

Boris Zazhigaev,

Ph.D. (Political Science), professor, head of the Chair of International Relations and Foreign Policy, pro-rector of Kiev International University (Kiev, Ukraine)

UKRAINE ON THE CROSSROADS OF THE GLOBAL POLICY

Part 1

UKRAINE AND EUROPEAN SYSTEM OF MODERN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

Occupying an important geopolitical location on Eurasian continent Ukraine still preserves total economic (or more precise - energetic) dependence on the Russian Federation and keeps on playing a crucial role in the transit of Russian energy resources in the Western Europe. Ukraine found itself in the triangle of geopolitical interests of the world leading powers: the USA, Europe and Russia. Those are first and foremost economical and security (military and humanitarian) interests. Practically in the modern conditions Ukraine has occupied a geopolitical place of Western Europe and plays the role of Western Europe in the bipolar world of the second half of the XX century. Interests of the USA, Europe and Russia are focused on Ukraine's territory. These interests create a corridor in which Ukraine can pursue its foreign policy. It is worth mentioning that due to the subjective reasons which determine the place in the structure of international relations Ukraine is not capable to claim its own geopolitical interests even in the Baltic-Black Sea region. According to it, the actuality of the topic offers a special interest to a research.

2010 Presidential elections in Ukraine and the accession of power by Viktor Yanukovich as well as regional political elite have created conditions for change of all geopolitical spectrums in the modern global world. Change of priorities inside the country has altered the balance of influence on Ukraine in favor of the Russian Federation.

A tendency of shaping a single planetary civilization is appearing to be more visible in the global policy. Its basis is a real fact of "globalization" of the societal development, frequently being described as an increasing unity of the world. Occupying exclusive geopolitical location, Ukraine is developing in the stream of world global policy, practically not having the real influence levers on it by virtue of its economical state and its political establishment. It can simply maneuver among the political and economical interests of global political actors, thus getting the certain momentary benefits. The author examines the internal policy of Ukraine in the new context, as reality being shaped under the influence of powerful factors of global international relations, as derivative of the real policy of leading international actors.

A foreign policy of Ukraine in the modern world is being shaped on the crossroad of geopolitical interests of the USA, the UE and the RF. This factor, to a large degree, determines the vector of political process in Ukraine. Inside the country the political forces are balancing on existing reality: Ukraine is a disrupted nation, as deemed by Samuel Huntington.¹

A motion vector of Ukraine is located in the line depending on what kind of value priorities Ukrainian nation would perceive and what value, within the existing political realities, would be more beneