation is the EU-LAC Partnership Instrument aimed at intergovernmental dialogue in accordance with the Two Blocs Action Plan. The purpose of the Foundation is to strengthen and promote strategic bi-regional relations and to strengthen ties between civil societies [15].

Political dialogue at this stage acquired new features; the "political conditionality principle" was applied in the EU's foreign policy towards LAC. In 2010 the EU trade negotiations with MERCOSUR were conducted, and in the same year, the first round of negotiations took place in Buenos Aires, the second round - in Brussels on 11-15 October, and the third one - in Brasilia on 22 November - 7 December 2010.

The third stage (2011-2019) is characterized by an active phase of internal contradictions within MERCOSUR. In 2012, Venezuela became a full member of the bloc, so there was a need for MERCOSUR to update its integration strategy. Accession of Venezuela to the bloc became the main contradiction, complicating negotiations with the EU, since Venezuela's policy was in stark contrast with free trade policy, especially the idea of establishment of the FTA with the EU. Venezuela did not fulfil its commitments to bring its trade legislation in line with the MERCOSUR norms. Paraguay's membership was suspended for one year due to the impeachment of President F. Lugo. In the suspension of negotiations, one cannot ignore the emergence of China as a global player, which could actually become an alternative trading partner for MECROSUR, pushing aside the U.S. and the EU.

The representatives of MERCOSUR and the EU met in Paraguay and Uruguay to discuss current trade negotiations in February 2011. The following rounds of negotiations took place in Brussels and Asuncion the same year. Within the 21st Committee on Regional Negotiations, MERCOSUR and EU delegations held a number of working meetings. Nine rounds of MERCOSUR-EU negotiations took place in 2012 [21].

During this period, the representatives of the left political forces were in power in Argentina and Brazil who initiated the abandonment of the free market policy. The promotion of socialist ideas and transition to manual management of economy caused a new type of regional integration. With the rise of ideological differences, pure economic integration was declared unacceptable and that it was not meeting needs of the LAC peoples, as it did not lead to the improvement of Brazil's international status. New initiatives were put forward to restart integration processes, based on the principles of equality not only in the economic sphere but also in political, social, and intercultural ones. The ideological component played an important role within the bloc.

The EU-MERCOSUR negotiations were complicated not only by the

non-constructive policy within the bloc, Venezuela's failure to fulfil its obligations, the rapprochement of Brazil and Argentina with China, but also by the dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom – the so-called "Malvinas issue" in international relations. In 2011, Argentina, with the support of MERCOSUR, achieved the closure of South American ports for ships heading to the Malvinas coast for oil exploration, and expressed its dissatisfaction with the development of oil reserves by the UK.

The "Malvinas Issue" was actively raised by Argentina at the UN, at almost all summits and forums attended by Latin American countries. The Constitution of Argentina states that it views the archipelago as an integral part of its national territory and restoring sovereignty over the Malvinas with the respect for the way of life of its inhabitants is a permanent goal of the Argentine people [5].

At the ministerial meeting of the EU-CELAC forum in Santiago, held in 2013, MERCOSUR and the European Union delegates were present. In a year, both sides acknowledged with mutual accusations the lack of progress in the negotiations at the Brazil-EU summit. The joint declaration emphasized the consolidation of the strategic partnership.

In 2014 the EU's Generalised Scheme of Preferences for Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and Venezuela was terminated due to their transition to the World Bank's upper-middle income group of countries. As a result, exports to the EU from these countries began to be taxed. However, during this period, the establishment of the FTA was largely dependent on the particular political decisions of Brazil and Argentina.

A liberal, centre-right, supporter of more friendly relations with the U.S. and the EU came to power in Argentina in 2015. The new president of Argentina, right after elections on 2 December 2015, attended his first summit of the heads of state of MERCOSUR in Asuncion. The event was also attended by President of Paraguay H. Cartes, Uruguay's leader T. Vasquez and Brazilian President D. Rousseff. Associate members - Bolivia and Chile joined them. The President of Argentina M. Macri stressed Argentina's commitment to MERCOSUR and called for support trade between the EU and Latin American bloc at the summit [3].

In relations with the EU, Macri supports the policy of deepening economic and political ties with the EU within MERCOSUR. The signing of the Free Trade Agreement between the two unions offered Argentina great opportunities. Macri has sufficient support from the European Union in the process of restorating relations with the UK. Macri declared his desire to seek the return of Malvinas by legal means in full compliance with international law and UN resolutions.

During 2015-2016, representatives of MERCOSUR and the EU held a series of ministerial meetings in Brussels to exchange proposals on access to the relevant commodity markets.

In fact, with the complete transformation of foreign policy, Argentina has assumed the role of a facilitator in the negotiation process for the establishment of the EU-MERCOSUR FTA. In the first months of his cadence, Macri visited Berlin, Paris, and Brussels to hold talks with Chancellor A. Merkel, French President F. Holland, and High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy F. Mogherini. Thanks to an active pro-European position in 2016, Argentina and the United Kingdom made a joint statement on their readiness to cooperate in the field of economy and to seek a compromise on oil fields.

As for Brazil, in 2016, M. Temer - the interim President, who took the office after the impeachment of D. Rousseff, supported the idea of signing an agreement with the EU in the near future. Brazil and Argentina virtually suspended Venezuela's membership in MERCOSUR during that period and subsequently announced its withdrawal for failure to comply with obligations.

The start of the presidency in Brazil of J. Bolsonar – an odious politician and a supporter of far-right views – in 2018 can be considered the turning point in negotiations. Brazil's new president is a supporter of economic nationalism, proposing to overcome the crisis by means of an ultra-liberal economic model presented by his adviser on anti-crisis policy, a representative of the Chicago School, P. Gedes. In particular, Bolsonar is sharply critical of the increasing role of Chinese investors in the Brazilian economy. In foreign policy, he is a supporter of restoring friendly relations with the U.S. and the EU.

Thus, a favourable picture has emerged both within the MERCOSUR and the EU over the last 5 years, and in 2017 the European side presented package of proposals for import quotas for the EU, but they did not completely satisfy the representatives of MERCOSUR. In March 2017, the 24th round of the two-regional MERCOSUR-EU Negotiating Committee was completed in Argentina. At this meeting, arrangements were made on three parts of the future Agreement: the Trade Pact, the Political Dialogue and bi-regional cooperation.

In 2017, the 28th round of negotiations on the trade part of the EU- MERCOSUR Association Agreement took place in Brussels. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of MERCOSUR met with the Vice-President of the European Commission, to whom they presented a comprehensive proposal to reach the MERCOSUR-EU agreement.

The impetus for the resumption of negotiations was given by the EU countries due to the EU-US trade wars in 2018. MERCOSUR and EU represent-

atives were negotiating for trade cooperation, the removal of barriers, and tax reductions in Brussels. The meeting with the EU Trade Commissioner S. Malström and the EU Agriculture Commissioner F. Hogan was crucial to the future implementation of the Free Trade Agreement between the two blocs [4].

In 2018, presidents of the member countries of the Southern Common Market met at the Paraguay Summit. The negotiations were devoted to the search for new markets in the world. Also, the Latin American direction of the EU's foreign policy intensified in March 2018. The issue of updating certain FTA agreements between the EU and MERCOSUR was raised. In the same year, the G20 presidency moved to Argentina, so all participants of MERCO-SUR wanted to maximize this benefit in negotiations with the EU. Argentina, as G20 President, did its best to minimize the pressing issues that could be observed in relations between the member States [9]. The intensive negotiation phase lasted from March to June 2019.

Conclusions and forecasts

Thus, the European Union became an example for Latin American countries in the search for an integration model. The path to the creation of political institutions, common market, currency, customs unions, open borders, and supranational bodies has proved to be difficult. The Action Group established a common trade policy for all member states, based on the free movement of goods, services, and production factors. MERCOSUR has become the second largest customs union in the world after the EU and the third in the world as a free trade area after the EU and NAFTA. After all, NAFTA was reorganized into the USMCA in 2018 and a new trade agreement was signed between the US, Canada, and Mexico, which will enter into force in 2020.

Scenario 1. The failure to ratify the EU - Mercosur FTA Agreement. Despite the adoption of the EU - MERCOSUR FTA Agreement, there are differences between the various actors and participants of the negotiation process. The signing of the agreement provoked protests among the European agricultural producers and farmers, especially in France. French farmers protested due to the belief that the deal would put European producers in the conditions of unfair competition. In recent weeks, the European Commission has received letters from 340 civil society organizations encouraging the EU to end negotiations with MERCOSUR. Similar strikes took place in many EU countries, including Germany, Ireland, etc. The position of France raises concerns, in particular that E. Macron said that he would not sign the FTA unless the President of Brazil, J. Bolsonaro, signed the Paris Agreement on climate change, and adhered to its conditions, including standards of environmental

protection and health care. Bolsonaro repeatedly in his speeches spoke of Brazil's withdrawal from the climate agreement. Also, in the newly elected European Parliament, there were allegations that it was inadmissible to sign the agreement immediately after the election, as this could trigger possible non-ratification. Consequently, the position of France and the mass protests may eventually impact the final decision on the ratification of the EU-MER-COSUR FTA.

Scenario 2. Delay of the implementation of the EU-MERCOSUR FTA. The China-US trade wars have had side-effects such as the loss of the traditional influence of the US in LAC and a change of Brazil's and Argentina's foreign policy priorities. China, ousting the United States in the early 2000s, has become the number one trading partner of LAC, making multiple investments in the region. If the EU takes first place in trade with MERCOSUR, squeezing out the United States and China, as U.S. President D. Trump repeatedly said, sanctions might be imposed on the EU. In other words, the response to the EU-MERCOSUR FTA can be the introduction of customs duties on imports of goods from the EU to the U.S., or the launch of the INSTEX payment system to conduct financial transactions with Iran, circumventing sanctions. Thus, despite Trump's congratulations on signing the EU-MERCOSUR FTA, the economic benefits still a priority for all, and for the EU in particular it is possible to revise some of the provisions of the agreement, which will delay the ratification of the document.

Regarding Argentina, even though it has become the main country that has implemented the project establishing the largest free trade area in the world, there are fears of the process being dragged out on its part. In October 2019, a presidential election will be held in Argentina. The current primaries` leader is the opponent of incumbent President Macri - A. Fernandez, who has opposing (left) views. If President Macri is re-elected, ratification will be a priority. If Fernandez wins, the process can be delayed or Argentina will adopt a more passive stance. A postponement or a failure to accept the agreement will mean a huge economic setback for Argentina, and in the worst case, a loss of the MERCOSUR market.

Scenario 3. The complete implementation of the EU-MERCOSUR FTA Agreement.
In 2019, the European Union became the first trading partner to conclude an agreement with MERCOSUR. The agreement between the two regions will consolidate a strategic, political, and economic partnership, providing significant opportunities for the economic benefits for both unions. After reaching a trade agreement, the parties will move on to the legal issues, and after that, the text of the agreement will be presented. Then the European

Commission will translate the final text into all the official languages of the EU, the agreement will have to be ratified by the European Parliament (no ratification of the individual members will be required) and the congresses of MERCOSUR countries. Once ratified, the agreement will enter into force, and a new free trade area will be established with a population of about 770 million people and a total GDP of $21 trillion, which is about a quarter of the world economy. The entire ratification process is expected to take about two years, by 2021.

The agreement between the EU and MERCOSUR will eliminate most of the tariffs on exports to the EU, making EU companies more competitive, saving on customs duties €4 billion a year on each side. In addition to the elimination of customs duties, agreements on the removal of the non-tariff-based restrictions in the provision of various services will be reached. Products from MERCOSUR member states will be exempted from customs duties once the agreement enters into force, and the exemption from customs duties of goods from the EU to MERCOSUR will have been done for 10-15 years, which is a bit unfair. Although, these terms provably will be revised, despite fears of the European producers, because the products from the MERCOSUR countries will be much cheaper, and their quality is just as good. The agreement will reduce MERCOSUR's trade with the U.S. and China, weaken China's economic expansion in the region, and provide for enormous opportunities for international cooperation with global holdings and EU corporations.

Literature

1. Борзова А. Ю. Развитие стратегического партнерства между Бразилией и Европейским Союзом. История международных отношений. file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/10683-10147-1-PB%20(2).pdf

2. Борзова А. Ю., Кузеванов И. С. Роль Испании в развитии диалога между ЕС и странами Латинской Америки в рамках Института саммитов ЄС-ЛАК. Мир и безопасность. https://cyberleninka.ru/article/v/rol-ispanii-v-razvitii-dialoga-mezhdu-es-i-stranami-latinskoy-ameriki-v-ramkah-instituta-sammitov-es-lak

3. Вакарчук К. В. Зовнішня політика Аргентини в постбіполярний період, 5.10.2018. http://heraldiss.onu.edu.ua/article/view/144316/150638

4. Вакарчук К. В. Латинська Америка. Аналітичний огляд 07.2018. Борисфен Інтел. http://bintel.com.ua/uk/article/2018_07_latin/

5. Гриценко И. А. Переговоры ЕС–Меркосур: Роль Аргентины вчера и сегодня. https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/peregovory-es-merkosur-rol-argentiny-vchera-i-segodnya

6. Интеграционные процессы в Латинской Америке: состояние и перспективы. М., 2012. 120 с.

7. Канунников А.А. Европейский Союз – Латинская Америка: экономическое, политическое, социальное сотрудничество = European Union – Latin America: economic, political, social cooperation: М., 2014. 102 с.

8. Міжнародні регіональні процеси та зовнішньополітичні пріоритети України: монографія / За ред. С. Шергіна, В. Космини, Л. Чекаленко. Київ: Дипломатична академія України при МЗС України, 2017. 440 с.

9. Нахон С. Латинская Америка в «Группе двадцати»: преемственность и новые темы повестки (2008–2018 гг.). https://cyberleninka.ru/article/v/latinskaya-amerika-v-gruppe-dvadtsati-preemstvennost-i-novye-temy-povestki-2008-2018-gg

10. Тайар В. М. Европейский союз и Латинская Америка: Межрегиональное экономическое взаимодействие в XXI веке https://cyberleninka.ru/article/v/evropeyskiy-soyuz-i-latinskaya-amerika-mezhregionalnoe-ekonomicheskoe-vzaimodeystvie-v-xxi-veke

11. Шелудкова И. ЄС и Меркосур договорились, 29.06.2019. https://ru.euronews.com/2019/06/29/eu-and-mercosur-reach-trade-agreement

12. A stronger partnership between the European Union and Latin America. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/la/docs/com05_636_en.pdf

13. Additional Protocol to the Treaty of Asunción on the Institutional Structure of MERCOSUR Protocol of Ouro Preto SICE Foreign Trade Information System. http://www.sice.oas.org/trade/mrcsr/ourop/ourop_e.asp

14. Dubek C. M. The Shaping of EU-Mercosur Relations from Altruism to Pragmatism and Liberalism to Illiberalism. http://aei.pitt.edu/53006/1/3-37-4-PB.pdf

15. EU-LAC Foundation Internships. https://eulacfoundation.org/en/internships

16. Interregional Framework Cooperation Agreement between the European Community and its Member States, of the one part, and the Southern Common Market and its Party States, of the other part - Joint Declaration on political dialogue between the European Union and Mercosur. http://ec.europa.eu/world/agreements/prepareCreateTreatiesWorkspace/treatiesGeneralData.do? step=0&redirect=true&treatyId=405

17. Key elements of the EU-Mercosur trade agreement. http://www.sice.oas.org/TPD/MER_EU/negotiations/Key_Elements_MER_EU_FTA_e.pdf

18. Martin I. El acuerdo Mercosur-Unión Europea parece más cercano que nunca, 27.06.2019. https://www.clarin.com/economia/economia/acuerdo-mercosur-union-europea-parece-cercano_0_M5pWt4l-7.html

19. Mercosur accounts for 76% of the entire South American economy. Presidency of the republic of Brazil, 19 December 2019. http://www.brazil.gov.br/about-brazil/news/2018/12/mercosur-accounts-for-76-of-the-entire-south-american-economy

20. MERCOSUR Free Trade Agreement World Trade Law http://www.worldtradelaw.net/fta/agreements/mercosurfta.pdf.download

21. MERCOSUR-European Union Organization of American States http://www.sice.oas.org/TPD/MER_EU/MER_EU_e.asp

CHAPTER 7

THE EU POLICY TOWARDS SYRIA AFTER 2011

Alla Zakharchenko

The European Union traditionally regards the Middle East as an important sphere of influence due to historical ties and a wide range of political, economic, and security interests in the region. Taking into account the geographical proximity, Europe is very vulnerable in the face of the threats emanating from the region: illegal migration, the spread of Islamic extremism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and others. All these factors determine the EU's high interest in ensuring regional stability.

Until recently, the EU's cooperation with Middle Eastern countries was based on the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (1995), the European Neighbourhood Policy (2004), and the Union for the Mediterranean (2008). These initiatives implied the European Union's assistance in democratic transformations and economic reforms to achieve stability and predictability of Middle Eastern countries' development.

In practice, it turned out that the European initiatives had positive results mainly in the field of political dialogue, but they did not lead to significant socio-economic or democratic transformations in the region, as the events in the Arab world in 2011 vividly testified.

Potential instability in Arab countries had very serious consequences for Europe. That is why the support for authoritarian but reliable regimes outweighed the calls for democratization in the Arab countries. Under these conditions, the EU de facto ignored human rights violations and the 'façade' democracy in the Middle East without transcending the limits of democratic discourse [1, p. 27].

This also applied to Syria, with which the European Union actively cooperated in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and the European Neighbourhood Policy. The association agreement between the EU and Damascus had been negotiated since 1998. However, the EU did not find the conditions in Syria appropriate for signing the agreement due to the absence of political and social reforms and human rights issues [5].

The outbreak of the Arab spring was a surprise to the West, as evidenced by serious failures of European diplomacy at the first stage of anti-government protests. With the start of mass protests in Tunisia, and the governments' attempts to suppress them, the EU took a very restrained and cautious position. It limited its reaction to urging the authorities not to use disproportionate force toward the protesters. This reaction corresponded neither to the

traditional European rhetoric about the need for democratization, nor the real trends in social and political life in the region [1, p. 28].

After realizing that the "stability course" was ineffective, the EU significantly diversified its foreign policy strategy, trying to adjust it to the processes unfolding in the Arab world. The new approach provided a positive assessment of the revolutionary socio-political transformations.

Trying to catch a wave of change that it missed in Tunisia and Egypt, Europe, especially France, switched to active action in Libya. However, the protracted military operation against the backdrop of the civil war in this country led to significant casualties among the population, as well as political and economic collapse. It turned Libya into a permanent source of instability near the borders of Europe and seriously damaged the prestige of the EU in the Middle East [7].

EU approaches to the Syrian crisis at the initial stage of the civil war. When civil war broke out in Syria in mid-March 2011, the EU, relying on negative Libyan experience, abandoned the idea of military intervention. It chose the tactics of pressure through sanctions and the recognition of the loss of legitimacy by the Assad regime. In April 2011, the EU suspended its proposition regarding association agreement with Syria and adopted a series of sanctions, which can be divided into five categories:

1. sanctions targeted against the Syrian government (including suspension of loans and technical assistance provided by the European Investment Bank);

2. sanctions aimed at individuals directly involved in the exercise of repression (travel bans and asset freeze);

3. arms embargo (including an embargo on the supply of military equipment that might be used for repressions);

4. sanctions targeted specifically at the energy sector (including oil embargo);

5. sanctions based on trade restrictions [13, p. 80].

European officials repeatedly stated that Assad's regime is responsible for the conflict in the first place. The Syrian President was originally not included in the list of travel bans. The European Union intended to give him a chance to change his policy towards the opposition and carry out democratic reforms. However, continuous violence towards the opposition led the EU to add Assad and his family to the sanction list on May 23, 2011. The list gets updated even nowadays. The EU called for political reforms in Syria, which would include Assad's resignation. In response, Syria announced its withdrawal from the Union for the Mediterranean on December 1, 2011 [2, p. 130].

Since the early months of the conflict, the EU has expressed support for oppositional Syrian National Coalition (SNC) and provided humanitarian,

economic, and diplomatic support. The European Union recognized the SNC as "legitimate representatives of the aspirations of the Syrian people" in November 2012 [28].

Soon after, a contradiction within the EU arose. The issue in question was whether to supply arms to the Syrian opposition. France and Britain tried to convince other European states to deliver weapons to the opposition to end the stalemate in the civil war. However, the majority of the EU member states did not support this idea, fearing increased militarization in Syria. Thus, the common approach of the European Union towards the arms embargo collapsed in May 2013, and the countries started to pursue independent policies on this issue. Besides, in April 2013 the EU decided to ease the oil embargo to limit its negative impact on civilians in Syria. It allowed exporting Syrian oil and petroleum products to the EU based on an agreement with the Syrian opposition [13, p. 84].

The sanctions policy of the EU did not lead to political reforms or the end of violence in Syria and in general had a very limited effect. Moreover, European sanctions did not prevent the Syrian regime from using chemical weapons against the civilian population in 2013. The reason was the fact that the European Union was one of the few international actors (beside Australia or Canada) that imposed sanctions against the Assad regime without coordinating this step with the United Nations and other important international actors. Moscow and Tehran enabled exporting Syrian goods to Russia and Iran and continued to supply arms to Syria. This also reduced the effectiveness of European sanctions [22].

The sanctions policy was widely criticized by European and international experts. They argued that it was not only ineffective but also worsened the condition of ordinary people in Syria and damaged European interests [8; 20; 28]. By withdrawing from dialogue with the Syrian government and imposing sanctions, the EU disengaged itself from conflict resolution, which led to a humanitarian catastrophe with the refugee crisis and increased extremism. The major concern was the absence of a comprehensive EU strategy on this issue.

The EU Syrian conflict resolution strategies and their practical implementation. The first strategy "Towards a Comprehensive EU Approach to the Syrian Crisis" was adopted in June 2013. It defined main interests and objectives of the European Union with respect to the conflict in Syria: supporting a political process that can bring final resolution; preventing a spill-over of the conflict to neighbouring countries; addressing the humanitarian situation; assisting the affected populations; and eliminating the consequences of the conflict on the EU. Achieving these objectives envisaged continuing sanctions

policy, support to Syrian civilian population, prevention of the involvement of foreign (in particular European) militants in the Syrian conflict, as well as the EU cooperation with third parties and non-governmental organizations [27].

However, in practice, the political and diplomatic role of the EU in resolving the Syrian conflict was quite modest. The European Union supported Geneva peace process initiatives, including Geneva Communiqué, and other UN diplomatic initiatives. It participated in the efforts of the International Syrian Support Group [15]. At the same time, it did not play an independent or leading role. It rather acted in cooperation with other major international players, such as the United Nations, the League of Arab States, the United States, or regional actors such as Turkey and Saudi Arabia.

The rise of the Islamic State (IS) in June 2014 and Russian military involvement in Syrian conflict in September 2015 further complicated the political environment in the region and left even less room for the EU foreign policy manoeuvre.

The terrorist threat posed by the IS became one of the most serious European security issues. The Islamic State was responsible for dozens of terrorist acts in European countries. Moreover, a series of resonant attacks, including the March 2016 bombings in Brussels and the November 2015 attacks in Paris, were carried out by European citizens who had fought with the Islamic State. An estimated 5,000 EU citizens (mostly from Belgium, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom) have travelled to Syria and Iraq to become the IS and other radical groups fighters since 2011. Approximately 30% of European fighters returned home [12].

In such circumstances, the EU adopted a new fundamental document "Elements for an EU Regional Strategy for Syria and Iraq as well as the Da'esh Threat" in February 2015. It outlined the basic European strategy in countering the threat posed by the IS and other terrorist groups to regional and international stability. It stressed the need for diplomatic engagement and long-term support for political reforms, socio-economic development, and ethno-sectarian reconciliation.

In the Syrian context, this included support for moderate opposition and other members of civil society. Regarding the political process, the EU insisted that it cannot play a leading role but can only support UN efforts. It also stressed that "the Assad regime cannot be a partner in the fight against the IS" [9].

The EU later adopted a broad range of measures that support the Global Coalition in its fight against the IS through non-military means. The EU became a member of four of the Coalition's working groups: on foreign terrorist

fighters; anti-money laundering and countering terrorism financing; communications; and stabilization [11].

At the same time, the EU was not able to develop a unified approach to military participation in the fight against the IS. Each EU member determined the level of its participation in the war against the organization in accordance with its national interests. As a result, five EU member states – France, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Denmark, and the Netherlands – participated in the coalition carrying out airstrikes against the Islamic State in Iraq, and only two of them – France and the United Kingdom – in Syria [15].

The humanitarian area of the EU activity in the Syrian crisis is the most effective. It pays particular attention to the refugee problem, which, along with the terrorist threat, has become a major European security problem.

Since the outbreak of the war in 2011, the EU has collectively (the EU and single member states) mobilized over 10.8 billion Euros in humanitarian assistance for Syrians and Syrian refugees in the neighbouring refugee-host countries, making it the largest donor. The largest source of funding for Syrian refugees is the EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian crisis (Madad Fund) created in 2014. The Fund provides concrete assistance for refugees in Turkey, Jordan, Lebanon, and Iraq by investing in health, education, economic development, and workplace creation for both local communities and refugees, especially for vulnerable groups, such as women and youth [24].

In 2015, the EU created a Facility for Refugees in Turkey (which hosted 4 million refugees) with a total budget of six billion Euros (three billion Euros for 2016–2017 and three billion Euros for 2018–2019). The Facility provides a joint coordination mechanism to meet the needs of refugees and the host country in the socio-economic and other fields [25].

Since 2017, the EU initiated the annual Brussels Conference "Supporting the future of Syria and the Region." The purpose is to mobilize the international community to provide humanitarian assistance for Syrians. The third Brussels Conference (March 12-13, 2019) brought together more than 1000 participants: civil society representatives from Syria and the region, ministers and politicians from neighbouring countries, donor countries, regional and international organizations, UN agencies, and more. The conference raised over six billion Euros in humanitarian aid for Syrian refugees [6].

Several European states – Germany, France, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and the Netherlands – are members of the Syria Recovery Trust Fund (SRTF), which was established in 2013. The Fund provides assistance to Syrian communities on opposition-controlled territories by funding projects for essential services in sectors such as water, health,

education, and food security intending to alleviate the suffering of the Syrian people [26].

Europe released its vision of the prospects for resolving the Syrian conflict and combating its devastating consequences in April 2017 in the "Elements for an EU Strategy for Syria" policy document. The following are among the strategic objectives of the European Union:

1. a united Syria – a united and territorially integral country for all Syrian citizens;

2. a democratic Syria – a legitimate government and a pluralistic political system with respect for the rule of law and individual rights;

3. a diverse and inclusive Syria – a multi-cultural country, in which all ethnic and religious groups are protected and have equal access to government;

4. a strong and secure Syria – an effective state with functional institutions;

5. a stable Syria – a stable political system and a strong economy [10].

In order to achieve these goals, the EU is going to rely on its traditional soft power tools such as the promotion of democracy, human rights and freedom of speech. It will also be strengthening Syrian civil society. All this falls in line with UN Security Council Resolution 2254 and the Geneva Communiqué and describes in detail how the European Union is going to contribute to the post-conflict transformation of Syria. At the same time, the EU says almost nothing about how it is going to bring the conflict to an end.

The EU reaffirmed its status as a major donor for Syrian refugees. However, it specifically stated that it will help rebuild Syria only when a comprehensive political transition process that includes all parties is launched. In parallel, it stated that "special responsibility for the costs of reconstruction should be taken by those external actors who have fuelled the conflict" [10]. The EU made it clear that it does not want to pay for what other actors destroyed.

Nevertheless, the adoption of this detailed and ambitious strategy did not translate into concrete action in the diplomatic or military fields. When the United States, France, and the United Kingdom conducted airstrikes on regime facilities in April 2018, the EU took its time to react and then released a statement that it 'understood' the actions of the three countries but called for the urgent resumption of peace talks that could finally end the civil war [23].

The only European country with a significant militarily and political role in the Syrian conflict is France, which has consistently supported and armed the Syrian opposition and has become the main US partner in the fight against the IS. Paris took a decisive stance on the issue of chemical weapons in Syria and, since 2015, has delivered precision airstrikes on Assad's chemical weapons facilities. France provided arms and training to Kurdish Peshmerga forces, which has been an essential partner in the fight against the Islamic

State and welcomed delegation of the Syrian Democratic Forces in the Élysée Palace in March 2018 [18].

The reasons for low efficiency of the EU policies in the Syrian settlement. Even though the European Union disposes of a variety of strategies as well as diplomatic, political, economic, and humanitarian tools, it has not been able to effectively contribute to the resolution of the Syrian crisis so far.

Paradoxically, the EU did not play an essential role in resolving the conflict that affected Europe more than any of the other international actors involved. Besides, its policy was reactive – the EU took most of the decisions regarding the conflict in Syria in response to specific events (for example, the refugee crisis and terrorist attacks in European countries).

Both European and international experts criticize the role of the EU in the Syrian crisis and characterize it as rhetorical, secondary, and even marginal [17; 28; 30]. A whole set of objective reasons condition the weaknesses of European positions in this context.

First, the EU miscalculated the Assad regime's resilience and the extent to which both Iran and Russia would provide military support to Damascus. Second, the opposition in Syria appeared deeply fractionalized. The lack of common values and objectives (apart from ousting President Assad) largely complicated the European Union's contribution to the regime change in Syria. Third, the EU was simultaneously resolving additional crises, which were significant for European security, such as the crisis in Ukraine and the Iranian nuclear program.

In addition, the Trump administration's unpredictable Middle East policy became a significant problem for the EU. A series of contradictory steps by the American president demonstrated serious differences in the approaches of the EU and the US to regional security: withdrawal from the agreement on the Iranian nuclear program and resumption of tough economic sanctions against Tehran; US unconditional support to Israel, including the relocation of the US embassy to Jerusalem and recognition of Israeli sovereignty over the Golan Heights; finally, the decision to withdraw troops from Syria.

The US's withdrawal from Syria placed Europe in a difficult position. Such a move was likely to allow Iran to reinforce its presence in this country and the region. The withdrawal could amplify confrontation between Turkey and the Kurds. Finally, it could serve the Islamic State or other extremist groups' resurgence [21].

Another major factor is the new policy of the Russian Federation in the region. Russian military intervention in Syria in September 2015 not only rescued a collapsing allied regime but also considerably reinforced Moscow's regional positions. Russia also succeeded in maintaining good relations with

all the actors in the Middle East, even those who were bitter rivals: Iran and Saudi Arabia; Israel and the Palestinians; Turkey and the Kurds; Egypt and Qatar [16].

All of the above contributed to the emergence of a new diplomatic and military landscape in the Middle East, to which the EU was forced to adapt.

However, the main reason for European initiatives' failure was the lack of consensus within the EU states. On the one hand, the Syrian crisis revealed contradictions between the three most influential member states – the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, on the other – their unwillingness to involve EU institutions in conflict resolution efforts, except for more technical aspects (humanitarian assistance and sanctions).

According to some European experts, the new EU foreign policy architecture (the formation of which coincided with the events of the Arab Spring) is part of the crisis itself. Despite Common Foreign and Security Policy, as well as the hard work of High Representatives and European External Action Service staff, the reality is that the EU's foreign policy has increasingly been crafted at Heads of State and Government level, and often in a crisis mode. The EU's foreign policy mechanism does work, although its work consists of routine operations (statements, demarches, coordination at high-officials level, the local conversation between ambassadors), while individual states and leaders take the real policy initiatives, at best, after direct consultations [17].

EU policy scenarios for Syria. Nowadays the Assad regime has regained control over most of the territory it lost during the conflict; the Islamic State lost its territorial holdings; and the opposition to the regime is significantly weakened. However, the civil war has not ended and the long-term consequences of the Syrian conflict at this stage are not predictable.

It, therefore, appears likely that a complex political system will evolve in Syria, combining weak central rule and strong local centres of power with the significant involvement of regional and international external forces. The tasks of rebuilding the country's political system, security, and infrastructure would probably take a decade.

With Assad's victory in the conflict essentially assured, the dilemma the EU is currently facing is how to avoid sacrificing its fundamental values of democracy and human rights while achieving the important objective of providing much-needed support to Syrians in areas under regime control and improving the conditions that await refugees upon their return to Syria.

Bearing this in mind, we can suggest the following plausible scenarios.

Scenario 1. The EU non-cooperation position with the Assad regime will persist until the realization of an "inclusive political process that meets the legitimate aspirations of the Syrian people" as stated in the UN Security Coun-

cil Resolution 2254, serving as a basis for the EU stance. This policy involves the rejection of any steps that could help Assad consolidate his domestic position and provides for maintaining a tight sanctions regime, denying any political re-engagement, and withholding reconstruction support.

European politicians and diplomats who are proponents of this line admit that Assad won the war. But they hope that he "will lose the peace." They doubt that the Syrian regime will be able to exercise effective control over most of the country and guarantee stability. In such circumstances, European policy of "strategic patience" with the continuation of internal political and economic pressure will eventually force the regime to accept political reforms, including those that lead to fair and free presidential elections [4].

However, other experts believe that Western countries' expectation that an economic war will eventually compel the regime to acquiesce to their demands is both short-sighted and counterproductive [20]. They stress that despite the conflict and policy of Western isolation, the Syrian regime has significantly refined its survival skills in the last eight years, and it knows how to withstand external pressure. In addition, it enjoys the support of other influential external forces, such as Russia and Iran. In this context, the EU's policy of isolation only reinforces the Syrian government's worst impulses and harms ordinary Syrians. It also turns the EU into a marginal player, depriving it of its only lever of influence – the economic one.

Since the fall of 2018, there has been a growing discussion among European states over the advisability of maintaining a tough line regarding the Syrian regime. While France, Germany, and the United Kingdom want to maintain a tough anti-Assad stance, some countries, including Italy, Hungary, and Poland, are in favour of normalization. They consider this a necessary step to stabilize the situation in Syria and prevent the exacerbation of the refugee problem. In January 2019, the Italian foreign minister announced that Italy was considering reopening its embassy in Damascus [14]. This implies the possibility of a second alternative scenario.

Scenario 2. The EU or its individual members will move to a more pragmatic policy that allows partial lifting of sanctions, the provision of economic assistance, and a certain degree of interaction with the Syrian regime.

The supporters of this approach believe that although they do not need to normalize their diplomatic relationships with Damascus, European capitals should consider how to engage with it. It can be direct or indirect involvement in ways that serve their interests and, more importantly, the interests of the Syrian people [19]. Such EU policies may include elements of diplomacy, humanitarian assistance, reconstruction, and technical assistance in various fields (border control, elections, and transitional justice). By providing

even limited economic support, the European Union can still help improve Syrians' lives and prevent another Syrian mass-exodus to Europe [8]. At the same time, these steps should be very careful so as not to compromise basic European principles. Therefore, the possibility of broad EU participation in the restoration of Syria should continue to be tied to a full-fledged political settlement under the auspices of the UN.

However, such a scenario also entails difficulties and risks. First, Assad is very vocal regarding lifting sanctions. But he clearly stated on multiple occasions that he does not want Westerners to take part in the rebuilding of the country [3]. Second, the possible provision of economic assistance before reaching a final settlement of the conflict is very worrying for the Syrian opposition, which believes that this will initiate legitimization of the regime. Third, even a partial normalization of relations with Assad can demonstrate to neighbouring authoritarian regimes that crimes against their own people can remain unpunished.

Scenario 3. Regardless of further development of the situation, the EU policy in Syria and the Middle East region as a whole will be more independent in nature. The decrease in the EU's role as an institution will continue, while the activity of individual European states with their own national interests in the region, most probably France, is likely to increase.

While the United States is showing a declining interest in Middle East issues, the importance of the region for European security is growing. Trump administration's unilateral steps, as well as the differences in US and European views on important regional security issues, such as the Iranian nuclear program, the Middle East peace process, and Syria, will require a more independent policy on the part of the EU. If US involvement in the region wanes, Europe will increasingly be pushed to work with other influential actors, such as Russia and China, to further its interests. This trend was already evident in October 2018, when France and Germany participated in the Istanbul Summit on the Syrian settlement with Russia and Turkey (the representatives of the Astana Three), while the United States was absent [29].

France's role, having been active in Syrian affairs, became even more important after President D. Trump's statement on the withdrawal of American troops from Syria. When this happens, France will become the western country with the greatest influence in Syrian affairs and the largest military contingent there. Also, Paris is the largest supplier of humanitarian aid to the Syrian people, and its position will be important in the post-war reconstruction of the country.

Summing up, European influence in Syria in the immediate future will be limited and indirect. Even this modest ambition will require degrees of re-

solve and unity that are not currently present in European states. If the EU is unable to craft an effective, well-coordinated policy on Syria, it may end up being confined to the role of a secondary actor in modern conflicts: a provider of humanitarian and technical assistance.

The European Union could use its experience of low engagement in the resolution of the Syrian conflict to draw useful lessons for the future. The first lesson is the stark contrast between the EU's firm initial position (that Assad must go) and its subsequent modest diplomatic and military involvement. The second is the discrepancy between the EU's limited influence on the course of events and the fact that most of the dramatic humanitarian, economic, and security consequences of the Syrian crisis fall on European countries' shoulders.

The changing dynamics in the Middle East and international relations, in general, will require a fundamental rethinking of European foreign policy and methods of its realization in case the EU wants to preserve its role as an influential global actor.

The Arab Spring brought democracy only to one country – Tunisia. The situation in other countries of the region demonstrates the opposite tendencies of increased authoritarianism and instability. Bearing this in mind, the EU should intensify its military and political role along with its traditional tools (humanitarian aid, reform support, NGO and free media funding). The EU must build its defence capabilities to meet the challenges where soft power engagement does not suffice. The implementation of this and other related tasks in the context of the internal crisis of the EU will remain the main challenge for European states.

Literature

1. Данилов Д. Европейский Союз в поиске ответов на вызовы «Арабской весны». Индекс безопасности. 2012. № 3-4. С. 107-140.

2. Захарченко А.М. «Арабська весна» у дзеркалі європейських ініціатив. Зовнішні справи. 2011. № 3. С. 26-30.

3. Assad Pledges to Regain Control of Northern Syria by Force if Needed. Reuters. June 24, 2018. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-mideast-crisis-syria-assad/

4. Barnes-Dacay J. The Price of Disengagement: Syria and the Brussels III Conference. The European Council on Foreign Relations. March 12, 2019. https://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary

5. Benhamou M. Innocence and War: Searching for Europe's Strategy in Syria. The Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies Research Paper. May 2016. https://martenscentre.eu/sites/default/files/publication-files/syria-war-europe-strategy_0.pdf

6. Brussels III Conference on «Supporting the Future of Syria and the Region»: Co-chairs Declaration. The European Council. March 14, 2019. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2019/03/14/

7. Dempsey J. The European Union and Its Southern Neighborhood. The Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung Paper. September 20, 2016. https://eu.boell.org/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/09/

8. El-Gamal J. The Displacement Dilemma: Should Europe Help Syrian Refugees Re-

turn Home? The European Council on Foreign Relations Policy Bief. March 2019. https://www.ecfr.eu/page/

9. «Elements for an EU Regional Strategy for Syria and Iraq as Well as the Da'esh Threat». The European External Action Service. February 6, 2015. https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/20150206_join_en.pdf

10. «Elements for an EU Strategy for Syria». The European External Action Service. March 14, 2017. https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/celex3a52017jc00113aen3atxt.pdf

11. EU Actions to Counter Da'esh. July 11, 2018. The European External Action Service. https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/23264/

12. Gaub F. Waging Eurojihad: Foreign Fighters in ISIL. EU Institute for Security Studies Report. December 2015. https://www.iss.europa.eu/sites/default/files/EUISSFiles/Alert_53

13. Havlova R. The European Union and the Crisis in Syria. Současná Evropa. 2015. № 2. P. 65-93. https://www.vse.cz/se/123?lang=en

14. Italy Considering Reopening Syrian Embassy. Italian Associated Press National Agency. January 11, 2019. http://www.ansa.it/english/news/2019/01/11/

15. Pawlak P. Conflict in Syria: Trigger Factors and the EU Response. European Parliamentary Research Service Briefing. January 2016. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2016/573924/EPRS_BRI(2016)573924_EN.pdf

16. Pierini M. In Search of an EU Role in the Syrian War. Carnegie Europe Paper. August 2016. https://carnegieendowment.org/files/CP_284_Pierini_Syria_Final.pdf

17. Pierini M. The Crisis of the European Project and Its Consequences for the Euro-Mediterranean Agenda. EMed Mediterranean Yearbook 2018. https://www.iemed.org/observatori/arees-danalisi/arxius-adjunts/anuari/med.2018/IEMed_Crisis_EU_project_Medyearbook2018_Marc_Pierini.pdf

18. Rapnouil M.L. Alone in the Desert? How France can Lead Europe in the Middle East. European Council on Foreign Relations Policy Brief. April 2018. https://www.ecfr.eu/page/-/alone_in_the_desert_how_france_can_lead_europe_in_the_middle_east_.pdf

19. Samaha N. Can Assad Win the Peace? The European Council on Foreign Relations Policy Brief. May 2019. https://www.ecfr.eu/page/-/can_assad_win_the_peace_syria.pdf

20. Samaha N. The Economic War on Syria: Why Europe Risks Losing? The European Council on Foreign Relations. February 11, 2019 https://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary

21. Scazzieri L. A Troubled Partnership: The US and Europe in the Middle East. Centre for European Reform Paper. July 2019. https://www.cer.eu/sites/default/files/pbrief_middle_east_10.7.19.pdf

22. Seeberg P. The Limits to the Sanctions Regime Against Syria / On Target? EU Sanctions as Security Policy Tools. Edited by I. Dreyer, J. Luengo-Cabrera. EU Institute for Security Studies Report. September 2015. https://www.iss.europa.eu/sites/default/files/EUISSFiles/Report_25_EU_Sanctions.pdf

23. Syria Bombing: EU Understands Recent Air Strikes but Calls for Urgent Resumption of Peace Talks. The Independent. April 16, 2018. https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/syria-strikes-latest-eu-us-russia-uk-france-chemical-weapons-bombing-a8307526.html

24. The EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis. The Factsheet. November 2018. https://ec.europa.eu/trustfund-syria-region/sites/tfsr/files/eutf_syria_factsheet-english_13112018.pdf

25. The EU Facility for Refugees in Turkey. The Factsheet. October 2019. https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/frit_factsheet.pdf

26. The Syria Recovery Trust Fund. The Programme Strategy and Guidelines. http://www.srtfund.org/articles/11_the-programme-strategy-guidelines

27. «Towards a Comprehensive EU Approach to the Syrian Crisis». European Commission Press Release. June 24, 2013. https://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-596_en.htm

28. Turkmani R., Haid M. The Role of the EU in the Syrian Conflict. Security in Transition Paper. May 2016. https://www.fes-europe.eu/fileadmin/public/editorfiles/events/Maerz_2016/FES_LSE_Syria_Turkmani_Haid_2016_02_23.pdf

29. Turkey Hosts Russian, French, German Leaders for Syria Summit. France 24 News. October 27, 2018. https://www.france24.com/en/20181027-syria-turkey-leaders-russia-france-germany-istanbul-summit-erdogan-macron-merkel-putin

30. Youngs R. Syria: Is Europe's Influence in the Region Finished? The Conversation. December 6, 2018. https://theconversation.com/syria-is-europes-influence-in-the-region-finished-107818

CHAPTER 8

EU – U.S. RELATIONS UNDER PRESIDENT TRUMP

Volodymyr Dubovyk

For decades, the relations between U.S. and the European integration project have been a major factor in international relations. The United States has played a significant role in aiding this process from its outset. Traditionally, Europe has not been a priority for the U.S., and it was absent from European affairs on the eve of both world wars, only to enter later at a huge expense in resources and human lives. This lesson has now been learned: America should be involved with Europe. The Cold War was looming, and the U.S. needed allies. Functionalist ideas were put to a good work. Perennial arch-enemies have gradually learned to work together and Washington has benevolently assisted in the process. It has provided a security umbrella for the emerging bloc.

Not just security, but economy mattered. The United States has created massive space as a pivotal trade partner of the EU. "The Guardian" columnist Natalie Nougayrede has summarized the consensus of experts on the subject: post-war Europe was able to build itself up as a collective project thanks to US protection and financial support [14]. Successive U.S. administrations have stayed this course of support for the European integration. Some disagreements happened now and then, but that did not change the core character of this relationship. The end of the Cold War and the subsequent emergence of the EU have been significant events but have not altered U.S. – Europe relations. It was still based on common ideological values, economic cooperation, and shared security.

Despite EU growing and becoming a sound international player, Europe needed America as before. Washington, for its part, has looked into somewhat withdrawing from Europe in the post-bipolar times. However, it was soon discovered that neither Europe can do without American presence and leadership, nor can the U.S. afford to forsake Europe. The crises and wars in the former Yugoslavia were the early tests, which have evidently shown that Europeans are not quite prepared to deal with challenges of this sort and that American intervention was needful.

In the post-Dayton times, there were more examples of cooperation and occasional cases of disagreement. When 9/11 happened, European allies stood with America. They have met the U.S. intervention in Afghanistan with understanding. The subsequent Iraqi invasion in 2003 was when many major European allies distanced themselves from Washington. Yet the U.S. and the

EU are not set on diverging trajectories; consensus, unity, and coordination have prevailed over discontent.

Enter Donald Trump: impact for EU. This sort of bipartisan consensus on the nature of the relations for the U.S. with the EU has existed uninterrupted until President Donald Trump came in. The new president came across as an outsider, lacking preparedness, competence, and qualifications for the job. Initially there was some hope that he would leave his unconventional persona on the election trail and would emerge as a more statesman-like figure and that he would learn on the job. However, quite quickly it became clear that this is not going to happen.

Publicly, President Trump has expressed views that were quite unconventional, including those related to America's European allies, the EU. He apparently did not think that the EU was a friendly force, did not share values with it, has chosen to see it strictly as a competitor, and was seeing the Union as a part of the existing international arrangement which he has set to undo. Yet there was still an urge to wait till he comes to his senses, an attempt to not discuss it openly, and pretend that this is not a big deal and will somehow pass. Steven Erlanger, an experienced watcher of U.S. – EU relations and long-time European correspondent for "The New York Times" has observed with his co-author, the newspaper's head of the Berlin bureau Katrin Bennhold: "European leaders have long been alarmed that President Trump's words and Twitter messages could undo a trans-Atlantic alliance that had grown stronger over seven decades. They had clung to the hope that those ties would bear up under the strain" [7].

There was also an expectation that Trump might distance himself from the complicated matters of foreign policy, focus on his domestic agenda, and delegate U.S. international policy to more seasoned individuals in his administration. A cohort of such individuals has emerged in some key positions, which at the moment has included Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, Secretary of Defence James Matiss, National Security Advisor H. R. McMaster, and White House Chief of Staff John Kelly. They were half-jokingly referred to as "the generals" (all but Tillerson are generals), "regents" (in parallel to the historic precedent of regent assuming power under the circumstances when a monarch cannot act in his capacity for whatever reason) and the "adults in the room."

A notion has emerged that Trump does not shape U.S. foreign policy, or that there are, in fact, two foreign policies – one embodied by presidential statements and another by the rest of his administration, which was more in line with the traditional approaches. A veteran diplomat and now a Harvard professor Nicholas Burns has noticed: "For two years now, Trump's advisers

have told Europeans to watch what America does and not what the president says in his often intemperate and caustic tweets" [2].

Such an unorthodox arrangement was rather fragile by nature and questions persisted as to its longevity. The U.S. president does have a wide array of powers and prerogatives, particularly when it comes to the field of foreign policy. Eventually Trump grew emboldened to play a bigger role in the sphere of foreign policy, deciding to get rid of the restraints that some might have tried to put on him. All above mentioned individuals were one by one relieved of their duties and were substituted with those more loyal to the presidential line. John D. Negroponte, who once served as the Director of National Intelligence and knows well the inner workings of the executive branch has noted: "All of them know they still can't control the thunderbolt from on high" [13].

As the second year of his presidency was wearing off, President Trump has appeared willing to take more initiative in foreign policy in his own hands. Johns Hopkins University's Eliot Cohen, one of the leading American thinkers on the matters of foreign policy, a traditional conservative voice, who has worked within executive branch himself before becoming dean of SAIS, has described this phenomenon: "The longer someone is in high office and becomes accustomed to supreme power, the less opposition and disagreement he will encounter and the less disagreement he is likely to heed. Particularly for someone whose ego knows few bounds, it can be a dangerously intoxicating place" [4].

This newly found foreign policy activism of the president was still not complemented with knowledge or a willingness to acquire some. This was especially obvious when it came to the EU, whose modus operandi can be confusing to some people. "The New York Times" correspondent Mark Landler mentions an episode when Trump has "told Ms. Merkel that he wanted to negotiate a new bilateral trade agreement with Germany. The problem with this idea was that Germany, as a member of the European Union, could not negotiate its own agreement with the United States" [13].

The rift between EU and U.S. is open. There was one moment, an event, in fact, where Trump's anti-EU stance finally generated a strong reaction. The initial shock has grown over time into an open criticism of his stance towards the EU. There was no more hope on the European side that Trump's course would somehow sell-correct, that he would start taking the interests of U.S. European allies into account. This event, a watershed of sorts, was the 2019 Munich security conference.

Numerous accounts from this conference come to same conclusion: a gap has grown between the U.S. and the EU to the point that it was not possible anymore not to notice or to pretend that it is not there. Thomas Wright, one of

the top American experts on U.S. – EU relations, director of the Centre on the United States and Europe at the Brookings Institution, sums it up: "Europe and the Trump administration have stopped pretending to respect each other. For the past two years, we have been treated to a transatlantic charade. Everyone knows there's a problem, but publicly the leaders proclaim that nothing has fundamentally changed. But at the 2019 Munich Security Conference … the charade ended." His verdict is clear and leaves no doubt as to who is to blame: The D. Trump administration is an "American administration that has reversed a 70-year policy of support for Europe" [19].

Erlanger and Bennhold concur: "In the last few days of a prestigious annual security conference in Munich, the rift between Europe and the Trump administration became open, angry, and concrete" [7]. Burns agrees: "I left the Munich Security Conference concerned that we are witnessing the most worrisome division across the Atlantic in memory." He stipulates that in his view, Trump "has exhibited open hostility to Europe." Burns also adds some domestic American political context to the discussion, noting that the presentation of Joe Biden, the former U.S. vice-president and one of the candidates for the presidential nomination 2020 from the Democratic party has contrasted sharply with Trump's stance in Munich: "Joe Biden spoke for many former American officials in both parties who believe that the Trump administration has needlessly weakened our ties to Europe." Biden has basically encouraged Europeans to wait for Trump to be out of office [2].

It is not possible to ignore the fact that Trump, in his "attack" on the EU, has ran contrary to what many previous administrations have believed in. He picked a fight with the EU where there was none, doing so in a most needless manner and undermining the trust and cooperation that have existed previously. Interestingly, this point of view comes across from representatives of various foreign policy conceptual backgrounds. Elisabeth Winter, a research fellow with the Atlanticist think-tank German Marshall Fund, writes that Trump's predecessors "considered the maintenance of free and open markets through multilateral institutions" while "he prefers unilateral actions such as tariffs, sanctions and trade agreements that he considers 'fair.' And this applies even to dealings with the United States' transatlantic allies" [18]. Robert Kagan, a prominent scholar of the issues of foreign policy and the leading voice of the neocon line of thought, agrees: Trump is "rapidly destroying the trust and sense of common purpose that have held" the liberal international order together [10]. M. Landler concurs, as he is espousing a dominant liberal view: "Mr. Trump remains an erratic, idiosyncratic leader on the global stage, an insurgent who attacks allies the United States has nurtured since World War II" [13].

The criticism of Trump's approach to the EU has brought together experts on both sides of Atlantic. One German official is quoted saying: "No one any longer believes that Trump cares about the views or interests of the allies. It's broken." Nathalie Tocci, the preeminent scholar of Europe, an Italian, who also happened to be an advisor to Federica Mogherini, the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, said that for Europeans, the divide went "to the heart of how we view international relations and our national interest." S. Erlanger and K. Bennhold sum it up: "The Europeans no longer believe that Washington will change, not when Mr. Trump sees traditional allies as economic rivals and leadership as diktat. His distaste for multilateralism and international cooperation is a challenge to the very heart of what Europe is" [7].

Nougayrede writes in her column in "The Guardian": "The Trump administration not only dislikes the European Union, but is out to destroy it. The trip by the US secretary of state, Mike Pompeo, to Europe last week (in February of 2019 - V.D.) was episode three of the onslaught, designed to play on east-west divisions within the EU. Episode one was Donald Trump's Warsaw speech (July 6, 2017 - V.D.), infused with nativist nationalism. Episode two was Trump's 2018 moves on tariffs, and his tearing up of key agreements such as the Iran nuclear deal and the Intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) treaty." In other words, this time it is not just about Trump's controversial statements, but also about his actual policies. Nougayrede concludes: "Today the EU is the target of multi-faceted political offensives from both Washington and Moscow, not just because of what it does, but what it is" [14].

Judy Dempsey, an Irish scholar and an authority on European strategic affairs, presents her own score of the wrongs committed by Trump towards the EU: "Relations between the United States and the European Union are at an all-time low. Since becoming president, Donald Trump has done everything possible to undermine the unity of the bloc and question its principles. He has walked away from agreements on climate change, the Iran nuclear deal, and trade… He supports Brexit and praises the populist, anti-migration policies of Hungary and Poland" [5]. Interestingly enough, her advice for the EU is not to return the same policies towards Trump, pay him with the same token. She urges restraint: "European leaders are doing themselves no favours in bashing Trump" [8].

The EU as an economic competitor? There are a number of factors that have shaped Trump's views of the EU. One of them is viewing the EU exclusively as a competing economic power, and nothing else – one which was designed to take advantage of the U.S. To be sure, there is a certain amount of competition between the U.S. and the EU, and trade conflicts and disagree-

ments flare up from time to time. The usual way to resolve them would be through dialogue and not via dictate or blackmail. There are also WTO norms and regulations that help. At the same time, the EU is an important partner to the U.S. and not just in the realm of trade, but in many others, including that of the international security.

Kagan describes this equilibrium quite eloquently: "The United States would not insist on winning every economic contest or every trade deal. The perception by the other powers that they had a reasonably fair chance to succeed economically and sometimes even to surpass the United States – as Japan, Germany and other nations did at various times – was part of the glue that held the order together. This bargain was the foundation of a liberal world order that benefited all participants, including the United States [10].

The complexity of this arrangement is lost on President Trump. "Trump has broken with former U.S. presidents in treating the EU as a competitor rather than a friend" [2]. Former U.S. Trade Representative and president of the World Bank Robert Zoellick quips on this subject: "Mr. Trump's protectionist instincts could prove the most damaging in the long term," adding that "he views trade as zero-sum, win-lose" [13].

This "us or them" dichotomy is on display in a great number or cases. But hardly any of them are more vivid than the case of trade disputes with Germany. German-produced cars have become a bone of contention. During one of the meetings with German chancellor Angela Merkel, President Trump "went on a rant about Germany and cars." He "has taken Angela Merkel to task for her country's tariffs on U.S. automobiles and the ease with which German carmakers like Mercedes, Volkswagen, and BMW can sell into the U.S. market… Trump also says that the U.S - European trading relationship is very unfair" [17].

Trump's protectionist position has led the US Commerce Department in March 2019 to determine that European automobiles constitute a national security threat. President Trump has threatened repeatedly to impose a 25 % import tariff on European automobiles [12]. This mix-up of trade issues with security concerns is bewildering. No wonder it has been met with criticism on the part of European partners. Merkel has ridiculed the Trump administration's trade declaration that German cars represent a national-security threat to the United States [19].

One significant aspect of President Trump's protectionist position is that every time he speaks of the world being unfair to America, taking advantage of it, that the system is tilted against U.S. interests he hits a point, on which millions and millions of Americans concur. He reinforces these certain attitudes among the part of American public. There is a deep, conspiracy-fed

notion among some Americans that foreigners in general are not to be trusted. Finding a scapegoat for economic hardships works. Paul Pillar, a research fellow with Georgetown University and Brookings institution, explains this phenomenon: "The United States is embarking on a trade war with China and Europe less because a trade war had a prominent place in someone's foreign policy doctrine than because of applause lines that get applause due in large part to domestic economic dislocations tinged with xenophobia" [15].

The great disruptor: undoing the liberal world order. There are several things that Trump, some of his key advisors, and his most ardent base do not like. President is definitely anti-establishment. The establishment, including in his own Republican party, did not want him to become a president. It continues to resist many of the President's impulses, in doing so guards its own positions, but also U.S. national interests. This struggle is ongoing and, perhaps, nowhere else is it more visible and dramatic than in the fields of foreign policy, national security, and intelligence. The President derogatorily calls his opposition the "deep state." He also strongly dislikes all sorts of bureaucrats, all those people who stand on guard of various regulations and norms. In general, President Trump most certainly has a distaste for any sort of elites, and he is cheered on in this by his most loyal supporters.

Now, with that in mind, let's look at the European Union. There is hardly anything more establishment than the EU. It produces myriads of norms and regulations. It is bureaucratic beyond repair (so it seems). The EU is a complicated business and few people can fully comprehend it – be it its theoretical foundations or operational peculiarities – in its full complexity. At its core the "European project" is an elitist project. Elites came up with it; they run it and protect it. Now, how would we expect a person like Donald Trump to treat the EU?

Worse, for Trump, the EU is an integral part of what is often referred to as the "liberal international order." He most definitely dislikes the "liberal" part of it, and we will return to this further in this chapter. It is based on a certain set of principles, obligations, and commitments. President Trump questions them and believes that this order is unfair. "The post-war international order, the president of the United States declared, is "not working at all" [13].

Kori Schake, an expert with vast experience in government and academia, currently with the International Institute of Strategic Studies, and one of the notable adherents of a traditional conservative view on world affairs, has noted: "According to the president, the liberal world order is a con job – he insists America is paying too much and being swindled by its friends." "The president of the United States rejected associating the country with 'the rules-based international order' that America built after World War II" [16]. Kagan

is of the same opinion: "Trump's America does not care. It is unencumbered by historical memory. It recognizes no moral, political or strategic commitments. It feels free to pursue objectives without regard to the effect on allies or, for that matter, the world" [10]. P. Pillar agrees that Trump has shown "disdain for international rules and order and has even made efforts to undermine or destroy the rules" [15].

So, if not the "liberal international order," then what order is there for Trump? Apparently, he does not want any "order." His way is unbound unilateralism with no strings attached, no rules, no obligations, no international institutions or alliances. His view is a typical Hobbesian one with a taint of social Darwinism, perhaps: it is a jungle out there, a chaos, and that is fine because the strongest wins and we, the U.S., are the strongest. This view is based on extreme self-confidence (without accounting for the actual state of American power, resources and potential) and bragging about the U.S. being the best and the mightiest not because of what Americans believe or what they do, but simply because they are the United States of America. Through this prism, alliances do not matter, allies are no different from opponents. Trump's "America first" becomes "America alone" and he sees no problem in this. "Trump believes that keeping allies and adversaries alike perpetually off-balance necessarily benefits the United States, which is still the most powerful country on Earth" [9].

Jeffrey Goldberg, an editor in chief of "The Atlantic" has discovered what might be called a "Trump doctrine". It is "no friends, no enemies." One administration official explained that this is not "a variant of the Realpolitik notion that the U.S. has only shifting alliances, not permanent friends. Trump… doesn't believe that the U.S. should be part of any alliance at all… We have to explain to him that countries that have worked with us together in the past expect a level of loyalty from us, but he doesn't believe that this should factor into the equation" [9].

The EU and Donald Trump's values: the clash. President Trump is up in arms against liberalism in the United States, but this does not stop at the American borders. His worldview is deeply illiberal and that naturally pits him against the EU. The EU stands on the shoulders of the decades if not centuries of the liberal-democratic tradition. This tradition has defined European civilization and that, more broadly, of Western civilization, to include the United States. It is based on a certain set of values, and it is these values that this current American president finds himself in deep disagreement with.

Trump also rejects globalization, seeing it as an enemy of the people, and a negative force for the American interests. This is quite paradoxical, as it was always commonly believed that the U.S. is a leader of the globalizing

trend and benefits from it enormously. The EU is most certainly a part of globalization. It does endorse the free trade, something that is essential to the globalized world, and something that Trump views with dismay. The EU is opposed to the forces of nationalism, populism, and nativism, all of which Trump enthusiastically embraces. So, here, in this principled struggle, this current American President and the EU find themselves on opposite sides.

One might argue that historically, there was no stronger bond that tied the two shores of Atlantic – United States and Europe – than that of common values. Security and defence alignment mattered greatly. So did trade. But values were always at the heart of the transatlantic community. The current American President does not intend to respect this bond. Kagan opines: America "built and defended a world order premised on the idea that Americans would be safe only if democratic and liberal values were safe… But that was a choice. The United States, with all its great power, could have gone in a different direction. Now it appears to have done so" [10].

Various U.S. administrations in the post-bipolar era have manifested different types of approaches to the role that values should play in American foreign policy. The W. Clinton administration has assigned great importance to values and democracy promotion. The better known and most coherent doctrine from Clinton times was the one of the enlargement of the community of countries based on democratic and market economy principles. That included the whole-hearted support for the EU and its enlargement.

The G. W. Bush administration was all about values on the surface. It trumpeted democracy promotion. That administration was a staunch supporter of a bunch of movements that have presumably led to the triumph of a human rights-based order, including the "Orange revolution" in Ukraine. At the same time, it has often acted in a "unilateral way", with blatant disregard of the views of allies. The excessive use of force was deemed necessary to the democracy promotion. This was marred by gambles and mistakes, like the Iraq War and more.

The Barak Obama administration embarked on a course that was more subtle. The cavalier democracy promotion of the type that was supported by the previous administration was now rejected. Obama decided against throwing the full weight of the U.S. behind democracy promotion, and most definitely excluded the usage of the military force in facilitating this. We heard less about values even as his administration was doing its routine daily job in defending those values.

Trump has decided to discard the values agenda entirely. This was made known quickly. "Trump's secretary of state, Rex Tillerson, made it clear in his first substantive speech to State Department employees that American values

are now of at best secondary importance to 'American interests,' presumably economic, in the conduct of foreign policy" [4]. The President has opted against traditional liberal values in favour of the illiberal ones. He has chosen to fight globalization head on and stand for the forces of nationalism instead. The anti-globalization movement is a diverse one. We often pay more attention to those in it who represent the hard left. However, the right wing has major issues with globalization as well.

Supporting nationalism and undermining the EU. One major figure in this movement in the U.S. is Stephen Bannon. He has been long in sync with Donald Trump's thinking on this issue and has joined Trump's presidential campaign, while directing his media outlet "Breitbart" to the support of that campaign. Bannon has influenced Trump's worldview and this influence has proved lasting even though he has long left the administration. More importantly, S. Bannon has found in D. Trump a mouthpiece for his ideas not just in the context of U.S. politics but on the world stage as well. Any allies were fine, including Russia, which has long positioned itself as an opponent of liberalism. Europe was at the centre of the fight and the EU has become an enemy. Bannon has proclaimed: "There's a chasm that can't be bridged between the globalists and the nationalists" [13].

This ideology was an "assertive nationalism, a label that clearly applies to much of what Trump has said and done" [15]. There was a need now to look for allies in Europe that this administration could support in their struggle against the EU. There was no shortage of the anti-EU, anti-globalization, and illiberal political forces in Europe. As British journalist now working with "The New York Times" Patrick Kingsley has observed: "they find more ideological allies in Europe to work with" [11].

In its European policy, the administration (or at least some elements of the administration) has embarked on attacking certain governments and undermining the EU. Jeff Rathke, the former American diplomat and now the President of the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies at the Johns Hopkins University, has called it "an attempt to strengthen particular types of political forces inside Europe, particularly those that are a challenge to the governments in place." Germany was at the core of the effort. Richard Grenell, who became a U.S. ambassador to Germany in May 2018, has not wasted much time and has caused quite a diplomatic furore when he said in June 2019 that he wanted to "empower" conservatives across Europe [11].

In the meantime, Bannon has been active himself. On one of his tours to Europe, he "met with Mr. Orban; praised Italy's new government; spoke to far-right activists in France; considered creating a Breitbart-style news operation in Central and Eastern Europe … and described himself as "the infra-

structure, globally, for the global populist movement" [11]. Bannon continues work on his pet project of creating a sort of "nationalists international".

While Bannon is not formally part of the administration anymore, some of the top figures of the administration have joined the effort to support illiberal, nationalist, anti-EU forces in Europe. Secretary of State Michael Pompeo has said that "the 'human rights' rubric has been stretched in a variety of dimensions to become an important component of globalists' effort to constrain and embarrass the independent exercise of both judicial and political authority by nation-states". His European tour in February 2019 revealed where the sympathies for the administration lie, and that is with increasingly authoritarian governments in Central Eastern Europe, which have had their share of conflict with EU governing bodies. "Through his choice of destinations, Pompeo amplified divisions between countries that were formerly behind the iron curtain and those that weren't. This astutely plays on sensitivities, manipulated by demagogues that have marred the EU's capacity to unite in recent years" [14].

John Bolton has been a national security advisor since April 2018. His views on the subject are well known. Nougayrede brings attention to one particular piece written by Bolton back in 2000 and titled "Should we take global governance seriously?" In it, Bolton lashes out at "globalists" who seek to tie nation states into a web of international norms and agreements that restrict sovereignty. He says a truly democratic mandate can only exist at the national level. He calls the EU "the leading source of substantive globalist policies" and a threat to US interests. In Bolton's view, "European elites" are "not content alone with transferring their own national sovereignty to Brussels; they have also decided, in effect, to transfer some of ours to worldwide institutions and norms, thus making the European Union the miniature precursor to global governance" [14].

So, it would seem fair to say that President Trump has gradually surrounded himself with and promoted the individuals with views similar to his own, which are based on the assumption that the EU is a foe and that the natural allies for the United States in Europe are the anti-globalist, nationalist, and anti-EU forces.

The EU and Donald Trump's red flags: Immigration, Germany, and Obama's legacy. The immigration issue is at the core of Trump's connection with non-liberals and nationalists in Europe. Here they naturally find a common cause, their strongest bond, perhaps. Trump has been known for his fixation on immigration. He has pretty much made this issue one of the core items in his 2016 campaign. His promise to deal with illegal immigration has apparently resonated strongly with a lot of Americans. Little wonder that he

has doubled down on this issue ever since becoming president. Domestically in the United States, immigration has become one of the most divisive political issues.

Immigration has also rocked Europe in recent years like never before. The growth of anti-EU sentiment and dissatisfaction with certain realities of life has prepared rich soil for the anti-immigration movement. The rejection of the concept of multiculturalism has been one of the fundamental elements here. The massive influx of refugees from the Middle East has made its impact. The EU and certain European political leaders have opted in favour of welcoming this new wave of refugees and immigrants. Yet, anti-immigration forces have grown strong in various parts of Europe. This has become a major issue for intra-European politics. Trump has predictably taken the side of the anti-immigration movement and so this made him and the EU oppose each other.

This cleavage on immigration has reached its crescendo with President Trump directly attacking Angela Merkel. She took a risky but principled, moral decision to accommodate a great number of them in Germany, but also, using her weight within the EU, she has pushed it to embrace the similar approach. A political long-timer and a charismatic leader, Merkel has barely managed to remain the Chancellor. Trump quickly reacted with an extraordinary tweet: "The people of Germany are turning against their leadership as migration is rocking the already tenuous Berlin coalition. Crime in Germany is way up. Big mistake made all over Europe in allowing millions of people in who have so strongly and violently changed their culture!" [11]; this has been, indeed, "an extraordinary effort to undermine the incumbent government of an important U.S. ally" [15].

Germany has become a preferred target of the President Trump's attacks. In Trump's view of Germany, all of the issues that were mentioned above have played a role. Germany is seen as a main economic competitor, but also a main protector of the "liberal international order." It is a leader of the EU and is firmly based on the values that he abhors. It chooses to welcome immigrants and he pledges to keep them out. Kinglsey chimes in on this subject: "Few countries have struggled more to adapt to Mr. Trump than Germany, and few leaders seem less personally in sync with him than its leader, Chancellor Angela Merkel… After she won a fourth term their relationship took on weighty symbolism: the great disrupter versus the last defender of the liberal world order" [11].

The Trump – Merkel relationship is a significant factor here, indeed. She is everything that he is not (and what he dislikes): a female, an experienced, knowledgeable politician, someone with a strong set of moral principles, an

Atlanticist, an enthusiastic supporter of the European Union, and an avid opponent of populism. Merkel has worked closely and has developed an excellent relationship with Obama, and this is something that makes Trump dislike her even more. With Trump coming to the White House, some have rushed to declare Merkel a true "leader of the free world," including Trump's American liberal opponents. Merkel "was finally playing the role that American liberals had wanted her to play – that of leader of the free world" [19].

An attempt to undo the Obama's policies had become a characteristic feature of Trump's intentions. In fact, for the most part it is as simple as that: let's see what Obama did and proceed with doing the opposite. Obama has cultivated relations with the EU and particularly with European leaders. He has preferred for American policies to be in sync with those of the EU (one notable example, "close to home," so to speak, was policy towards Russia since it started aggression against Ukraine in 2014). Obama's policy was clearly a multilateral one. And then Trump came in: "The most conspicuous trait of Trump's policies has been to do the opposite of, and to try to destroy, anything significant that his predecessor accomplished." This includes "specifically, the rejection of important agreements on the environment, trade, and weapons proliferation" [15].

J. Goldberg has looked into this "anti-Obama" factor. His sources in the administration clarified: "Obama apologized to everyone for everything. He felt bad about everything." President Trump, this official said, "doesn't feel like he has to apologize for anything America does… People criticize [Trump] for being opposed to everything Obama did, but we're justified in cancelling out his policies" [9].

Regional challenges: difference of approach between the EU and the U.S. There have emerged a number of issues around the world where the U.S. and Europe stopped being in agreement since Trump became a president. One of them is policies towards Iran. As Erlanger explains: "European allies regard the pact (JCPOA – V.D.) as vital to European security and to the preservation of nuclear non-proliferation. Even more, Europeans are angry that renewed American sanctions (against Iran – V.D.) hurt European companies far more than any American ones. Ms. Merkel said the split over Iran "depresses me very much" [7].

Another problem was not just that the U.S. has left the JCPOA and introduced sanctions on Iran, but that they have now demanded that Europeans follow the suit. Wright wrote from the 2019 Munich security conference that senior U.S. administration officials repeatedly said over the past year that while the United States was pulling out of the JCPOA, they were not calling on the EU to do the same. Then, "with no explanation for the U-turn, Pence

(U.S. Vice-President Michael Pence – V.D.) demanded that the EU now withdraw from the JCPOA. His message was clear: Under Trump, the alliance means getting behind whatever Washington decides, even if that changes weekly" [19].

Another problem has emerged with regard to the INF treaty. The United States has accused Russia of violating INF for a few years now. In view of these violations, the current U.S. administration has decided to leave the treaty. Europeans and the EU have been largely silent on this whole subject until that decision was made. What bothers Europeans now is that this decision affects Europe, that it was not coordinated with Europe, and that it is not clear what might come in the place of the now defunct INF treaty. Again, Merkel had something to say on the subject: the decision to leave the INF treaty "affects European security, and there has been no alternative strategy … We sit there in the middle with the result" [7].

The U.S. – EU – China triangle of relationships is not something that can be easily discerned. The EU sees China as an important trade partner, but also as an economic competitor and a human rights violator. It is not inclined to a full-scale trade war but prefers dialogue and compromise instead. President Trump has changed his public view of China and its leaders on numerous occasions. At the moment, the U.S. is in a full-scale trade war with China. The EU is struggling to define its position on this trade war. On the one hand, it has its share of problems with China, but on the other, the EU does not want this trade war to destabilize the world economy. Again, here the EU would prefer to have some degree of coordination on this with the U.S., but this is not forthcoming. Trump sees both China and the EU as foes. In their bilateral meeting in the White House, President of France E. Macron said to Trump: "Let's work together, we both have a China problem," according to a source in the room. The source said Trump responded that the European Union is "worse than China" [17].

The challenge of climate change has been rising as one of the top priorities for the EU in the recent years. Trump does not see it as a real challenge; in light of this, the United States has left the Paris Climate Change Agreement. This has been a major negative development in the U.S. – EU relations. In fact, for European public opinion, this has been a most visible and deep disagreement between the parties in the last years.

Ongoing Russian aggression against Ukraine has been featured prominently on the transatlantic agenda. Prior to the Trump coming to the White House, the U.S. and the EU closely coordinated their positions, and they were, indeed, watertight. Since the change of guard in the White House, there has been no major divergence of positions on this issue on the surface. The EU

maintains sanctions, despite some of the business and political elites arguing in favour or returning to "business as usual" with Russia.

Trump has been somewhat ambivalent on this subject ever since his election campaign, expressing amiable view of Vladimir Putin on various occasions. He has hinted about his wish to entertain some sort of a grand deal or a bargain with Russia. However, Trump has been pretty much incapacitated in this regard due to the ongoing investigations of his personal and his campaign ties with Russia. Congress has been driving the policies in the meantime, and the administration, on its part, has not altered its position, critical of Russia and supportive of Ukraine.

One issue where the disagreement between U.S. and the EU has emerged is an issue of "Nordstream 2". While the EU has gradually consented to this pipeline, Trump and his administration have expressed their dissatisfaction. U.S. Congress has launched a process towards potential sanctions against companies involved in the project. This could become another row between the sides, and of serious scale, and certainly so between the U.S. and Germany.

What does the future hold? So, the relations between the United States and the EU are at their low point right now. The question naturally arises as to whether there is anything that could be done to improve them? What is the future of the U.S. – EU relations in the short, middle, and long term? Is the Trump phenomenon something which is an aberration or a sign of something lasting? Should the EU change its forward-thinking and strategic policies reflecting on the current state of relations?

At the moment, it seems that relationship is broken. Barring some major and unexpected change, improvement seems unlikely. Wright comments that "Western leaders are retreating into their foxholes, taking pot-shots at one another, rather than figuring out how to deal with new challenges" [19]. Many in Europe and U.S. seem to hope that Trump is going to lose in the 2020 presidential elections and that relations might go back to where they were before he came to power. At the same time, there seems to be a lack of desire on the part of the EU to make things worse by in any way retaliating against Trump's words and policies. Former senior U.S. official Victoria Nuland sums this mood up: "Europeans are holding their breath and thinking that it's maybe only two more years." They don't "want to do anything to wreck things further or to insult Trump personally and risk an angry response" [7].

Burns agrees by saying that European leaders "might be calculating that they can wait out Trump until the 2020 presidential election, when most clearly hope he will be defeated." He is cautiously optimistic as to what happens then: "Most Americans agree Europe remains vital for the United States with

the apparent exception of President Trump, whose ill-advised policies threaten to separate America from our closest allies in the world" [2].

What if Trump wins in 2020 and remains in power for four more years? This would most probably be a negative scenario for the U.S. – EU relations. If Trump wins again, he is going to feel vindicated and emboldened; he would happen to believe even more that his policies are positively resonating with Americans, that he is doing the right thing, and he will double down on those policies. Four more years of Trump will most probably do more damage to relations between the U.S. and the EU.

Cohen offers his doom and gloom vision on the probable impact of Trump's time in the White House: "Even barring cataclysmic events, we will be living with the consequences of Trump's tenure as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief for decades. Damage will continue to appear long after he departs the scene." He believes that it is quite likely "that Trump will leave key government institutions weakened or corrupted, America's foreign-policy establishment sharply divided, and America's position in the world stunted." At the same time Cohen reflects that "Trump is not entirely a historical fluke, and it is reasonable to see his foreign policy as reflecting some Americans' attitudes toward the outside world" [4]. This is, in our view, an important observation indicating that public attitudes in U.S. might, indeed, have a sizable impact on its foreign policy, including, perhaps, its relations with the EU.

Donald Trump not only reflects the attitudes of part of the electorate, but he is also very much shaping those attitudes. In his public appearances, statements, and tweets he mostly focuses on the domestic agenda, but sometimes goes into the matters of America's international politics. American columnist Jonathan Chait has cited these examples: "At his rally in North Dakota two weeks ago, he said, "Sometimes our worst enemies are our so-called friends or allies, right?" At a subsequent rally in Montana last week, the president declared, "Our allies in many cases were worse than our enemies" [3].

There are reasons to believe that Trump has, indeed, generated a political movement of sorts. It has elements of populism, nationalism, nativism, and isolationism. This ideology of 'Trumpism' will most definitely survive Trump. In "Trumpworld," the EU is not viewed favourably, as we have seen, and so this view will also be there, among public and some political forces, perhaps, when he is not in the White House anymore.

What is equally significant is that the negative view of the U.S. has also become widespread in Europe. The European public reciprocates to the mood of the Trump base. The anti-Americanism in Europe is nothing new and has long history. The wave of anti-Americanism has gotten higher in the recent two decades. The politics of the G. W. Bush administration and primarily his war

in Iraq have contributed. The eight years of Obama have improved the situation, but not dramatically. Trump in the White House is something that has pushed the levels of sympathy towards America in Europe down decisively.

In democratic societies, the role of public opinion in policy-making is something that should not be neglected. Therefore, the public attitudes of Europeans towards the U.S. are of significance. American journalist Daniel Estrin believes that even "if Trump was to be defeated (and that's a big if), a change in the White House is not going to fundamentally change the dynamics of what is happening in Europe." He quotes one recent Pew Research Centre poll that suggests that Germans believe Russia's Vladimir Putin and China's Xi Jinping handle world affairs better than Trump does [8]. Erlanger and Bennhold cite Karl Kaiser, a German scholar and a long-time analyst of German-American relations, who confirms this: "Two years of Mr. Trump, and a majority of French and Germans now trust Russia and China more than the United States" [7].

Some believe that the current rift in the U.S. – EU relations is something that could not be attributed exclusively to Trump and his destructive policies. Perhaps, the adrift of U.S. and EU moving in own directions have started earlier. It has accelerated under Trump but would not stop when he is gone. Erlanger and Bennhold deduce: "A growing number of European voices warn that the current trans-Atlantic discord has more fundamental roots and that there will be no returning to the past" [7]. One of these prominent voices is experienced German politician Norbert Rottgen, who pronounces: "Mr. Trump is not the cause … but a symptom of the tectonic shifts in geopolitics that have led to the return of great power rivalry and centrifugal forces away from multilateralism." His prognosis is that "in the post-Trump era, there is no return to the pre-Trump era. "He concludes: "The status quo was Europe's security guaranteed by the United States. That won't happen again" [7].

Michel Barnier, the former European commissioner and French foreign minister, who has been recently mostly known as EU's chief Brexit negotiator, is in agreement with his German colleague. He notes that "the United States had chosen to defend its interests with unilateral actions and pressure." In such circumstances, in his view, "outsourcing Europe's security is no longer an option." He continues that "if it wants to be taken seriously as a foreign policy player, the EU must have the power to back it up." The reality is, Barnier says, that "Europe still wields significant soft power, but we remain a hard-power minnow" and so "Europe needs a second leg to stand on" [6].

Indeed, many in Europe now think that the time when European security depended on American support and presence entirely is in the past and, therefore, Europeans must step up to the plate and learn to take care of themselves.

Merkel is one of these voices. For her "something elemental has changed across the Atlantic." She believes that "we Europeans must really take our destiny into our own hands and that the times in which we can fully count on others – they are somewhat over" [13].

If not in the security realm, the EU is becoming more assertive in the field of trade and geo-economics. Winter sees signs that the EU is moving towards "a more assertive stance against the United States." She notes that the EU is showing "growing willingness to exploit its economic power for political purposes." There is also a discussion on "European strategic autonomy." In this domain, the EU is trying to draw some lessons from Trump's antagonism.

Tocci says that Europeans are weak and divided. "We want to believe it will be fine again later (when D. Trump is gone - V.D.) because we have no alternative". For her it is about time to start working on such an alternative. And she believes that the Europeans "are beginning to do what we should," – spend more on the military, discuss some sort of European army in coordination with NATO, think more strategically as Europe in the face of Russia and China. But she cautions that "no one believes it's doable in the short run," and Erlanger and Bennhold add that "many believe it's not easily doable at all" [7].

One of those who are not objecting to Europe becoming stronger but are not seeing an alternative to American presence and protection in the meantime for the immediate future is Jan Techau, director of the Europe Program at the German Marshall Fund. He laments that "Trump does not understand the price he pays in strategic terms when he bashes his allies so publicly and openly." He agrees that America has to "pressure allies to do more," but "at the same time the message has to be "We will always be there." What worries Techau is that this current situation of ambiguity is inviting trouble for European security, that it means "strategic vulnerability" of Europe to Russia and China. If there is any ambiguity, he says, Russia and China know that the security guarantee is no longer real. "When that protection goes … then this strategic space is up for grabs" [7].

There is a danger, indeed, in this discussion of a temptation for Europe to go it alone. "America first," which has in some ways turned into "America alone," has already inflicted damage on the transatlantic community and its unity. If Europe chooses to reciprocate in a similar way, this might do even more damage. The "Europe can do it without U.S." mantra will most probably turn into a mostly hollow rhetorical exercise while, at the same time, hardly obscuring the actual inability of Europeans to take care of their own security and defence.

One of those rallying against Europe's unilateral moves is Judy Dempsey.

She has expressed her disagreement with Barnier's view, mentioned above. In her opinion, it is irresponsible to plot the "Europe alone" plan now, while knowing full well that European security depends on the U.S. [6]. Dempsey puts some hope in the fact that Ursula von der Leyen has been chosen as a president of the European Commission: "unlike the incumbent, Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker, she is a committed Atlanticist. She doesn't buy into the anti-American rhetoric that Europe has to take care of its own security and defence" [5].

The rhetoric and policies of President Trump have strained U.S. - EU relations. In many ways, they have gotten to an unprecedented low point. The President's choice to see the EU exclusively as an economic competitor, his rejection of the common traditional values behind the transatlantic community, and his intention to undermine the "liberal international order" have factored in. Trump's disagreement with the EU on the issue of immigration and his support for populist anti-EU forces in Europe have contributed. So did Trump's broken relationship with German Chancellor Merkel. At the moment, one sees in U.S. – EU relations a lack of trust, absence of a common vision on a number of strategic issues, and uncertainty about ways to move forward. The question as to whether this current negative stage in this relationship is something that might pass and give way to a more traditional cooperative mode remains an open one.

Literature

1. Barker T. What a democratic House means for Europe. Politico. 2018. November 7. https://www.politico.eu/article/

2. Burns N. Pence and Biden in Munich: stark contrast shows how Trump is running relations with Europe. Belfer centre. 2019. February 18. https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/

3. Chait J. Trump is training his base to hate NATO and like Putin. National interest. 2018. July 10. http://nymag.com/intelligencer/2018/07/

4. Cohen E. How Trump is ending the American era. The Atlantic. 2017. October. https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2017/10/

5. Dempsey J. Can Ursula von der Leyen save the transatlantic relationship? Carnegie this week. 2019. July 7. https://carnegieeurope.eu/2019/07/05/

6. Dempsey J. Europe's flawed peace policy. Carnegie this week. 2019. June 13. www.carnegieeurope.eu/strategiceurope/79285

7. Erlanger S., Bennhold K. Rift between Trump and Europe is now open and angry. The New York Times. 2019. February 17. https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/17/world/europe/

8. Estrin D. Munich security conference reveals a growing rift between U.S. and its allies. NPR. 2019. February 16. https://www.npr.org/2019/02/16/695438900/

9. Goldberg J. A senior White House official defines the Trump doctrine: "We're America, bitch". The Atlantic. 2018. June 11. https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2018/06/

10. Kagan R. Trump's America does not care. Brookings. 2018. June 17. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2018/06/17/

11. Kingsley P. As Europe's liberal order splinters, Trump wields an axe. The New York Times. 2018. June 18. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/18/world/europe/

12. Lachman D. On the road to a German-U.S. trade war. AEI. 2019. July 31. https://www.omfif.org/analysis/commentary/2019/july/

13. Landler M. Trump, the insurgent, breaks with 70 years of American foreign policy. The New York Times. 2017. December 28. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/28/us/politics/

14. Nougayrede N. Why Trump and his team want to wipe out the EU. The Guardian. 2019. February 18. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/feb/18/

15. Pillar P. How Trump is reshaping American foreign policy. National interest. 2018. June 21. https://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/

16. Schake K. The Trump doctrine is winning and the world is loosing. The New York Times. 2018. June 15. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/15/opinion/sunday/

17. Swan J. Scoop: Trump tells Macron the EU is worse than China. Axios. 2018. June 10. https://www.axios.com/

18. Winter E. Transatlantic trade - the emergence of an EU geoeconomic strategy. GMF. 2019. July 29. http://www.gmfus.org/blog/2019/07/29/

19. Wright T. The moment transatlantic charade ended. The Atlantic. 2019. February 19. https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2019/02/

CHAPTER 9

CSDP DEVELOPMENT PROSPECTS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE TRANSATLANTISM FACTOR

Olga Romanova

1. The current state of relations between the EU and US in the field of European security: general description

At the beginning of the XXI century, the European security system became complex and transatlantic in nature. The end of the Cold War and the disappearance of the threat of widespread East-West conflict have been significant factors in the evolution of the forms and content of the US-European strategic partnership in the field of European security. On the one hand, the economic potential of the European Union has grown so much that it is at odds with the military and political dependence of Western European countries on the United States. As noted by G. Andreani, S. Bertram, and H. Grant, "the persistence of a situation in which Western Europe was an economic 'giant' while remaining a military and political 'dwarf' was seen as intolerable" [16, p. 8]. On the other hand, the European Union has proved completely unprepared for modern local war, in which "it is impossible to achieve victory without the active use of military transport aircrafts, attack planes, and helicopters equipped with high-precision weapons operating in all weather conditions, as well as satellite facilities' navigation and intelligence, that is, without all that the Pentagon had but virtually Western European countries hadn't" [1, p. 37]. The result was the growing political dependence of Western Europe on the United States in resolving local military conflicts.

In 2018, French President E. Macron and German Chancellor A. Merkel once again stated the necessity of creating a "real European army" independent of the United States that would allow Western Europe to "better protect itself" [29]. It would be wise to mention, that this idea is not new in the history of the formation of the "EU military-political dimension," but at the present stage, in the context of the emergence of new challenges and threats to European security, it is gaining new importance and becoming more relevant.

Nowadays, the European Union holds 17 military and civilian (mixed) operations and missions in various regions of the world and usually takes part in resolving conflicts of low intensity. European states have not been able to supplement or replace US resources in high-intensity military operations yet.

In particular, in the Concordia operation conducted under the auspices of the EU in Macedonia under the formula "Berlin Plus," the role of the European Union was negligible. In fact, the EU's first military operation was not an

independent event, but merely an integral part of NATO's major Harmony operation. The European Union's forces numbered 300 people. Their task was to ensure the security of EU and OSCE representatives, who monitored the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. This operation, insignificant from a military point of view, was of great political importance. For the first time, EU observers acted under the protection of the EU military, without the involvement of national governments, NATO allies, or UN peacekeepers. The experience was successful [24].

In Operation Althea, which has been conducted in Bosnia and Herzegovina since 2004, according to the Berlin Plus formula, the EU contingent has become the official successor to NATO-led SFOR and IFOR contingents. It should be noted that this was the first case of subordination of foreign military forces of the European Union (outside of bilateral national treaties or partnerships within NATO or UN mandates). However, the independence of the European Union military structures is relative. The European Union Military Headquarters uses the Allied High Command (NATO) in Europe as its operational headquarters and works through the Deputy High Commander, who is, however, necessarily a European officer. The European Union forces have undertaken all NATO tasks, except for the hunt for war criminals.

The Artemis operation, which was conducted in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, was carried out mainly by the French military. The CSDP contingent of about 2,000 people (85% - French, mostly paratroopers) was quickly deployed to Bunia, the centre of the conflict. Belgium, the United Kingdom, Germany, and Greece participated together with France. Neutral Sweden also sent its contingent [3, p. 534]. The Congo Peacekeeping Mission became the third (and first outside Europe) operation by the European Union Force. The European Council endorsed the launch of the EU military operation and appointed German and French commanders. The role of the operational headquarters was taken over by the operational command of the German armed forces (in Potsdam). Within the framework of this operation, Europe acted alone, without the assistance of the United States.

The ambiguous US attitude to the role of Western Europe in the European security system affects the whole dynamics of the CSDP. According to Michael Howard, "NATO has developed a military-political infrastructure that has united the armed forces of most European countries and provided the United States with a unique opportunity to influence the policies of its allies..." [25, p. 172]. Nowadays, the United States within NATO is in control of intelligence, with the basic tools of analysis and communication, and has a high capacity for rapid response, delivery of military contingents, weapons and humanitarian assistance to any crisis point in the world. Because of their

dominant position in the Alliance, they have been given the opportunity to influence the security policies of Western European countries by virtue of the unanimity principle that determines the decisions of the Atlantic Council, the United States remains the host of the game, defining the operation in which they participate or instructing Europe to carry out an action in which they are not directly involved [28, p. 194]. In this context, French General Francois Valentine noted, "if Europe does not solve this problem for at least 10 years, it would become a US satellite for security" [36, p. 38].

The concentration of Western European military-political cooperation in NATO, in which the US occupies a leadership position, sets the limits for the development of European integration in the fields of foreign policy, security and defence. Consequently, changing the framework conditions - transforming transatlantic relations through greater responsibility for European countries - would allow them to "consistently and proactively enhance the potential of political and practical interaction in foreign policy and security, including defence" [5, p. 168].

The United States, for its part, is not satisfied with the cost of maintaining NATO, as they finance a large part of the organization's budget. According to Stockholm International Peace Research Institute US military budget in 2018 amounted to 649 billion dollars, while the five largest European defence budgets (France, UK, Germany, and Spain) - 209 billion dollars [35]. Therefore, objective prerequisites for the redistribution of responsibilities between European members of the Alliance and the United States in the field of security and defence have emerged.

The NATO Strategic Concept emphasizes that developing a European identity in security and defence, which is reflected in the strengthening of European support in the Alliance, will not only serve the interests of European countries but also enhance the unity and effectiveness of the Alliance as a whole [11]. This provision clearly characterizes the essence of the US-West European compromise and the balance of interests reached by NATO, which is characteristic of the entire subsequent period of its development. The United States has been able to influence European activity and reduce its competitive potential while retaining its leadership position and has found a strong motive for pressuring the Allies to make greater contributions to NATO. Western European countries, in turn, have been given the opportunity to overcome the American barrier to developing their own security and defence cooperation, while avoiding the erosion of the US role in Europe. Thus, NATO and the US recognized the need to create a European component to complement and strengthen transatlantic security cooperation. It should be noted that the issue of enhancing European identity in security and defence was not entirely new

to the North Atlantic Alliance. But with the formation of a new European security system, this problem has taken on other features.

2. The main problems of EU - US relations

After signing the Maastricht Treaty, relations between Western Europe and the United States, the transatlantic factor, were considered by the western politicians in the light of their impact on the development of the ESDP (the Treaty of Lisbon introduced the present name – CSDP). US policy has also evolved to reflect the desire of the European Union to create its own foreign policy and defence. At first, Americans were sceptical of the idea of forming a European system of politics and defence. Former US Secretary of State H. Kissinger ironically asked which phone number is the person responsible for the declared common foreign and defence policy (Common Foreign, Security and Defence Policies) [9, p. 36]. However, at the moment, the concept of European identity in the field of security and defence is perceived by the United States not as a remote and uncertain political landmark, but as a task of practical policy.

In examining the problem in this context, it is worth noting the US attitude to Western Europe's aspirations not only to strengthen its responsibility for the implementation of European security policy within NATO, but also to create its own defence policy. The real question for official Washington is the following questions: To what extent does the development of European autonomy in the field of security and defence not affect America's national interests? How will the European Union avoid unnecessarily duplicating the functions of NATO structures?

It is worth noting that the desire of the EU to create a separate European security system has been widely examined by many US researchers and politicians. Some perceived Western Europeans' desire for autonomy in security and defence as undermining the US position in Europe. In particular, John Bolton believed that "the EU's intention to unify defence and security policy is motivated by a partial desire to weaken the influence of the United States and partly by openly anti-American intentions" [18]. He argued that "when the United States is defeated..., there is a probability that within 10 years NATO will lose its military sense and, American political support" [19]. Commenting on the European defence problem, Peter Rodman noted that "the Atlantic allies have created a new mechanism by which Europeans have been able to act on their own discretion, using NATO's resources, but a new European initiative may, on the contrary, give Europe the opportunity to break free. Americans if they wish" [31]. On this depends, says Rodman, "the way in which it will be done... the European project, which will be a new

European security structure and how it will coordinate with the Atlantic Alliance" [31]. The American politician emphasizes that throughout the history of the EU, the United States itself has called on the European Allies to "take part of the NATO defence burden and to encourage them to coordinate their efforts to maximize the effectiveness of their efforts" [31].

Official Western European political circles, for their part, have also carefully examined Washington's position on the identified issues. In particular, former French Defence Minister Alan Richard noted that the European defence and security project "responds to the old American proposals to the Europeans to develop their national forces in order to obtain greater efficiency and better self-sufficiency, resulting in a European failure will be a common Atlantic failure, as a European success will be a common Atlantic success" [30].

Thus, over the last decade, dialogue between the United States and Western Europe on military security and defence has proved to be quite difficult and ambiguous.

On the one hand, Washington painfully refers to attempts of increasing its European ally's degree of autonomy in the military field by establishing the CSDP. American leadership fears that the Common Security and Defence Policies of the EU can lead to the dispersion of resources (if Western Europeans spend their funds for expansion of defence capabilities, that has already been done enough in the US and NATO), the creation of new bureaucratic structures, not backed by real growth of the defence potential to misunderstandings between the institutions created within the framework of the CSDP, and the NATO structures and, ultimately, to the mismatch in military in planning carried out simultaneously under the auspices of the CSDP and the North Atlantic Alliance [26]. The United States has preferred to support strengthening the European pillar of NATO rather than the Common Security and Defence Policies, because, in their opinion, it was never sufficiently integrated into NATO.

On the other hand, the US is not enjoying the situation in which Western Europe has been completely unprepared for contemporary local conflicts.

American researcher I. Daalder rightly noted that the problem of the CSDP functioning in US- West European relations "is not in its potential future strength... but in its real political weakness" [22]. As a result, in order to overcome military-political inequalities within the Alliance, NATO endorsed the European Union's decision "to have the capacity to act independently and to adopt military action when the Alliance is not involved" [11]. NATO leaders also expressed their willingness to identify the mechanisms needed to give European countries access to much of the Alliance's military resources

and capabilities to respond to the EU-led crisis within NATO [10, p. 7].

While welcoming European defence initiatives as a whole, the United States at the same time emphasizes that America welcomes European defence plans to the extent that they will help strengthen NATO and the United States as a whole and opposes the development of separate defence structures that are incompatible with NATO structures. M. Albright described this basic setup according to Washington's formula: during the construction of the CSDP, the European Union should avoid the three 'Ds' – duplication, decoupling, discrimination. The first 'D' (duplication) means that the EU, while developing its military and political mechanisms, must refrain from duplicating NATO's actions and efforts. The second 'D' (decoupling) does not allow the US to remove itself from the solution of European security problems. The third 'D' (discrimination) requires the exclusion of "discrimination" against non-EU and NATO members [15, p. 21].

In principle, Washington is ready for consensus if it does not directly affect its national interests. In a report by the United States Department of Defence and Administration, "Strengthening Transatlantic Security is the American Strategy in the 21st Century," the United States expressed concerns about Western Europe's persistent desire to form its own, more autonomous, North Atlantic, and its so-called defence issues. America strongly rejects any capacity to create and operate independent military planning bodies within the EU. The Pentagon concluded that their formation could lead in the future to the bloc's loss of the status of the basic component of the new regional security structure, which in turn would lead to a diminishing role of the US in European affairs, weakening their influence on the course and nature of the processes taking place in the regions. Thus, one of the pressing problems for the US in transatlantic relations is the operational planning and management of troops during the crisis. If the United States has shown a certain loyalty to the active involvement of Europeans in defining the structures of NATO forces, strategic and operational command of current operations, particularly in the Balkans, remains a US priority [17, p. 161].

To avoid accusations by NATO of duplication of its military structures with the European Union, it was confirmed at the EU summit in Nice that the North Atlantic Alliance would retain its position as the main defence and security structure in Europe. Moreover, the final outcome document excludes provisions on the EU's autonomous decision-making initiation and conduct of non-NATO operations.

Then, two key areas of transatlantic defence co-operation have become the basis for operational planning for crisis operations and the harmonization of NATO and EU defence capabilities. As noted by Pol de Witte, the

Head of Section of the Department of Political Affairs and Security Policy, a real breakthrough in establishing formal relations of the European Union and NATO took place after the adoption of the "Declaration of the EU – NATO – ESDP," through which a number of documents on cooperation in Crisis regulation known as Berlin Plus were approved. The main purpose of these arrangements was the elimination of unnecessary duplication of the organization and the adaptation of NATO's military planning system, taking into account the Allies' allocation of forces and overall resources for EU operations [8]. In accordance with the Berlin Plus Agreements, strategic and operational planning for crisis prevention operations was carried out by the HQ of NATO Allies in Europe. The EU's Operational Commander has been appointed as a Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the NATO Joint Force in Europe. Thus, all military and political crisis management and planning had to be carried out within the North Atlantic Alliance, with direct US influence. The Belgian proposal to set up an EU Operational Planning Headquarters in the Brussels suburb of Tervuren "greatly influenced the formation of a negative view of European defence in Washington" [4]. The United States has come to the conclusion that if the EU creates a basic European defence organization with its own operational planning staff, it will lead to duplication and, ultimately, to a rivalry with HQ of NATO Allies in Europe. The compromise was the initiative of the European Union to create a small group of operational planners at the HQ of NATO Allies in Europe, which would coordinate EU-NATO relations in the conduct of the Berlin-plus missions when the European Union borrows NATO forces and resources. As a result of the decision of the Big Three (France, Germany, and the United Kingdom), the European Union has the right to plan and carry out anti-crisis operations as follows:

– the operation will be carried out within the framework of Berlin-plus arrangements using NATO resources (implementation of the EU Peacekeeping Mission in Bosnia);

– the operation will be conducted autonomously by the EU with the help of national headquarters (Operation Artemis in the Congo);

– the operation is conducted autonomously by the EU military headquarters if the peacekeeping aspects play a significant role. For this purpose, an appropriate operational civilian-military planning unit is set up at the EU military headquarters [14].

Two options for EU involvement in peacekeeping are being considered in Brussels: using Allies resources (based on Berlin Plus arrangements) or relying on the military capabilities of an EU member state to host the operation. Most attention is given to crisis areas in the immediate vicinity of the EU borders (the Balkans, North and Central Africa, the Middle East).

In 2016 the European Union Global Strategy was introduced which have given the CSDP a new impetus. EU-NATO cooperation constitutes an integral pillar of the EU's work aimed at strengthening CSDP as part of the implementation of the EU Global Strategy. It also contributes to Trans-Atlantic burden sharing. On July 2016, the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission together with the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization signed a Joint Declaration in Warsaw with a view to giving new impetus and new substance to the EU-NATO strategic partnership. Declaration outlined seven concrete areas where cooperation between the two organisations should be enhanced: **1.** countering hybrid threats; **2.** operational cooperation including at sea and on migration; **3.** cyber security and defence; **4.** defence capabilities; **5.** defence industry and research; **6.** exercises; **7.** supporting Eastern and Southern partners' capacity-building efforts [37].

On the basis of the mandate by the Joint Declaration common sets of proposals were endorsed by the EU and NATO Councils in December 2016 and 2017. Four progress reports have been submitted highlighting main achievements and added value of EU-NATO cooperation in different areas. On 10 July, 2018, the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission together with the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization signed a second Joint Declaration in Brussels calling for swift and demonstrable progress in implementation.

The strategic partnership between the EU and NATO is currently reflected at tactical and operational level in the existing cooperation and coordination between EUNAVFOR MED Operation Sophia (ENFM) and Operation Sea Guardian in the Central Mediterranean. The two military operations actively exchange information.

Cooperation between the EU and NATO is now the established norm and daily practice and continues to take place on the basis of key guiding principles: openness, transparency, inclusiveness and reciprocity, in full respect of the decision-making autonomy and procedures of both organisations without prejudice to the specific character of the security and defence policy of any Member State.

3. EU - US relations development scenarios

Thus, the idea of a "division of responsibility" between the United States and the European Union in the field of European security in the practical realm may be further implemented under two possible scenarios.

Scenario 1.

The European Union, which has exceptional capabilities in coordinating

the multilateral and multifunctional civilian aspects of crisis management, can take responsibility for civilian and military forms of security at the lower and middle levels of hostilities [8]. The United States, according to Tom Donnelly, "based on a purely fighting capability, is tasked with completing advanced tasks" [6]. In this context, the security regulations of the North Atlantic Alliance will need to ensure the rapid planning and continuity of the transition from one stage of the intensity of the fighting to another. US researcher Christopher Bennett believes that "when both of these organizations (EU and NATO) work together to achieve a common goal, as they did in 2001 in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, they can be a powerful force in conflict prevention and crisis management regulation" [2]. The Concordia operation in Macedonia has also intensified the EU's ability to regulate European security issues in practical cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. According to Julian Lindley-French, the Director of the European Security Policy Branch at the Geneva Centre for Security Policy, a "new transatlantic agreement" between the EU and the US implies that Americans will learn peacekeeping, and Europeans will be rearmed for military actions [8]. In the future, such cooperation in the field of crisis management can become quite effective and complementary. In this regard, says Robert Hunter, "The United States should welcome European efforts to develop greater unity in security, which help support European defence spending and provide an incentive to modernize military forces, enabling our European allies to take on a greater part of the public transatlantic burden" [26]. From this perspective, the development of European identity in the fields of foreign, security, and defence policy can further strengthen the potential of crisis management, both of the North Atlantic Treaty Union and of the EU. According to M. Brown, "relations with Europe are the key to the success of American foreign policy... and US military intervention in European affairs serves to advance national interests" [20, p. 23].

In the context of emerging threats such as world terrorism, transatlantic relations are also of particular importance to US defence policy. Given that the intensification of US activity in the world triggers negative reactions in the form of terror by 'non-Western' societies, i.e. systems with a low degree of compatibility with the US, the need for the United States to support the European Union as a strong military ally and a system of high degree of compatibility with the US will grow. "A healthy relationship with Europe, says S. Huntington, is a major tool for the United States to escape loneliness in its superpower status" [27, p. 35].

Thus, the further modernization of the European security system is increasingly dependent on the degree of intensification of transatlantic coop-

eration, which is equally important for the European Union and the United States. In this regard, it is planned to pay particular attention in the future to the interoperability of their strategic cultures and military capabilities. H. Solana's paper "A Secure Europe in a Better World," advanced the thesis on the formation of a new strategic culture in Europe: "We need to create a strategic culture that encourages early, rapid and, if necessary, hard intervention". For this, Solana's paper notes, it is necessary to first increase resources for military needs in order to create more 'flexible' and mobile forces. At the same time, the paper clearly underscores the need to strengthen Euro- Atlantic relations: "Together, the European Union and the United States can finally become a significant force on a global scale" [32, p. 15]. To this end, work on the European Military Capacity Action Plan and NATO's Prague Commitment to Improve Defence Capacity should be progressively harmonized. The selection procedures for benchmarks based on the benchmarks that are indirectly present in both documents need to clearly agree with each other. Then, it also needs to pay more attention to the harmonization of EU Rapid Reaction Force of the NATO Response Force (NRF) with the prospect of their common use in operations to prevent crises. Herewith, NRF will provide a higher level of response than EU Rapid Reaction Force and can act as a powerful force that can create change. As a result, NATO will have the task of establishing synergies between the US and Western Europe in their shared pursuit of international security, thereby providing a basic defence guarantee. This development of transatlantic cooperation in the future involves the gradual transformation of NATO to Euro-Atlantic Union where unconditional American leadership will be balanced by the European core – conductor CSDP.

Scenario 2.

The practical implementation of the adopted military-technical programs requires Western Europe to coordinate more closely and to allocate significant financial resources to the creation of an adequate material base for the European defence system. As there is a strong probability that the failure of Western Europe to overcome the enormous quality military and technical disparity that exists between the United States and its European allies in the near future will create further complications for the successful development of CSDP.

As a consequence, the question arises as to the justification for talking about future productive cooperation between the EU and NATO in the presence of certain contradictions. In this context, J.-I. Hein notes that "transatlantic differences should be understood as differences with US policy, not NATO" [23, p. 132]. R. Kagan calls out all the reasons for the existence of strategic differences between the US and the EU, such as the "difference

between the paradigms of strategic culture, the ideological chasm that has caused Europe to refuse to use conflict resolution and leaving this task to the US, and the technological separation of the United States from Europe in the field of arms", reinforced by Europe's unwillingness to increase military spending [7 , p. 37].

To Washington, the main assessment criterion of CSDP remains "the EU's share in the division of financial and military and political burden in terms of military security (burden sharing)" [13, p. 46]. Despite the fact that in the aggregate, the economy of Western Europe competes with that of the United States, defence spending in Europe for military purposes is less than half that of the United States. Moreover, this amount is spent on that has a little value in relation to new force design missions, which are in major concern to the United States. As noted by a former State Department and Pentagon staffer E. Wayne Merry, "in Europe, the problem is that much of the military's spending is only remotely related to defence, because it is directly or indirectly assigned to job creation, preservation of the model of surplus, albeit inefficient, "balanced" national defence structures" [13, p. 56]. In order to correct NATO's imbalance during the Alliance's Washington Summit, the Defence Capabilities Initiative was adopted, aimed at enhancing the level of interaction between the US and Western Europe in the course of future joint operations. But the implementation of this initiative did not have enough resources allocated by Western European countries to increase their military and technical capabilities. The level of coordination of military R&D (Research & Development) in the US is much higher than in Western Europe, where local military industrial complexes lead to fierce competition with each other, resulting in inefficiency and duplication.

One option for the creation of the material base of the European defence system could become a significant restructuring of the MIC (military-industrial complex) through the merger of the largest national and international corporations producing advanced weapons. This requires an increase in the share of EU Member States' military budgets. In general, European countries are far from being able to significantly increase military spending, "if the United States are spending 3.2% of GNP for military purposes, then the United Kingdom is spending only 2.8 (and is going to reduce this share to 2.4%), France - 2.6, and Germany - 1.5 (aiming to reach the level of 1.1%)" [21]. The process of creating a European Rapid Response Force has also faced serious financial, technological, political, and bureaucratic problems. In these circumstances, according to G. Andriani, S. Bertram, and H. Grant, Europeans are unlikely to do without American technical and organizational capabilities in conducting their military operations within the framework of the Petersburg tasks [16,

p. 78]. NRF can become a serious competitor for the EU Rapid Reaction Force. As a result, cooperation in the area of crisis management in the US and the EU, instead of being complementary, will become competitive and inefficient. In the future, as some military experts predict, joint operations involving Americans and their European allies would simply be impossible from an operational and military-technical point of view. The official US approach to the European Allies will increasingly be built on the principle of "coalitions of the willing and able," in which only the United States and those countries that can and want to bring real weight contribution to the establishment and operation of the NRF, will have the weight and voting rights in the North Atlantic alliance. The apparent imbalance in the potential between US forces and the armed forces of European countries could turn NATO into a useful tool for US governance and military strategy. In particular, under the influence of the United States, the new NATO Strategic Concept has already raised the need for military operations outside the traditional area of responsibility and for NATO to play a leading role in the formation of a new Europe, in the construction of a new Euro-Atlantic security system [33]. It was determined that the European security and defence system itself should only develop within NATO. The globalization of the Alliance's functions, that is, the Alliance's ability to intervene militarily in military conflicts anywhere in the world, has been enshrined at conceptual and practical levels.

Also, one of the main ideas of NATO reform, by Western researchers R. Hunter and M. Brown, is the idea of changing the balance of responsibility between NATO and the UN in favour to the former. According to Washington, "not every kind of hostilities should be conducted in accordance with the direct mandate of the UN Security Council" [34, p. 13]. In this case, the US course on globalization of NATO's sphere of activity, giving it a leading role in conflict resolution, could lead to major changes in the entire international relations system in the future, based on the central role of the UN and the UN Security Council. This situation, in turn, forms another imbalance between Western Europe and the United States, dubbed by Jack Threddenik, a 'Strategic Conceptual Imbalance' that can be broadly regarded as a significant difference between the two concepts of security - based on law and on the basis of force - undoubtedly reflects the distinction between European and American philosophy of the use of force [12, p. 84]. In this context, European strategic thinking is focused on so-called 'multilateralism,' which involves, firstly, the widespread use of international institutions (UN) to ensure international security and, secondly, collective decision-making procedures. In contrast to this approach, 'unilateralism' (a term increasingly used in academia to characterize the foreign and military policies of the US Republican admin-

istration) formulates foreign policy and military strategies, focusing solely on their own assessments and interests, without considering the views of the Allies. In this approach, multilateral international organizations are viewed not so much as a collective decision-making tool but as a decision-making tool in Washington.

Further, the tendency of the formation of two imbalances between the US and Western Europe: the 'potential imbalance' and the 'strategic conceptual imbalance' may lead to the final approval of the centre-right model of organizing a European security system with unconditional American global leadership. This, in turn, will adversely affect further development of a 'European identity' in foreign policy, security, and defence, reducing its content to a coherent EU course in the wake of US global politics.

Thus, the role and place of the CSDP in the new European security system in the context of transatlantic relations largely depends on the ability of Western Europe to overcome the first balance of military capabilities for several years and prevent the development of a second conceptual imbalance.

References

1. Батюк В. И. Отношения США и НАТО в начале XXI века. США-Канада: Экономика, политика, культура. 2003. № 10. С. 31-44.

2. Беннет К. Выстраивая надежные партнерские отношения. НАТО-ревью. 2003. № 3. С. 7–12.

3. Буторина О. В. Европейская интеграция. М.: Деловая литература, 2011. 720 с.

4. Грант Ч. Оживляя европейское сотрудничество в области обороны. НАТО-ревью. 2003. № 6. С. 4-8.

5. Дойбнер К. Дифференцированная интеграция: переходное явление или структурный признак будущего Европейского Союза? Политика и современная история. 2003. № 2. С. 29-40.

6. Доннелли Т. Переосмысливая НАТО. НАТО-ревью. 2003. № 2. С. 3–5.

7. Каган Р. Про рай і владу. Америка і Європа у новому світовому порядку. Львів, 2004. 133 с.

8. Линдли-Френч Д. Обязывающие святи. НАТО-ревью. 2003. № 4. http://www.nato.int/

9. Мартинов А. Спільна зовнішня та оборонна політика Європейського Союзу: проблеми формування та перспективи реалізації (90-ті роки ХХ століття). Людина і політика. 2001. № 5. С. 35–48.

10. Пошук нового балансу трансатлантичного партнерства. НАТО сьогодні. Брюссель, 2002. С. 5-8.

11. Стратегічна концепція Альянсу: Затверджена главами держав і урядів, які взяли участь у засіданні Північноатлантичної ради у Вашингтоні (федеральний округ Колумбія) 23-24 квітня 1999. Офіц. Вид. Брюссель, 1999. 19 с.

12. Тредденик Д. Глобализация, международная безопасность и НАТО. США – Канада: Экономика, политика, культура. 2004. № 3. С. 70-87.

13. Уэйн М. Е. Delenda est NATO. США-Канада: Экономика, политика, культура. 2003. № 10. С. 45-68 .

14. Эрхарт Х.-Г. Становление политики безопасности Европейского Союза. Международная политика. 2004. № 3. С. 8-17.

15. Albright M. The right balance will secure NATO's future. Financial Times. 1998.12.07. P. 16.

16. Andreani G., Bertram C., Grant Ch. Europe's Military Revolution. London, 2002. 322 p.

17. Bail P.-Y. Le. La structure de forces de l'OTAN. Défense nationale. 2001. № 5. P. 159-163.

18. Bolton J. R. European Common Foreign, Security and Defense Policies – implications for the United States and Atlantic Alliance: Statement before the Committee on International Relation. House of Representatives, 10 November 1999.   http://www.aeg.org/ct/ctbolton4.htm

19. Bolton J. R. Risking NATO's Future? House of Representatives, 31 October 2000. http://www.aie.org/ra/ rajb31.htm

20. Brown M. Minimalist NATO. A Wise Alliance Knows When to Retrench. Foreign Affairs. 1999. May-June. P. 21-39.

21. Budget Highlights. Office of management and Budget. http:// www.whitehouse.gov

22. Daalder I. Europe and America Aren't Divorcing. http://www.brook.edu/ wiews / op.ed//daalder/199911210.htm

23. EU Security and Defence Policy. The first five years (1999-2004), ed. by G. Gnesotto. Paris: European Union Institute for Security Stadies, 2004. 296 p.

24. EUFOR, European Union Forces. http://eufor.com.ua/articles/facts/50-eufor.html

25. Howard M. An Unhappy Successful Marriage. Security Means Knowing What to Expect. Foreign Affairs. 1999. Vol. 78. № 3. P. 164-175.

26. Hunter R. E. European Common Foreign, Security and Defense Policies – implications for the United States and Atlantic Alliance: Statement before the Committee on International Relation. House of Representatives, 10 November 1999. http://www.brook.edu/views/op.ed/hunter/

27. Huntington S. The Lonely Superpower. Foreign Affairs. 1999. March-April. P. 32-45.

28. Jessel J. Le XXI siècle: avec ou sans la France ? Paris: L'Harmattan, 1997. 237 p.

29. Merkel joins Macron in calling for a 'real, true European army'. The Guardian. 2018.13.11. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/nov/13/merkel-joins-macron-in-calling-for-a-real-true-european-army

30. Paradoxes euro-americains sur la defense. Le Monde. 2 juin 2000.   http:// www. inopressa.ru/lemond/2000/06/2

31. Rodman P. European Common Foreign, Security and Defense Policies – implications for the United States and Atlantic Alliance. Statement before the Committee on International Relation, House of Representatives. 1999. November 10. http://www.nixoncenter.org/publications/testimony/11_10_99. europe.html/

32. Solana J. A Secure Europe in a Better World. European Council. Thessaloniki, 20.06.2003. P. 4-15.

33. Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Adopted by Heads of State and Government at the NATO Summit in Lisbon 19-20 November 2010. https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_publications/20120214_strategic-concept-2010-eng.pdf

34. The Future of NATO: The Washington Summit. House of Commons. Session 1998-99. London, 1999. p. XIII.

35. Tian N., Fleurant A., Kuimova A., Wezeman P. D., Wezeman S. T. Trends in world military expenditure, 2018. SIPRI Fact Sheet (29.04.2019). https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2019-04/fs_1904_milex_2018.pdf

36. Viriot J.-M. L'autonomie, clé de voûte d'une véritable défense européenne. Défense nationale. 2011. № 2. P. 35-44.

37. EU-NATO cooperation – Factsheets. Bruxelles, 11.06.2019. https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/28286/eu-nato-cooperation-factsheet_nl

CHAPTER 10

THE EU STATES POSITION
AS FOR THE TERMINATION OF THE INF TREATY

Polina Sinovets

On August 2, 2019, the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty was terminated. The Treaty is well known not only for the fact that in 1987 it became the first evidence of the end of the Cold War, but also for making Europe the main beneficiary while it was signed by the two nuclear superpowers. The reduction of the US-Russian mutual rivalry led to the withdrawal and the final liquidation of US and Soviet intermediate-range missiles based in Europe, which tremendously reduced the number of targets in the region. On the other hand, the withdrawal of the INF range missiles enhanced strategic stability by prolonging the missiles' flying time between Moscow and Washington. Therefore, the likelihood of nuclear war was substantially reduced due to the creation of special conditions favourable for bringing détente to the international system.

The termination of the INF Treaty, provoked by Russia and initiated by the United States in the winter of 2019, will also affect Europe. The main question is whether the EU states have any plan of neutralizing future negative consequences of the failure of the INF Treaty. This question is also about Europe's readiness to play a wider role in vital arms control treaties, an even more active one than it was playing before.

Because most of the EU states are also members of NATO (except neutral Austria and Sweden), research and explanation of the EU's position on the INF as a military-political treaty are possible via the understanding of NATO's position.

On the eve of the Treaty's termination on July 14th, 2019, the EU High Representative F. Mogherini stated: "We are deeply concerned over developments regarding the INF Treaty, which could end on 2 August 2019... In that regard, substantial and transparent actions must be taken immediately to ensure full and verifiable compliance with the INF Treaty provisions. The upcoming days represent the last opportunity for dialogue and taking the necessary measures to preserve this important component of European security architecture" [1].

The history of the INF Treaty. It is hardly possible to analyse the current situation without understanding history. It is worth mentioning that in 1976, the Soviet Union deployed "Pioneer" intermediate-range missiles in Ukraine, Belarus, and Eastern Europe. In response, Europeans urged the US to deploy

its INF missiles on the territories of certain NATO states, in particular, the UK, FRG, and Italy (the so-called "Euromissiles crisis"). Simultaneously, Washington suggested to Moscow that they both get rid of all intermediate-range land-based missiles. This approach, based on the deployment of missiles on the one hand and the offer to dismantle them on the other, got the name of "dual-track decision." It resulted in a mutual compromise between Moscow and Washington, according to which the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty was discussed and signed in 1987.

This treaty became the first arms control agreement, which put an end to the Cold War and started a strategic dialogue between two nuclear superpowers. According to the Treaty, both states banned land-based missiles with a range between 500 and 5500 km. The INF was strictly about missiles, no matter what kind of warheads they carried; however, most of the missiles of that class were loaded with nuclear warheads at that time. Finally, the US and Russia got rid of all INF range missiles, however, this issue was raised again by the United States in 2014. Washington condemned Moscow for testing missiles forbidden by the INF and since 2017 for deploying 9M729 (SSC-8 according to NATO classification), which, according to the US intelligence information, is intermediate-range. Since 2018, European NATO allies supported the US's allegations against Moscow. However, the idea of terminating the INF as a failed treaty turned out to be not so attractive to them as it used to be for Washington.

As a matter of fact, the suspension of the INF Treaty in February 2019 and its final termination in August this year threatens to change the situation if not to a new Cold War, then to its quite unpleasant replication. Gorbachev's coming to power in the mid-1980s was a turning point for the Soviet policy as the new political thinking prepared Moscow to compromise with the West. The revanchist policy of Vladimir Putin looks very different in this sense; therefore, military pressure attempts against Moscow may have dangerous results with European security at stake.

The first EU reaction to the INF termination emphasized the special concern of Europeans related to the INF Treaty: "a pillar of European security architecture since it entered into force 30 years ago" [2]. EU called for Russia and the US to remain in the framework of constructive dialogue to preserve the INF and to ensure its full and verifiable implementation.

The violation of the INF Treaty and Russian motivation: the European view. This part is mostly based on the materials of the workshop, held at Odessa Centre for Non-proliferation on May 3, 2019. The study covers five states and provides an analysis of their positions by experts from respective countries. These states are the two nuclear powers of Europe: Great Brit-

ain and France; the states that were involved in the "dual-track decision" and "Euro missiles crisis" of the 1980s: Germany and Italy; and, finally, "the frontline state" bordering with Russia – Poland.

The studies proceed from an in-depth analysis of on- and off-the-record interviews and statements by government officials and parliamentarians, the assessment of public opinion and mass media reactions, to content analysis of the politicians' speeches and the opinions of the experts in the field.

The research is based on the number of key questions to which the experts were trying to respond. In particular:

The first question: "Has Russia violated the INF treaty?" got very different answers and reactions in different NATO states.

For example, the UK and Germany's positions on the one hand vis-à-vis France and Italy on the other.

The UK is a member of the "Five eyes intelligence" together with the US, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Therefore, it is quite obvious that since the beginning of the "INF crisis," London supported the US, who was regularly sharing confidential information with the British intelligence community. Answering questions as to whether London has "independently verified Russian non-compliance," Sir Alan Duncan, the Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth office replied: "It is not appropriate for us to comment on individual intelligence-gathering exercises of that sort, but what I would say is that we have monitored things very carefully. We agree with the US assessment that Russia is in violation… I will not go into any more detail, other than to say that, in our view, the intelligence is absolutely clear" [3]. According to the information from London, the range of the new Russian missile is about 2500 km; therefore, it seems to threaten all the territory of Europe.

Similar to London, Warsaw was also one of the first European states who started to raise the issue of Russian non-compliance with INF. In particular, first, it happened in July 2014, one day after the US alleged Russia was breaking the Treaty. The MFA of Poland expressed their anxiety in an official statement. It emphasized the role of the INF Treaty as "one of the foundations of the arms control and nuclear disarmament regime" and noted that it made a significant contribution to European security. In that statement, Poland called on Russia to "provide comprehensive explanations" and "to return to the observance of the Treaty" [4].

Concerning Germany, there is certain consensus in the German government that Russia "clearly" breached the INF Treaty. This conclusion was made after the exchange of information with US intelligence [5].

The positions of Rome and Paris regarding the Russian breach of the INF

look completely different. In particular, the Italian government never officially spoke about Russian violation. However, joining the Alliance position, Rome supported "NATO Foreign Ministers' statement" on the INF Treaty, published on December 4th, 2018 [6].

Paris, which used to trust only its national intelligence information, was also restraining from any firm statements on the Russian violations since December 2017, when it supported the NATO Foreign Ministers' statement. Corentin Brustlein (IFRI) commented: "Even though the US brought the case for a Russian violation to their NATO allies a few years ago, it seems only to have shared credible intelligence very late" [7]. It is a matter of fact that even after joining the December statement, Paris always refrained from direct accusations of Russia violating the INF Treaty [8].

The second question: "What was the reason for Moscow to deploy the banned missile and what consequences will these actions have?"

Giving his comments at the parliamentary hearings regarding the INF suspension and the consequences of Russian violations, a representative of the French MFA highlighted that the political consequences of 9M729 overwhelm the military ones for France. Similar to the Euromissile crisis of the 1980s, the main concern is the strategic decoupling between the US and Russia. It seems that this fear relies on the idea that the perspective of Russian strikes on the European theatre may prevent Washington from fulfilling its obligations according to the NATO Charter Article 5, providing Moscow with the escalation dominance. One more level of challenges appears from NATO's enlargement following the Cold War and the flexible variants of power projection by Russia, as well as the decoupling of European NATO allies (Eastern European states are more vulnerable to Moscow and Western Europeans are less vulnerable) [9].

Unlike France, Poland is more concerned with the military consequences of Russian missile SSC-8 (9M729). According to Tomasz Szatkowski, the Deputy Minister of National Defence, these missiles threaten all European NATO territory significantly, contributing to Russian military efforts to pressure Europe and to differentiate the level of security at both sides of the Atlantics. Similarly, one Polish diplomat in NATO emphasized that SSC-8 "must be seen in the context of Russia's broader defence strategy" ... pointing out the role "that nuclear weapons play in Russian 'escalation dominance' strategy [10]. The ideas mentioned above correspond to the traditional Polish anxiety that in a conflict with NATO, Russia may attempt to prevent the Alliance from enhancing its Eastern flank, threatening it with nuclear weapons or just its conventional PGMs use. Most of the non-state experts defined SSC-8 as nuclear-capable. Still, some of them also noted the importance of such a missile for a conventional strike [10].

The UK has not mentioned its official interpretation of Russian motivations to deploy SSC-8. British officials noted political imperatives, admitting that SSC-8 is a "part of a broader project to reassert Moscow's military power after the collapse of the Soviet Union" [3]. At the military-technical level, Alan Duncan declared that Russians probably consider this missile system more mobile, cheaper, and perhaps less vulnerable" compared to air- or sea-launched options [3]. The last point is easy to explain with the large territories Russia has always had. Due to this fact, it traditionally relied on land-based missiles. In this context, British politicians regard the strategy of decoupling NATO as too obvious and not primary. As "the very fact that [the Russians] have sought to conceal [the deployment] suggests that their primary objectives in pursuing this system have been the military ones" [3].

The means to overcome the consequences of the INF Treaty termination

Arms control. The important issue is also the efforts of Europeans to overcome the obvious consequences of the INF collapse. In particular, we divided all arms control initiatives currently appearing in Europe and the military measures the Europeans are ready to use.

Some of the arms control initiatives seem to be universally shared by most of the influential European states.

In particular, the first initiative is the restoration of the INF Treaty due to the involvement of new members, such as China. In spite of the fact the Chinese do not see their responsibility regarding the INF Treaty, European states intend to keep pressuring Beijing using all possible arguments.

Also, most of the states involved in the research support the existing mechanisms of arms control. In particular, the New START Treaty is especially important for the European NATO allies. The New START remains the only arms control treaty in force between Russia and the US after the INF collapsed. It serves as a certain assurance of their strategic relations transparency. The failure to extend the New START will inevitably accelerate the arms race between Moscow and Washington and also aggravate all strategic stability problems already existing between the two nuclear giants.

Additionally, we can speak about certain differences between European states in their arms control approaches.

Germany is the state with the widest number of arms control initiatives. Notably, Heiko Maas, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, has pledged to make "proposals for a comprehensive regime that creates transparency for missiles and cruise missiles" and to "advance discussions on an international set of rules that will, for example, also include cruise missiles" [5]. The Missile Dialogue Initiative was established for this purpose [5].

Roderich Kiesewetter, a CDU MP and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and SPD MP Rolf Mützenich, a member of the Foreign Affairs and Defence Committees, independently made suggestions in the German parliament to remove the 9M729 systems over the Urals to prevent these missiles from reaching the territory of Europe. Kiesewetter also called for building a new dialogue or "controlled armament" if this strategy fails. It means "agreement on specific limitations for INF Treaty-range sea-, air-, and ground-launched missiles" [5].

It is also worth mentioning that German experts work intensively looking for a resolution to the INF crisis. In particular, they focus on the role of European states. Ulrich Kuhn claims that Europe must pursue its interests in the INF dialogue between Russia and the US. Europeans should make it clear to the US that "they will not automatically endorse a new American call for forward-deployed American INF-range missiles on European soil" [11] as it brings the significant risk for them. Moreover, Kuhn believes that Europe should take the primary role in the development of the new system of arms control. Besides involving China, it also means creating additional initiatives in the field of nuclear security and strategic stability. In particular, it means codification of mutual obligations taken by the US and Russia simultaneously on the missile deployment locations: non-deployment of US missiles in Europe and removal of Russian missiles over the Urals. In the case of new missiles' deployment, security may be enhanced by separating the deployed missiles and their warheads, thus increasing the time necessary for preparing the launch [11].

In general, arms control is considered the major tool for most of the states; however, few of them seriously believe that these measures will be effective. In particular, Moscow's return to compliance is the most doubtful issue.

In the UK, May's conservative government believed that it adhered to the idea of preserving effective arms control agreements. However, it always emphasized that the effectiveness of the treaty is measured by the readiness of the parties to comply. The Labour party also touched upon the idea of multilateralization of the INF Treaty. Though, the government never publicly admitted the possibility of the INF extension: "for that to happen such countries would need to be persuaded of the benefits of eliminating their missiles" [3].

Poland's position is close enough to the British one. In particular, in November 2018, Prime Minister T. Morawiecki declared the necessity of a new treaty substituting the INF. In spring 2019, the Minister of Foreign Affairs Czaputowicz suggested pursuing the new treaty involving Russia, the US, and China as well as other states, possessing INF range missiles. At the same time, the Polish government never believed that it would be easy to reach a

compromise, pushing further agreement. In March 2019, Czaputowicz asked hypothetically if NATO could persuade Russia to conclude the new agreement without enhancing its military measures. The Minister also claimed that the USSR signed the INF only due to the military pressure created by the US missiles deployment in Europe [12].

In general, the main feature of the Polish approach to the arms control is the firm position of the Polish government on the principle of "no unilateral concessions to Russia." Poland always stood against NATO's unilateral steps towards Russia, which could undermine the Alliance's deterrence credibility and successful defence policy. Consequently, Poland probably will be against any agreements permitting Russia to preserve any preponderance over NATO, such as the freeze of the intermediate-range missiles in Europe [10].

As for the mechanisms of cooperation, the Italian parliamentarians suggested involving different channels of communication with Russia, particularly the European Union, Special verification commission, and the NATO-Russia Council [10].

Military measures. Regarding the introduction of military measures to counteract Russian missiles, it is worth mentioning that most of the researched states regard such a possibility as the least desirable.

Germany's position can be characterized by the statement by its MFA H. Maas that the deployment of the INF missiles in Europe will be "the wrong answer" [5]. It means that any measures enhancing defence against Russian missiles should not look like the "tit-for-tat strategy practiced in the 1980s," resembling the situation of the Euromissile crisis [5].

The UK Ministry of Defence also stated that any decision on the deployment of missiles should be made in the light of the Russian threat growing and its perception by NATO. Therefore, they believe that it is too early to make any decisions in this regard yet. In fact, London does not exclude any military measures; however, they should appear as the result of the common Alliance's decision [3].

The Polish position looks more radical in this regard. Since the end of 2018, the Polish government publicly emphasized the necessity of the common NATO reaction on the Russian violations. In February 2018, Szatkowski welcomed the NATO decision to work out common military measures and also pointed out that that the Alliance must not tolerate a "vacuum" and "weakness" in "an important segment of strategic balance" [10]. He also stressed that the absence of such a reaction would be disadvantageous for Poland.

Contrary to some mass media speculations, it is worth noting that in spite of the general firmness of the Polish position, Warsaw has never publicly requested the deployment of the American INF missiles on its territory. In Feb-

ruary 2019, Czaputowicz even commented that Poland "does not wish that to happen at all." Speaking later about INF systems more broadly, he said: "We are not very much in favour – we are definitely even against – the deployment of missiles on our soil" [10].

Moreover, in October 2018, President Duda stressed that there were no negotiations between Warsaw and Washington on the deployment of the INF range missiles in Poland [10].

The Italian government views the deployment of a new generation of medium-range forces as a highly undesirable and unlikely scenario. After all, Italian public opinion and the media have openly and repeatedly raised concerns about possible new deployments. It was actually the only topic related to the INF that triggered a huge discussion in the press. This means that it will be extremely difficult for the Italian Government to consider deploying forces contrary to the INF spirit on its territory if this option is ever considered by the United States [13].

At the same time, even if we are not talking about Russia's symmetrical response, this does not mean that the demise of the INF has had a neutral impact on the pace of the arms race in Europe. The increasing interest in defence and deterrence systems is worth noting here.

In particular, the German government has expressed interest in acquiring a ground-based tactical air defence system (TLVS) that could replace Patriot systems. Such a system is intended to protect troops and territories in the context of alliance and national defence, and, in particular, combating all air targets, including cruise missiles. After long negotiations on the expected capabilities, MBDA and Lockheed Martin, the defence companies developing the new system, will provide documentation to discuss the budget to German Bundestag [14].

The second solution concerns the replacement of German dual-use aircrafts participating in NATO's nuclear mission. The deployed multi-link Tornado aircraft is expected to be fully operational by 2035. Prior to the development of the proposed German-French combat aviation system, F/A-18 and/or Eurofighter are considered as a potential solution. The final decision on interim substitution will, however, depend on the US decision to certify any aircraft for a nuclear role [5].

Poland signed a $10.5 billion agreement with the US in 2018. Accordingly, Warsaw received 208 Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3) rockets, 16 M903 launch stations, four AN/MPQ-65 radars, four control stations, spare parts, software, and related equipment. These missiles made by the US defence contractor Raytheon, aim to track and intercept Russian unmanned aerial vehicles as well as tactical missiles, such as Iskander, deployed in the Kaliningrad region (USA and Poland, 2017) [15].

Also, in June 2019, there appeared some rumours of NATO's interest in European missile defence systems that could protect the continent from being struck by Russian medium-range missiles. Such plans, if they do take a clearer form, are at a very early stage of development. Even despite J. Stoltenberg's statements about the Alliance's planning of new missile and air defence systems, NATO's official position now is that modern missiles in Poland and Romania "are not configured or even capable of intercepting Russian missiles" [16]. Thus, the Alliance faces a rather difficult choice. On the one hand, it could re-equip modern American systems in Poland and Romania. According to Washington's official rhetoric, they are not designed to intercept Russian missiles, especially cruise missiles. Intercepting the latter has always been considered the most difficult thing to do. Besides, any efforts to re-equip modern missile defence systems defy longstanding assurances to Moscow that these systems are innocuous for Russia's missile potential.

Conclusions and forecasts

Thus, these case studies have shown that European countries are still divided as to whether they need or can take a more proactive stance on strategic arms control. After all, the demise of the INF Treaty and the deployment of Russian missiles aimed at Europe is a strategic issue for the region.

In general, we can identify several groups within European NATO countries that have similar positions regarding the suspension of the Treaty.

In particular, the first group may be represented by the states that are considered the closest allies of the United States and view the threat from the new Russian 9M729 missiles as credible. This group includes the United Kingdom and Poland. They fully support the termination of the Treaty by the US as a strong and logical response to Russia. At the same time, while maintaining transatlantic solidarity, they do not rule out any marginal steps to deploy US missiles on their land.

The second group brings together the states that still support US steps to suspend the Treaty but only through transatlantic solidarity. These states were largely dissatisfied with the US decision because it could put them in a very uncomfortable position, similar to the time of the "double-track decision." The countries in this group either pursue a fairly independent strategic position (like France), or are more interested in the southern direction (like Italy), or feel threatened by Russia and thus are simply in tune for a dialogue. Countries such as France, Italy, and Germany are in this group.

At the same time, it should be noted that Europe has a clear understanding of the main strategic danger, along with the existence of quite diverse positions. This danger is the disintegration of NATO as a result of the INF

crisis. Such understanding leads to the active efforts of all European states to preserve the key strategic line, namely, the integrity and solidarity of the positions of all European states in order to maintain a unified political line both on US potential proposals and on potential Russian threats.

Concerning possible scenarios for the termination of the INF in August 2019, there are several possible scenarios.

Scenario 1. Domination of arms control.

In particular, it is Europe's mediation of a new agreement on medium-range missile control, not only between the US and Russia but also with China's involvement. Unfortunately, though engaging Beijing is a logical and highly desirable step, its implementation is virtually blocked by Beijing's unwavering stance on discussing arms control issues with Moscow and Washington. It can only happen when both countries reduce their nuclear arsenals to Chinese levels (i.e. a three or more times' reduction only in strategic forces).

Another option is to get by without China, reaching if not an agreement, then some arrangement between the US and the Russian Federation not to deploy medium-range missiles in Europe and the European part of the Russian Federation. It is also likely that Moscow will uphold the need to limit US missile defence systems in Europe. However, the prospect of an arrangement in this area remains very unlikely.

Some safeguards for the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe are necessary from the point of view of European countries, especially Germany, but are not very consistent with the current climate of relations between the Russian Federation and the United States. Moreover, Moscow does not fully acknowledge that it violated the INF and that the 9M729 is a missile that contradicts to its spirit. However, if the two nuclear giants can agree on a continuation of the START Treaty for another five years, this could be a favourable basis for further agreements in the field of INF.

Scenario 2. The militarization of Europe as a consequence of medium-range missile deployment

Today we know of the European states' plans to develop their own defence infrastructure. Those are, first of all, offensive weapons, which may include US bombers, or, in the worst case, even medium-range missiles aimed at the Russian Federation. Medium-range missiles currently being manufactured in the United States could be deployed in Europe sometime in 2020 [11]. That is to say, the logic is that the United States will seek to agree with European allies on the deployment of new missiles, even with conventional warheads instead of nuclear ones.

The negotiations will also probably be about defence systems, such as Patriot, as well as about providing current missile defence systems with tech-

nical capabilities to intercept cruise missiles. This idea can be implemented, but its downside is the high cost of Patriot systems. This is why the system is unlikely to be used by most European countries. In addition, the deployment of new US missiles in Europe will be a sign for Moscow to deploy and target own missiles at Europe. Even the construction of new missile defence sites (or providing more advanced capabilities such as intercepting cruise missiles or generally medium-range missiles) can worsen relations with Russia, which are already in a very bad state. It will also very likely push Moscow to deploy medium-range missiles on its own European territory.

Also, missile defence, as well as the deployment of new US missiles in Europe, will again contribute to the division of European states:

- to those for whom Russian threat is more real;
- to those who are favourably inclined toward the Russian Federation and do not want to provoke it;
- to those who feel more threatened by Moscow.

Scenario 3. A combination of arms control and defence

Since any model is virtually non-existent, it seems that the most realistic situation will be a combination of noticeable features of both the first and second scenarios. In particular, common sense and pressure from Europe will eventually force Washington to consider extending the START Treaty, and the deployment of US medium-range missiles in Europe will also be a matter of bargaining and possible concessions in the US-Russia dialogue.

Another issue is the defence systems that have been sacred and have always been outside the scope of any negotiation with Russia for the American establishment over the past twenty years. That is, it can be that even if some compromise on mutual restraint on offensive arms is reached, missile defence systems will gradually evolve in both quantitative and qualitative terms, which will provide a "creeping arms race." Such an arms race will continue not only in US-RF relations but also, undoubtedly, affect European states, especially those located in close geographical proximity to Russia.

Literature

1. Declaration by the High Representative on behalf of the EU on the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, European Council, Council of the European Union, 14.07.2019, https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2019/07/14/

2. The End of INF Treaty? A Pillar of the European Security Architecture is at Risk/ European Parliamentary Research Service, 04.02.2019, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2019/633175/EPRS_BRI(2019)633175_EN.pdf

3. Barrie D. & Cameron J. The British position on the INF Treaty / Responses to the INF Treaty crisis: the European dimension. The European INF Initiative Project Meeting, May, 2019, Odessa, Ukraine, OdCNP, I. I. Mechnikov National University, 2019, http://odcnp.com.ua/images/pdf/Europe-Responces-to-INF-Crisis.pdf

4. MFA statement on information about Russia's non-compliance with the INF Treaty. Poland is concerned about the US Department of State's findings on Russia's non-compliance with the INF Treaty, 4.07.2014, https://www.msz.gov.pl/en/news/

5. Berghofer J. & Kubiak K. The German position on the INF Treaty/ Responses to the INF Treaty crisis: the European dimension. The European INF Initiative Project Meeting, May, 2019, Odessa, Ukraine, OdCNP, I. I. Mechnikov National University, 2019, http://odcnp.com.ua/images/pdf/Europe-Responces-to-INF-Crisis.pdf

6. Statement on the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, Issued by the NATO Foreign Ministers, Brussels, 4 December 2018, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_161122.htm

7. Brustlein C. A French assessment of the end of the INF Treaty and its implications for Europe / Responses to the INF Treaty crisis: the European dimension. The European INF Initiative Project Meeting, May, 2019, Odessa, Ukraine, OdCNP, I. I. Mechnikov National University, 2019, http://odcnp.com.ua/images/pdf/Europe-Responces-to-INF-Crisis.pdf

8. Champchesnel T. French statements on the current INF crisis/ Responses to the INF Treaty crisis: the European dimension. The European INF Initiative Project Meeting, May, 2019, Odessa, Ukraine, OdCNP, I. I. Mechnikov National University, 2019, http://odcnp.com.ua/images/pdf/Europe-Responces-to-INF-Crisis.pdf

9. National Assembly hearing, M. Nicolas Roche, director Department of Strategic, Security and Disarmament Affairs, Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs, 20 March 2019, http://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/15/pdf/cr-cdef/18-19/c1819029.pdf (Non-official translation by T. de Champchesnel, "French statements on the current INF crisis").

10. Kacprzyk A. Poland's Position on the INF Treaty/ Responses to the INF Treaty crisis: the European dimension. The European INF Initiative Project Meeting, May, 2019, Odessa, Ukraine, OdCNP, I. I. Mechnikov National University, 2019, http://odcnp.com.ua/images/pdf/Europe-Responces-to-INF-Crisis.pdf

11. Kühn U. Europe and the INF Crisis – Strength and Dialogue// CRCD, https://www.cirsd.org/en/horizons/horizons-summer-2019-issue-no-14/

12. Poland is both pro-American and pro-European - Polish PM in Hamburg// The First News, 17 November 2018, https://www.thefirstnews.com/article/

13. Pulcini G. The Italian Position on the INF Treaty/ Responses to the INF Treaty crisis: the European dimension. The European INF Initiative Project Meeting, May, 2019, Odessa, Ukraine, OdCNP, I. I. Mechnikov National University, 2019, http://odcnp.com.ua/images/pdf/Europe-Responces-to-INF-Crisis.pdf

14. Sprenger S., Kington T. Germany's long-awaited anti-missile program is about to face politics. Defense News, 20 May 2019, https://www.defensenews.com/global/europe/2019/05/20/

15. US and Poland Strike 10,5 billion missile defense deal, 2017, November 18, https://www.dw.com/en/

16. NATO states agree to respond if Russia abandons missile treaty, UA Wire, 27.06.2019, https://www.uawire.org/

CHAPTER 11

EUROPEAN UNION
MEDIATION AND PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

Hanna Shelest

1. Current State of the EU Policies on Mediation and Peacekeeping

Different European Union member-states had a long history of conflict resolution and mediation efforts; however, the EU as a whole has limited experience in this capacity. It is a result of a narrow strategic approach, when confidence-building measures and post-conflict reconstruction came out on top over political involvement. Moreover, the inability to find consensus between the member-states on foreign policy issues and the absence of a common position on a specific conflict and ways of its resolution also affected a level of the EU involvement in problems of war and peace.

The European Union within a history of its existence has never been an active international mediator. Some experts even emphasize that mediation as a professional tool and instrument of conflict resolution has not yet entered the consciousness of the EU [13, p. 6]. Given its own violent history, the Europe's integration process has long been regarded as the EU's main contribution to conflict prevention. According to Gross [14], in the EU's immediate neighbourhood exporting a set of values through enlargement and conditionality has been salient in conflict prevention – an approach that was later adapted and applied to the wider neighbourhood through the European Neighbourhood Policy. However, new conflicts at the post-Soviet space did not fit such approaches, as erupted precisely because of the existential choice of future – within the European or Eurasian projects, where parties to the conflict had completely different attitude towards the EU, thus a possible EU membership intermit to be a safeguard for a conflict outbreak.

Last years, more and more articles appeared about a role of the EU as a mediator and a peacekeeper. As such, there were several waves of interest regarding this topic: as a result of reflection on the EU role in the Balkans conflicts in 1990s; on the EU role in the resolution of the Russian-Georgian conflict in 2008; and a recent wave connected both with an expansion of work in Africa and with the Normandy format for the mediation in the Russian-Ukrainian conflict.

There is no overall agreement inside of the EU on what mediation actually constitutes. For opinion of A. Herrberg, "there is no distinct agreement on the extent to which the EU has been actively involved in international mediation. That said, Javier Solana, High Representative for the CFSP, has been seen as

providing 'good offices', whereas the EU Special Representatives are seen as "official" mediators on a daily basis, travelling, representing the EU in specific regions" [13, p. 13].

A principle of "acceptance" is one of the basic principles of mediation. However, before deciding whether conflicting sides are ready to accept the EU as a mediator, it is even more important to define whether the EU sees itself as a possible mediator and a peacekeeper. For this purpose, it is necessary to evaluate whether Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) considers the joint mediation and peacekeeping missions as its main mechanisms.

In the European Security Strategy [8] adopted in 2003, serious attention is paid to the problem of conflict resolution, however, a bigger consideration is given not to the conflicts as they are, but to issues such as terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, failed states and organized crime, which were perceived as consequences of regional conflicts that could ultimately influence the security of the European Union. Conflicts described in the Strategy were the Middle East, the Balkans, Democratic Republic of Congo, East Timor, Afghanistan, Kashmir, the Korean Peninsula and the Great Lakes Region, and almost no attention paid to the Black Sea region.

In Lisbon Treaty signed in 2007, it was stated that "the CSDP shall be an integral part of the common foreign and security policy. It shall provide the Union with an operational capacity drawing on civilian and military assets. The Union may use them on missions outside the Union for peace-keeping, conflict prevention and strengthening international security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter" (Art. 28 – point 49 of Treaty) [5].

Before the Treaty of Lisbon entered into force, the tasks, which could be carried out under the framework of the CSDP, had been: humanitarian and rescue missions; conflict prevention and peace-keeping; combat forces in crisis management. The Treaty of Lisbon added three new tasks to this list: joint disarmament operations; military advice and assistance; post-conflict stabilization [6]. However, in the Lisbon Treaty, there is not a single word on mediation as an instrument of the foreign policy and conflict resolution, the same is true for other basic documents of the EU. Yet, the mediation efforts were present among the EU activities, and received special attention after 2008 involvement in the Russian-Georgian conflict.

Already in 2009, the Concept on Strengthening EU Mediation and Dialogue Capacities was adopted, stating that "in practice mediation is already an integral part of EU external action, [since] the EU has so far used this tool in a rather ad-hoc fashion" [2]. Moreover, it was stated that "The EU is a global actor and its political, developmental and security interests go well beyond its

neighbourhood. It will therefore continue to offer its mediation (support) services whenever relevant and as part of its comprehensive approach to conflict prevention and resolution" [2]. A creation of the Division for Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Mediation Instruments – within the Security Policy and Conflict Prevention Directorate was an important step for institutionalization and separation of this work from the general foreign policy activities.

Presented in 2016 Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy [9] de-facto put the mediation in the same line as preventive diplomacy, seeing it as an instrument for pre-emptive peace and early action – "Early warning is of little use unless it is followed by early action. This implies regular reporting and proposals to the Council, engaging in preventive diplomacy and mediation by mobilising EU Delegations and Special Representatives". Concurrently, Conflict Settlement section is mostly dedicated to the questions of working with local authorities and municipalities for confidence building and development, engagement with civil society, inclusive governance, and cultural, inter-faith, scientific and economic diplomacy.

Political dialogue is among the main instruments of the EU foreign policy, which is used while participating in a conflict resolution and conflict management. Such a dialogue aimed first of all for a change in behaviour of the conflicting parties and a change of their negotiating positions. However, in 2008, during the Russian-Georgian conflict, the overall impact of political dialogue on the peace process was marginal. This had to do with the fact that the EU failed to create sufficient leverage over the conflicting parties that would have enabled it to broker peace. For the opinion of M. Merlingen, in the case of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, such polices were excluded because the EU did not have official relations with them [17, p. 13]. It is difficult to agree with such a statement, as absence of the official recognition had not prevented the EU to be involved in Kosovo or Palestine. At the same time, division in the member-states' positions made it impossible for the EU to make its relations with Moscow conditional on its desire to settle conflicts at the Georgian territory.

De facto, after the involvement in the resolution of conflicts in the Balkans states, the EU concentrated on a soft security approach, not paying much attention to the political mediation, especially in conflicts at the post-Soviet space. For the EU representatives' opinion, these conflicts have been much more in line with the post-conflict reconciliation and confidence building measures activities rather than mediation and conflict management. It is possible to say that the EU gave the upper hand in a political settlement to the OSCE, while itself concentrated on democratization, economic development, preparation for the Association Agreements signing (Moldova and Georgia), seeing this as the best leverage for achieving compromise between the conflicting parties.

At the same time, among more or less successful cases where the EU did play a mediation role, experts name signing of the Ohrid Agreement between the Macedonian majority and Albanian minority in 2001 (due to the joint efforts of the EU and the USA, with the OSCE and NATO support); the Aceh Peace Process between the Government of Indonesia and the Free Aceh Movement (mediation of former Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari, supported by the Crisis Management Initiative, and the EU monitoring mission as a leverage); the Middle East Peace Process, where the EU has attempted to play a mediator role within the Middle East Quartet.

Sometimes we can witness a substitute of terms, when certain activities from the category of peacebuilding or peace prevention, are named as mediation. Until 2008, the European Union predominantly played a role of the sponsor of the peacebuilding, reconstruction and confidence-building measures between the conflicting parties. All this indirectly facilitated possible conflict resolution, but was not mediation per se, as did not touch political side of the problem, concentrating at the lower level of people-to-people relations.

First EU's involvement as a mediator in the Black Sea region happened in 2005 with Moldova's Transnistrian conflict when it was invited by GUAM member-states. However, for a long time, this participation has been limited to activities of the European Union Border Assistance Mission to Ukraine and Moldova (EUBAM), which in addition to the border management, exercised some minor mediation efforts, and to formal participation in the "5+2" negotiations format. Though, in the mid of 2000s, one could notice the "threeplicity", when simultaneously the EU, Germany and Romania pretended to mediate, while their positions not always coincided.

Back in 2006, the International Crisis Group, in its report on the EU's role in conflict resolution in the South Caucasus, insisted that to guarantee its own security, the EU should become more engaged in efforts to resolve disputes in Nagorno Karabakh, South Ossetia and Abkhazia. ICG emphasized that "it can do so by strengthening the conflict resolution dimension of the instruments it applies" [3]. That analysis was based at the EU's existed practices. In 2003, the EU appointed the Special Representative for Caucasus, whose role improved in 2006 due to active work of Peter Semneby in Georgia. One of the main tasks in his mandate were 'preventing conflicts in the region' and 'contributing to the peaceful settlement of conflicts'. However, he has been given few means to achieve these objectives, among others; he has not been authorized to act as a mediator between the conflicting parties. His main role was to act as a local relay of the EU messages designed to moderate the conflictual behaviour between the parties and to persuade them to reinvigorate

their search for a negotiated settlement [17]. All this took place in parallel with activities of the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, mediation efforts of the UN Group of Friends and individual states such as Germany that did not have an accumulative effect, but resulted in distracted attention to the individual efforts.

Strengthening of the EU's role, that happened in 2008, has evolved in response to the changes in the international system, the EU's own internal political dynamics, and the EU's capacity and willingness to play a major role in regional and international conflicts [1]. Beginning of the Russian-Georgian war demonstrated that the EU standard mechanisms for conflict prevention were not effective. Despite significant funding disbursed to mitigate the consequences of the conflicts, EU assistance could not replace a political and security strategy for conflict prevention [18]. Some experts assumed that this involvement as a mediator was motivated by the necessity to restore a reputation in the region and to return positions that had been lost due to the war start and inefficiency of the preventive mechanisms.

It is important to emphasize that until 2008, in Georgia, the European Union played a role of the sponsor of the peacebuilding, reconstruction and confidence-building measures between the conflicting parties. All this indirectly facilitated possible conflict resolution, but was not mediation as such. If the United Nations and the OSCE could be named among those who lost in Georgia, so the EU unexpectedly was able to impose itself as a peacemaker, due to the President Sarkozy active participation on behalf of the EU, when the EU played the key role in signing a ceasefire and the Six Points Agreement. In September 2008, an agreement between the EU and Russia was signed aimed to withdraw Russian forces and to deploy the EU monitoring mission [22]. With this agreement, the EU allotted a role of the peace guarantor in Georgia and for the first time the EU started to act as an official mediator. However, still in the preparatory phase, it decided to limit its meditation to issues related to conflict management, as opposed to conflict resolution, that according to some experts was the result of a realistic assessment of the dim prospects of a genuine peace conference along the lines of the Dayton negotiations on Bosnia [17].

The EU role in conflict resolution in Georgia can be described as a mix of negotiations and mediation. The EU had negotiations with Georgia and Russia separately, predominantly within the framework of the bilateral agenda, including questions concerning the conflicts. At the same time, the EU tried to be a mediator between the conflicting parties. However, bilateral negotiations dominated over mediation. In the report of the International Alert in 2010, it was stated that the EU's strength was in its multiple roles, mandates and

engagement on different levels – although the EU has not always been able to capitalise on this [11].

In the field of international peace mediation, the perceived context of the international system and the identity of the mediator, shape the form and character of mediation. It is important to stress the reciprocal influence of each of these factors, which determine the shape of the EU's international peace mediation efforts [13, p. 9]. EU mediation in Georgia has failed because there was a huge gap between their role as 'apolitical' peacebuilders and their role as politically engaged peacebrokers [17, p. 3].

The disputes still going on whether EU mediation in 2008 can be considered successful since fighting stopped but the peace has not been reached and even more separatists regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia announced their independence. A question of the mediator's success is one of the most disputable in conflict studies. If to evaluate the mediation by the complete conflict settlement only almost none of the mediation efforts can be regarded as so. However, if to evaluate by identifying what is a goal of the mediation efforts or what has been reached as temporary or intermediary goals – the mediation can be assessed in a more objective way. With this regard, the EU did not have a goal of managing the long lasting conflicts between Georgia and the separatists regions, which had been taken place since the beginning of 1990s. The goal was to reach a cease-fire between the Russian and the Georgian armies in August 2008, aimed to prevent further development of the military actions, and to return the parties back to the negotiation table. This goal has been reached, even if it had a limited impact, as the EU did not have a long-term goal and was not ready to develop a long-term strategy of the conflict resolution.

The Ukrainian events of 2014 became a much bigger challenge for the EU in terms of the mediation efforts used. On the one hand, the European Union could not stay apart of the conflict happening just at its borders, so the mediator's motivation was clearly defined. On the other hand, the EU had at least two challenges – a necessity to prove its impartiality (as the European integration of Ukraine was that very reason perceived as a reason to the conflict) and a loss of its main leverage, which had been used in other conflicts in Europe - possible European integration, which played well during the Kosovo-Serbia negotiations in 2013.

Originally, there were two attempts to mediate in Ukraine: Geneva format and Normandy format. Geneva format, initiated in April 2014, involved Ukraine, Russia, the US and the European Union, where European Union was presented as an organization. A certain unwillingness of the US to be actively involved as a mediator has ruined this format, while a new one - Normandy

has evolved. However, this time, the EU was not present there as an organization, represented by Germany and France, both as single players and as a voice of the EU. Participation of the two EU leading states should demonstrate a joint position of the EU towards mediation and future settlement, adding that "European" support element.

During the five years of the conflict, different versions of additional countries involvement have sounded, including Poland [27] or Budapest Memorandum signatory states – the US, the UK and China [26], but not the EU. This happened in contrary to the situation in another region – Nagorno Karabakh. OSCE Minsk group, which was established more than 20 years ago to negotiate a conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan, involved co-chairs from Russia, the US and France. Recently, more and more the ideas are presented to replace France by the EU for more impartial position, as well as necessity to strengthen the European voice (contrary to the Russian and the US ones).

In Hazelzet's view, the EU mainly brought a decisive contribution in three types of situations: the EU was willing and capable to act (i) where other organisations were not; (ii) when there was a specific demand for it to intervene; and (iii) in low- to medium-intensity conflict environments [12]. For our opinion, the combination of the first and the third reasons was the most important for the EU. In Georgia the European Union appeared the only available mediator, due to the Russian blocking of the OSCE and the UN missions' prolongations, and the intensity of the conflict was already low. The same can be said about Kosovo, as the EU mission replaced the UN mission on the ground. In contrast with the Ukrainian case in 2015, where conversations about bigger EU involvement started, including a peacekeeping mission, all three conditions were weakly presented. OSCE has already launched its mission, the conflict was of the high intensity and de facto, it was only one condition - existed demand to intervene, but associated rather with political and diplomatic support.

Peacekeeping. The European Union does not have a significant experience in conducting peacekeeping operations. Even this term is rarely used by Brussels. The EU usually concentrates on the civilian operations, peacebuilding process, confidence-building measures and post-conflict reconstruction, and conflict prevention.

The EU's peacekeeping activities have been usually triggered by the necessity to support the UN activities, sometimes also motivated by the post-colonial ties of the individual member-states with countries where conflicts occurred. The EU Global Strategy 2016 just confirmed this thesis of the UN priority, while considering own operations just as a complimentary action: "Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) could assist further and

complement UN peacekeeping through bridging, stabilisation or other operations" [9, p. 40].

As of 2019, the EU had six military and 11 civilian missions in different countries around the world [10]. Both missions, which work in Ukraine, are civilian – the EU Border Assistance Mission to the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine (EUBAM, since 2005) and the EU Advisory Mission for Civilian Security Sector Reform Ukraine (EUAM Ukraine, since March 2014). During its history, the EU has deployed 29 operations.

While the UN police missions are considered as military missions, so the European Union considers its police missions as civilian ones. Lately, the United Nations holds a multifunctional missions / operations, not separating police missions, so depending on a mandate all of them are considered as peacekeeping operations. Contrary to this, the European Union clearly separates military missions and police missions for example, missions currently deployed in Afghanistan and Palestine (in the past in DR Congo and FYR Macedonia), the main tasks of which are: police and judicial reform, assistance in fighting organized crime, security sector reform, trainings and advisors support. De facto, most of the functions of the EU police missions do not reflect the functions of the peacekeeping or peacemaking missions.

If to analyse EU military missions, six from which are currently active, so not all of them can be considered as peacekeeping ones, despite the fact that indirectly they can facilitate peace through alteration:

1. EU NAVFOR Somalia (Operation ATALANTA) – navy mission to fight piracy (since 2008). Mandate: protects vessels of the World Food Programme, delivering aid to the Somali people; deters and prevents piracy and armed robbery at sea; ensures the protection of other vulnerable shipping; monitors fishing activities off the coast of Somalia.

2. EUNAVFOR MED operation Sophia (since 2016) – to identify, capture and dispose of vessels used by migrant smugglers or traffickers.

3. Military training mission in the Central African Republic (EUTM RCA, since 2016). Mandate: In close coordination and complementarities with the MINUSCA, to support the CAR Government in the implementation of the Security Sector Reform, to support the build-up of a modernised, effective, ethnically balanced and democratically accountable FACA.

4. EU Training Mission in Mali (since 2013). Mandate: to support Mali forces in establishing sovereignty and democratic order at the whole territory of the country, organized crime and terrorist threats neutralization, training and advice on command and control, logistical chain and human resources, as well as training on International Humanitarian Law, and training of combat units.

5. EU Training Mission in Somalia (since 2010). Objectives: aims to strengthen the Somali federal defence institutions, continuing to employ its three-pillar approach: training, mentoring and advising.

6. EU Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina – Operation ALTHEA (since 2004) is a supportive mission to the EU political involvement in BiH. The key objectives are to support the Armed Forces of BiH in training, to support them in their progression towards NATO standards, to provide deterrence and continued compliance with the responsibility according to the Dayton/Paris Agreement and to contribute to a safe and secure environment in BiH.

Moreover, it is necessary to mention that EU military missions are usually short-term and supportive to the activities of other international organizations. The EU decision is enough for their deployment, and the UN resolution is not obligatory, however, the EU have launched its operations there, where either UN mission or of another international organization had already been present. CONCORDIA/FYROM – mission in Macedonia (March-December 2003) was used to monitor the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, but the operation made use of NATO assets and capabilities, which was made possible due to the EU-NATO arrangements. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo (2006) – the EU launched a military operation in support of the United Nations during the election process, while mission in Darfur (2005-2007) was a support to the African Union Mission to Sudan (provided equipment and assets, provided planning and technical assistance and deployed military observers, training of African troops, helped with transportation and provided police assistance and training). EUFOR Tchad/RCA (Central African Republic) was the biggest (3700 military personnel) that worked in 2008 and was authorized by the UN SC resolution (main objectives: protection of civilians in danger, particularly refugees and displaced persons, facilitation in the delivery of humanitarian aid and the free movement of humanitarian personnel, contribution to protecting UN personnel, facilities installations and equipment and to ensuring the security and freedom of movement of its own staff, UN staff and associated personnel) [10].

So far, we cannot speak about established practice of the EU peacekeeping activities, principles of decision-making about the launch of the peace operations or basic requirements for their deployment. In reality, the EU still acts rather *ad hoc*, than considers it as a part of its foreign policy and security instruments.

2. Main Problems and Challenges
In 1990s – beginning of 2000s, many experts raised a question as whether an economic organization – as the EU was perceived – should be involved in

conflict resolution, or this filed should be left for the regional security initiatives. An additional argument in support of restrictive own activities was a fact that most of the EU member-states were NATO members. Furthermore, the Western European Union still existed until 2011 (before being closed as a result of the Treaty of Lisbon) [23], but its experience and mechanisms had never been considered as capable in peace-keeping. Member-states politically favoured intervention through their membership in NATO as a transatlantic framework (Afghanistan, Libya), a coalition of the willing (Iraq 2003) or decided to wait for the UN or regional response (Lebanon 2006-09, Sri Lanka 2009, Kyrgyzstan 2010, Syria 2012). Thus, since many EU deployments were not in response to crises but were more of a capacity-building nature, the term 'crisis management' does not fully correspond to the reality on the ground [12]. Those first operations have become important tools of the EU's external action, but they have also shown the limits of what the EU and its member states are able and willing to offer for enhancing global security [21].

One of the main problems of the EU mediation activities is a choice between an institutional and a state mediation. Normandy format and mediation efforts to settle the Russian-Ukrainian conflict is a vivid example of this dilemma. Discussions continue whether it has been EU as a mediator or the individual member-states – France and Germany that participate in the Normandy Four.

During Euromaidan (November 2013 – February2014), the European Union was seen as a more consolidated actor, as one could see joint efforts between the member-states and between institutions (the European Commission and the European Parliament). Later, the single position has been elaborated on sanctions against the Russian Federation. However, the sheer fact of sanctions decreased the EU possibilities to act as a mediator, as affected the factor of "neutrality", which is considered as a pre-requisite for successful mediation. Even if this factor is less and less considered as a basic one, and more and more substituted by a principle of impartiality, first of all, impartiality towards the final modality of the conflict resolution, nevertheless, its absence presents an opportunity for conflicting parties to manipulate, up till the refuse of mediating efforts.

Partiality and neutrality is a problem of the EU involvement comparing to the UN one. Some experts think that for the EU as an organization it is difficult to be impartial in most of the cases. Colonial past of some of its member-states, in such countries as Zimbabwe or Sri Lanka makes it difficult to perceive the EU as impartial on the ground.

One of the main concerns has been that Europe still is not been ready to speak with one voice in issues of foreign and security policy, especially con-

cerning conflicts and crisis situations. The ability to act as a single actor in the Russian-Georgian conflict in 2008 had a significant positive effect on the European Union image, but has not become a stable behaviour. Appreciation of its own responsibility and capacities to settle the conflicts gradually are ingraining among the representatives of the EU institutions, however, national interests of the individual member-states still dominate.

This problem is closely connected with an issue of the EU motivation to be involved in the conflict resolution. As Argyro Kartsonaki and Stefan Wolff ask in their article, is it driven by human or European security imperatives? [15]. On the one hand, the normative approach of the EU and a core idea of the unity – no war in Europe anymore – presents a pacifistic tactic of resolving conflicts in other states as they violate democracy, human security, development and cooperation in Europe. On the other hand, the motivation can be perceived as that one protecting its own security, preventing spill over effect, fortifying national interests and minimizing negative effect of transnational threats. As the authors of the article mentioned, the motivation of the EU to be involved can differ depending of the proximity of the conflict to its borders. The EU applies a human security approach, albeit predominantly in an instrumental way, in particular in those areas where it also has the strongest security interests of its own [15].

Yet one problem of the EU mediation is an issue of influence on the sides to the conflict, so de facto expectations that the EU will act as a "formulator", but not only as a "facilitator" of the peace agreement. Leverages are the most difficult elements of studying theory of mediation, as they are a relative concept, which cannot be analysed in a quantitative or material manner. Traditionally, researchers agree that leverage is an ability of a mediator to pressure one or both conflicting parties, so they would accept a proposed solution to the conflict. Still, there is undecided what resources are core for such a pressure. W. Zartman and S. Touval speaks about "sticks and carrots" policy [25, p. 13], while T. Princen differentiates between material aspects (ability to provide or recall economic assistance) and non-material aspects (ability to use moral and psychological pressure) [19, p. 167]. The leverage of the deeper cooperation with the EU or possible European integration played a significant role in the Balkans conflicts. While this argument did not have the same effect for Ukraine or Moldova, as their separatists regions, in contrast to Kosovo, did not want to join the EU.

If for W. Zartman, S. Touval and J. Bercovitch leverages are the main for future success of the mediation efforts, so for another group of researchers, such as C. Yarrow [24] and R. Slim [20] the very lack of the mediator's political power is a fact that influence a mediation success. For their opinion,

due to this "weakness" and inability to impose sanctions, a level of trust and sincerity of the mediator increases.

Moreover, it is necessary to consider that leverage, which a mediator promises to use, can be both real and imaginary, or a promise without a real possibility to be used. For example, a threat to use economic sanctions can be bluster to make a party to the conflict to sit down to negotiating table. Or consequences of such sanctions will not have a real threat to economy of the conflicting party as other actors of the international relations will not follow them. As an example of the ineffective use of leverages, we can name a threat to postpone negotiations on a basic treaty between the EU and the Russian Federation in August 2008, which were renewed in the beginning of November 2008 without full implementation of the Cease-fire agreement's conditions. The same effect had a return of the Russian delegation to the Parliamentary Assemble of the Council of Europe without fulfilment of obligations. The very fact that it happened by the initiative of the EU members – France and Germany – added difficulties to their position as mediators in the Normandy format.

An absence of a significant experience in conducting peacekeeping operations, both of its own and under the UN mandate, also prevent the EU members states to adopt decisions about participation in peacekeeping operations. Even more, split forces between operations and missions under the aegis of the UN, NATO, OSCE, multilateral forces does not allow formulating a clear strategy of peace operations launch in different parts of the world.

Also, it is possible to ask whether a peace promoter can be a synonym to a mediator. Confidence-building measures, support of the ground initiatives, disarmament and democratization, reconciliation and post-conflict reconstruction are effective means for peace promotion; however, their aim is not always to resolve. Mediation requires greater political involvement in the resolution process itself and negotiations between the conflicting parties, what the EU is not by and large ready to do.

3. Scenarios for future developments

Speaking about possible scenarios of the EU mediation and peacekeeping activities development, it is necessary to underline that they will depend on two basic conditions - internal discussions within the EU on foreign policy priorities of the organization and possible increase of actions in a security domain, as well as from external conditions, specifically escalations in the regions, which are strategically important for the EU.

External Conditions

Enhancing of the EU mediation and peacekeeping activities will depend

on the external security situation, including regions of the EU's and its member-states' interests. While searching its new global role and changes in relations with the US, the EU will need more rapidly to react on external challenges and make assessments about their direct influence on the European security. In addition, this search of the global role will constantly make Brussels and individual European capitals to face a choice, which conflict in other world regions is so to attract European attention and involvement.

1. Escalations on the Balkans. In case the situation escalates, what can happen in Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and North Macedonia, more active political, diplomatic and peacekeeping participation of the European Union in a resolution and management of the Balkans conflicts is possible. Considering that the EU was one of the main security actors in the region, which from the first days has been involved in conflict resolution, and also has leverages on all sides, a variant of delegating responsibility for conflict resolution to the UN or the OSCE is unlikely. Moreover, in this very region the EU has the biggest leverage and interest of the member-states. Presence in Kosovo and in Bosnia and Herzegovina in a status of the participant of the peace reconstruction, position the EU as an actor who should be the first to react in case of the situation escalation.

2. Change of the situation in regions of the so-called frozen conflicts in Transnistria, Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Nagorno Karabakh. Despite the medium level of involvement in the resolution of these conflicts, nevertheless the EU continues to keep track of events in peace processes. On the one hand, it is possible to expect a policy of engagement and reconciliation as a prerequisite for peaceful integration what Brussels prefers and on which will concentrate till the last moment. At the same time, in case of escalations, one can expect that the EU will act as a mediator, because considered as the only "honest broker" in the region after years of unsuccessful mediation efforts of other international organizations. Simultaneously, unwillingness to compete with the Russian Federation for this region, absence of leverage of the European integration for the separatists regions (in contrast to the Balkans), imperceptions of the EU as a security actor in this region can be considered as impediments. Maximum, considering current conditions, it is possible to expect proposals of political mediation or establishment of the alternative negotiating formats, rather than peacekeeping activities (such as, change of the current peacekeeping operation in Transnistria for the EU police mission).

3. If to speak about *Ukraine*, so it is unlikely that the EU will be more involved as an organization. Current situation when two most influential member-states are involved is so that satisfies other member-states, and leaves a space for the European Commission's manoeuvre. Such a duality allows the

EU, on one level to impose sanctions against the Russian Federation, and on another one, to be considered as an impartial mediator in the Normandy format.

4. Escalation of the situation *in Africa* and decrease in the UN peace activities' effectiveness can lead to a more active political participation of the EU, both in cooperation with the ECOWAS and independently. Big competition at the African continent, which has taken place between different countries in recent years, can result in a greater security involvement, as safeguarding investments, trade and big economic projects can happen only when security exists. Transit of power in some countries of the continent can spark new conflicts and escalation of others. In such conditions, the EU involvement as an organization, but not individual member-states will be considered as acceptable and effective. Escalation of humanitarian crisis and increase in migrants' flows can trigger the EU member-states to be actively involved in African continent aimed to prevent and to resolve armed conflicts. In such a case, remoteness of the conflicts will not be the main factor, as development of these conflicts can have a direct influence to the European security.

Internal Discussions

Adopting the EU Global Strategy, which envisages greater EU involvement in peace processes, its authors propose that "our peace policy must also ensure a smoother transition from short-term crisis management to long-term peacebuilding to avoid gaps along the conflict cycle" [9]. While such a strategy in general is worth of consideration, however, we should mention that mediation and peacekeeping activities are usually aimed for short-term crisis management (even if peacekeeping mission is stationed for a long time). Mediation is very seldom aimed for a long-term peacebuilding strategy, as considers that it should be a goal of the conflicting parties themselves.

As a matter of fact, as a result of the internal discussions within the EU, the following scenarios have chances:

1. *Maintaining a status-quo*, which envisages more reactive position of the European Union towards the conflict resolution. This scenario foresees continued focus on peacebuilding and confidence-building measures. Securing perspective of the deeper cooperation and integration with the EU among the main leverages in relations with parties to the conflict will remain the core strategy. This scenario also will include focus on the immediate borders or global challenges as those connected with nuclear non-proliferation. With such developments, it is difficult to expect involvement into new conflicts resolutions, but rather maintenance of the own status and ideas in the regions, where there is a long presence, first of all in the Balkans.

2. *Expansion of the EU peacekeeping activities,* increase in missions and military operations, including in African conflicts. This scenario is possible in case of better evaluation of the peacekeeping activities within the new European Commission, as well as enhanced security cooperation of the member-states, which has started recently. Development of cooperation within PESCO also can facilitate this scenario. In such conditions, individual members, such as France, can be driving forces, as they have old contacts in the region and respectively feel responsibility over it. The only problem in such a case can be a necessity to prove its own impartiality and coordination of efforts with the UN.

3. *Rejection of active peacekeeping and mediation activities.* In case of a significant development of internal political and economic crisis in the EU, as well as strengthening of the right-wing parties of Eurosceptics, possible variant of concentration solely on a political dialogue and cooperation on a bilateral basis with different countries, without an attempt to be involved in crisis management and conflict resolution, is quite possible. In case political crisis inside of the EU develops, the Union's authority as a mediator will decrease, in addition to decrease in effectiveness of its main leverages. Last but not least, such developments can be caused by Brexit, when other member-states concentrate their attention on internal transformations and reforms. This scenario also can be caused by the increase of some member-states' rhetoric that security dimension should be a prerogative of the NATO and the UN.

Due to the existence of both internal and external factors that can influence possible scenarios of mediation and peacekeeping activities of the EU, as well as their numerous combinations, today it is impossible to clearly name the most probable scenario. For our opinion, in near years, status quo will remain, till the EU will finish its internal transformations and reforms, that will allow to define clearly its own place in the global security system. Rethinking of its own peacekeeping activities and work over mistakes of the previous mediation efforts are necessary to formulate new approaches and to assess own capabilities in case a scenario of greater involvement in conflict resolution around the world is chosen.

Literature

1. Bardakçı M. EU Engagement in Conflict Resolution in Georgia: Towards A More Proactive Role. Caucasian Review of International Affairs. 2010. Vol. 4 (3), Summer. P. 214-236. http://cria-online.org/12_2.html

2. Council of the European Union. Concept on Strengthening EU Mediation and Dialogue Capacities. 2009. November 10. http://eeas.europa.eu/cfsp/conflict_prevention/docs/concept_strengthening_eu_med_en.pdf

3. Conflict Resolution in the South Caucasus: The EU's Role. International Crisis Group, Europe Report. 2006. N°173, 20 March.

4. European Commission. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. Black Sea Synergy - A New Regional Cooperation Initiative. April 11, 2007. http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/pdf/pdf/com07_160_en.pdf

5. EUR-LEX. Treaty of Lisbon Amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty Establishing the European Community. 2007. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:12007L/TXT

6. EUR-LEX. Common Security and Defence Policy. 2010. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:ai0026

7. Engberg K. Ten years of EU military operations. European Union Institute for Security Studies, Brief No. 41, European Union Institute for Security Studies. 2013.

8. European Council. European Security Strategy «A Secure Europe in a Better World». December 12, 2003. http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsupload/78367.pdf

9. European Union. A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy. June, 2016. http://europa.eu/globalstrategy/en

10. European Union. Military and civilian missions and operations. 05 March 2019. https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations/430/military-and-civilian-missions-and-operations_en

11. Frichova Grono M. Georgia's Conflicts: What Role for the EU as Mediator?, IfP Mediation Cluster, International Alert. March, 2010. 20 p.

12. Hazelzet H. The added value of CSDP operations. European Union Institute for Security Studies Brief No. 31. 2013.

13. Herrberg A. Perceptions of International Peace Mediation in the EU. The Crisis Management Initiative. IFP Mediation Cluster. 2008. 27 p.

14. Gross E. Peacebuilding in 3D: EU and US approaches. Chaillot Papers, No. 130. EU Institute for Security Studies. 2013.

15. Kartsonaki A. & Wolff S. The EU's Responses to Conflicts in its Wider Neighbourhood: Human or European Security? Global Society. 2015. Vol. 29, No 2. P.199-226.

16. Kleiboer M. Time to Talk?: Multiple Perspectives on Timing of International Mediation. Cooperation and Conflict. 1995. Vol. 30. P. 307–348.

17. Merlingen M. and Ostrauskaite R. EU Peacebuilding in Georgia: Limits and Achievements. Centre for the Law of EU External Relations. CLEER Working Papers. 2009. No. 6. 28 p.

18. Popescu N. The EU's Conflict Prevention Failure in Georgia. CACI Analyst, 2009.

19. Princen T. Mediation by Transnational Organization: The case of the Vatican. In Mediation in International Relations: Multiple Approaches to Conflict Management, ed. J. Bercovitch, J. Rubin. New York: St. Martin's, 1992. P. 149–175.

20. Slim R. Small-state Mediation in International Relations: The Algerian Mediation in the Iranian Hostage Crisis. In Mediation in International Relations: Multiple approaches to conflict management, ed. J. Bercovitch, J. Rubin. New York: St. Martin's, 1992. P. 206–231.

21. Tardy T. CSDP in Action – What Contribution to International Security? European Union Institute for Security Studies. Chaillot Papers. May, 2015.

22. The 8 September 2008 agreement, detailing the implementation of the 12 August 2008 six-point plan. Embassy of France. 2008. http://ambafrance-us.org/IMG/pdf/mise_en_oeuvre_plan_12_aout_2008.pdf

23. Western European Union. Decisions Council Decision 2011/297/CFSP of 23 May 2011 amending Joint Action 2001/555/CFSP on the establishment of a European Union Satellite Centre. Western European Union official website. 2011. http://www.weu.int/

24. Yarrow C. Quaker Experiences in International Conciliation. New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1978. 335 p.

25. Zartman W., Touval S. International Mediation: Conflict Resolution and Power Politics. Journal of Social Issues. 1985. No. 41. P. 8–15.

26. Новое время. Нереалистично, но желательно. Кучма прокомментировал расширение «нормандского формата». 4 вересня 2015. http://nv.ua/ukraine/events/ne-realistichno-no-zhelatelno-kuchma-prokommentiroval-rasshirenie-normandskogo-forma-ta-67188.html

27. Новое время. Новоизбранный президент Польши сделал заявление по украинскому кризису. 5 серпня 2015. http://nv.ua/world/geopolitics/novoizbran-nyj-prezident-polshi-sdelal-zajavlenie-po-ukrainskomu-krizisu-62686.html

CONCLUSIONS

The uniqueness of the EU as a global actor is that it favours non-military resources that, from an official point of view, are able to fully secure its interests. These resources are based on various forms of soft power (economic, civic, ethical, and attracting power). Joseph Nye considered the attribute of soft power the attractiveness of its owner. Based on the above provisions, this monograph attempts to answer the questions that are most relevant in the context of the EU's foreign policy perspectives: Has the EU sought to project its attractiveness abroad? Has EU influence increased / decreased in this regard? Modern (trans-sovereign) nationalism in Europe views the EU not as a union of states, but as a union of nations, a Europe of regions with many centres of power and a plethora of loyalties. Such an understanding fits best with the model of Neo-medieval Europe, which assumes that governance and powers in the EU are shared between regions rather than fixed at the centre. Thus, 'regionality' is seen as a fundamental principle of the European political space. This vision of 'regionality' implies that regions can go beyond the EU, making it possible for close cooperation between Member States and non-member countries. Therefore, this model is the most attractive to the environment surrounding the EU. The notion of 'normative power of Europe,' which the EU clearly seeks, is inherently a practice of discursive representation that involves 'building oneself through others,' so that the EU, as a force for good in the international arena, can only be strengthened through programs such as, for example, EaP. Given the interests of the EU, it is important for it to create systems of 'good governance' in the external environment – publicity and accountability of state institutions, quality legal and judicial systems. So, for the EU, some degree of 'Westernisation' of the CIS, including Russia, is considered necessary. It should also be noted that the current Latin American integration model is based on EU experience. Thus, the answer to the question of whether the EU tried to project its attractiveness abroad is definitely positive.

Since the end of the Cold War, the European Union has become the main structured pole for interstate relations on the European continent. The attractiveness of this pole was very strong, which reflected the desire of the countries of Northern, Central, Eastern, and South-Eastern Europe to join it. The EU has introduced a soft integration mechanism to strengthen economic and political co-operation, and therefore European security as a whole. Despite competitors trying to weaken the value of the EU, it is the EU that reserves the right to shape the modern configuration of architectural design of the Greater Europe. The EU as an international actor seeks to be an active player

at the pan-European, regional and sub-regional levels. Outside Europe, the EU became the first trading partner to conclude an FTA with MERCOSUR in 2019. The agreement between the two regions will be able to consolidate strategic, political and economic partnerships, creating significant opportunities for the economic benefits of both alliances. The EU's main interest is to have stable and economically prosperous neighbours on its borders with whom it would maintain non-conflict relations. The benefits of the neighbours' economic prosperity are obvious: their wealth will create markets, help to avoid pockets of poverty, unwanted migration to the EU, and the spread of crime and corruption. For example, Croatia's accession to the EU has become a model of loyalty to democratic values and a guarantee of the effectiveness of enlargement policy. A new strategy for the Western Balkans, which aims to identify the main steps in preparation for the next phase of enlargement while maintaining its influence in the Balkans, is a means of ensuring EU defence policy. According to Jack Snyder, any European country that now chooses a path to a 'nation state' outside the EU is doomed to be drawn into the Russian sphere of influence. He calls nation states inherently weak, incapable of surviving without the markets and connections that colonies or integration provide. The EU is a way to live in Europe without colonies. The events of recent years lead to the conclusion that in the future, EU countries will change energy consumption and its sources to reduce dependence on Russia; may use sanctions and boycotts as levers of influence on Russian policy. Work has already begun on addressing the financial sector vulnerability. The creation of a central European anti-money laundering body and the full implementation of existing pan-European anti-money laundering legislation will allow for more effective oversight and enforcement of the European financial sector. A new EU-wide screening mechanism for foreign investment is a first step in addressing the vulnerability of the Union but will be strengthened by adding measures to enforce European Commission information collection requirements. Member States will, in the future, adopt screening mechanisms that meet EU requirements and expand their own collection of foreign investment information. The EU will also continue to work on the effectiveness of its CFSP and CSDP, as they play a role in ensuring stability, security, and prosperity across the European continent. The EU will rethink its outdated European Security Strategy (ESS), addressing differences between the main EU member states in defence and strategy. The EU and NATO understand the importance of coordinating analysis and responses to new threats, including hybrid ones. It is quite realistic to achieve greater transparency of information in the technology sectors and social media in order to increase resistance to external hostile invasion. The European Code of Practice on Misinforma-

tion is an ambitious initial measure that will be improved by encouraging the exchange of information and providing meaningful progress reports against misinformation. The EU is working well with local and independent media to be able to build on Russian sources. Therefore, over the past 10 years, EU foreign policy has been strengthened by using only soft power levers, which gives the opportunity to answer "yes" to the question or to increase the EU's influence in this regard.

At the same time, scepticism is growing today about the future membership of Turkey, Ukraine, Moldova and other interested countries, and the EU clearly needs a new paradigm. Slippage in the creation of a stable, democratic, integrated game rules system is largely due to the reluctance of individual European players to follow the rules. The EU must overcome internal contradictions, and only then can regional policy be improved. Institutional restructuring within the EU must be completed, leaving unambiguous decision-making. The impact of the EU on countries wishing to join it depends directly on the organization's ability to give them the prospect of membership. In implementing the EU enlargement plan, the EU penetrates further into the post-Soviet region, which Russia considers to be a sphere of its privileged interests. This is the main problem of relations in the EU – EU – Russia format.

In addition to Russia, the EU's relations with its main ally, the United States, have been negatively affected, including by the difference in their value systems. On the one hand, the EU's economic potential has grown so much that it is at odds with the military and political dependence of Western European countries on the United States. On the other hand, European states are not yet able to replace US resources in high-intensity military operations. The move to tackle climate change, one of the EU's key priorities, was blocked by Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. Differences between the views of the US and the EU on security issues, such as the Iranian nuclear program, the Middle East peace process and Syria, will push the EU towards a more independent policy. If US involvement in certain important EU regions continues to weaken, Europe will have to work with other influential actors, such as Russia and China, to advance its interests. And if the security of Europe was guaranteed by the US earlier, now it is not. Therefore, the EU is forced to spend more on military goals, discuss the European army in coordination with NATO, think strategically in the face of Russia and China, who know that there is no guarantee of security, and Europe is not ready for contemporary local conflicts. Thus, the EU's distance from the US diminishes its foreign policy potential today.

The EU's power towards conflicts has been in its multiple roles, mandates and involvement at various levels and the EU has not always been able to

use this. The start of the August Russian-Georgian War of 2008 demonstrated that EU standard mechanisms for conflict prevention were not effective. Despite the considerable amount of money spent to mitigate the effects of conflict, financial assistance does not replace politics and security. Even better, events in the Middle East since 2011 have shown this. In terms of geographical proximity, Europe is very vulnerable to the threats posed by it: illegal migration, Islamist extremism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. No European initiatives have led to significant socio-economic or democratic transformations in the countries of the region, as evidenced by the Arab Spring. The situation in other countries of the region shows the opposite tendencies – increasing authoritarianism and growing instability. In this regard, the EU should intensify its military and political role, along with the use of its traditional instruments of influence (humanitarian aid, support for reforms, funding for non-governmental organizations and free media). First of all, this concerns defence capabilities to counteract security issues that do not have enough soft power alone.

Thus, the current dynamics of international relations require a fundamental rethinking of EU foreign policy if it is to retain the role of a powerful international actor. The realization of even modest ambitions requires the determination and unity of European states, which is not yet observed. If the EU fails to develop an effective and well-coordinated policy, it can become a minor actor, a provider of humanitarian and technical assistance. Despite the presence of the CFSP, as well as the intensive work of the EU's High Representatives for Foreign Affairs and the staff of the European External Relations Service, EU foreign policy is mainly developed at the level of heads of state and government, and mainly in crisis. The EU's foreign policy mechanism is operational, but its work is largely made up of declarations, demarches, coordination at the level of senior officials and ambassadors, while real steps are taken by individual states. Countries are not yet ready to speak with one voice, especially with regard to conflict. The ability to act as a whole in 2008 during the Russian-Georgian conflict had a significant positive effect on the image of the EU, but it did not become a sustainable behaviour. Recognition of one's own responsibility and one's own capacities is gradually taking hold in the minds of the representatives of the European institutions, but the national interests of individual Member States still come first. In the coming years, the status quo will be maintained more quickly until the EU completes its internal transformation and reforms, which will allow it to more clearly define its own place in the system of international relations.

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

BRUSYLOVSKA Olga, Prof. (2012), Dr (Political Science, 2008). She has been working at Odessa Mechnikov National University (ONU) since 1991; Chair of the International Relations Department since 2015. She defended her Doctoral Thesis (specialisation – Political Problems of International Systems and Global Development) at the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (Kyiv), on the topic "Political-Systemic Transformation in the Region of Eastern Europe (1989 – 2004)". She is an author of more than 80 academic publications, including the monograph "Post-communist Eastern Europe: External Impact, Internal Changes" (Odesa, 2008); revised and enlarged edition "Systemic Transformation of the Region Eastern Europe (1989-2004)" (Saarbrücken, 2016). She is a Science Editor of the academic journal "International and Political Studies" (ONU, Odesa, Ukraine), a member of Editorial Board of the academic journal "Political Life" (Vinnytsia, Ukraine), the academic journal "Transformations" (Warsaw, Poland), and the electronic academic journal "Rhetoric and Communication" (Sofia, Bulgaria), a member of Review's Board of the academic journal "Strategic Review" (Poznan, Poland).
E-mail: brusylovska@gmail.com

DUBOVYK Volodymyr, Associate Prof. (2000), PhD (Political Science, 1996). He has been working at Odessa Mechnikov National University since 1992. He is the Director of the Centre for International Studies at ONU (1999). He defended his PhD thesis (specialisation - Political Problems of International Systems and Global Development) at ONU on the topic "U.S. Policy towards Ukraine (1991 - 1996): Analysis of Foreign Policy Concepts". He is the author of more than 50 academic publications.
E-mail: volodymyrdubovyk@gmail.com

GLEBOV Sergii, Associate Prof. (2008), PhD (Political Science, 2002). He has been working at Odessa National University since 1999; Deputy Director of the Institute of Social Sciences; Senior Research Fellow at the Centre for International Studies at ONU. He is a political observer, an author and an anchorman of a regular TV and Radio political shows for the media outlet "GLAS". He defended his PhD thesis (specialisation – Political Problems of International Systems and Global Development at ONU on the topic "Constructing Security and Cooperation System in the Black Sea Region and the Role of Ukraine in this Process (1990s)." He is the author of more than 60 academic publications.
E-mail: sergglebov@gmail.com

KOVAL Igor, Prof. (2001), Dr (Political Science, 2000); Honoured Science and Technology Figure of Ukraine. He has been working at Odessa Mechnikov National University since 1978; Chair of the International Relations Department (1999-2015); Director of the Institute of Social Sciences (1996-2010); Rector of ONU since 2010. He defended his Doctoral Thesis (specialisation – Political Problems of International Systems and Global Development) at the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, on the topic "Conceptualization of the US East European Politics at the Beginning of the Global Transformation Process". He is the author of more than 80 academic publications, including the monograph "The Last Battle of the Cold War: The Eastern European Policy of the Superpowers in Concepts of the Western Political Science (1980s – beginning of 1990s)".

E-mail: rector@onu.edu.ua

ROMANOVA Olga, Associate Prof. (2009), PhD (Political Science, 2008). She has been working at Odessa Mechnikov National University since 2004. She defended her PhD thesis (specialisation – Political Problems of International Systems and Global Development) at Odessa Law Academy, on the topic "Foreign Policy Strategies of France, Germany, and the United Kingdom in the Context of the Development and Implementation of the EU CFSP". She is the author of more than 30 academic publications.

E-mail: olga.romanova@onu.edu.ua

SHELEST Hanna, PhD (Political Science, 2012). Member of Board at the Foreign Policy Council "Ukrainian Prism". She defended her PhD thesis (specialization – Political Problems of International Systems and Global Development) at the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, on the topic "Institute of Mediation in the Process of Peace Settlement of Military Conflicts". From 2004 to 2015 worked as a Senior Researcher at the National Institute for Strategic Studies under the President if Ukraine, Odessa Branch. In 2014 was a Visiting Research Fellow at NATO Defence College in Rome. Editor-in-Chief at English language analytical journal «Ukraine Analytica». Chief Editor of the Annual "Scorecards of the Foreign Policy of Ukraine". She is the author of more than 50 academic articles and numerous policy reports for the governmental institutions in Ukraine and abroad on security issues, conflict resolution, hybrid threats and the Black Sea Cooperation.

Email: shelest@prismua.org

SINOVETS Polina, Associate Prof. (2008), PhD (Political Science, 2004). She has been working at Odessa Mechnikov National University since 2000. She defended her PhD thesis (specialisation – Political Problems of International Systems and Global Development) at the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, on the topic "Nuclear Deterrence in the Policies of the USA and Russia in the Post-Bipolar Period". She has been the Head of Odesa Centre for Non-proliferation at ONU since 2015. She is the author of more than 70 academic publications.

E-mail: polina.sinovets@gmail.com

VAKARCHUK Kateryna, PhD (Political Science, 2010). She has been working at Odessa Mechnikov National University since 2007; Deputy Dean of the Department of International Relations, Faculty of International Relations, Political Science and Sociology since 2018. She defended her PhD thesis (specialization - Political Institutes and Processes) at Odessa National Law Academy on the topic «Local Self-government as a Form of Democracy: Particularities of Institutional Model in Ukraine». She is the author of more than 30 academic publications, and analytical reviews of the political and economic situation of Latin American countries in the Independent Analytical Centre for Geopolitical Studies Borysfen Intel.

E-mail:katiavak30@gmail.com

VOLKOVA Yana, PhD (Political Science, 2018). She has been working at the Department of International Relations, ONU, since 2018. Having obtained her Master's degree in international relations, she worked on Turkish Diaspora engagement policy during her PhD program. Initially being interested in Turkish Diaspora, her research currently focuses on Diaspora and identity studies, migration, nationalism and trans-nationalism, specifically in the Black Sea Region. This is reflected in numerous publications in Ukrainian and international journals. She is also a member of the Horizon-2020 project titled "Knowledge exchange and academic cultures in the humanities. Europe and the Black Sea Region", where she makes a research on migration flows in the region and its role in the process of knowledge exchange and political development of the region.

E-mail: volkova.yana@onu.edu.ua

ZADOROZHNA Alina, PhD (Political Science, 2012). Assistant to the Rector of Odessa Mechnikov National University (since 2013). She defended her PhD thesis (specialisation – Political Problems of International Systems and Global Development at Chernivtsi National University on the topic

"Ukraine's Place in the System of Regional Relations between Countries of Central-Eastern and South-Eastern Europe". She is the author of more than 20 academic publications and a lot of media articles. She is a member of the National Union of Journalists of Ukraine.

E-mail: alizador@onu.edu.ua

ZAKHARCHENKO Alla, Associate Professor (2008), PhD (Political Science, 2006). She has been working at the Department of International Relations, ONU, since 1999. She also served as a Senior Researcher at the National Institute for Strategic Studies under the President of Ukraine, Odesa Branch (2003-2015). She defended her PhD thesis (specialization – Political Problems of International Systems and Global Development) at the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Kyiv, on the topic "Conceptual Background of the United States Policy toward the Resolution of the Arab-Israeli Conflict (1991-2001)". She is the author of more than 50 academic publications on problems of security in the Middle East.

E-mail: allazakharchenko@gmail.com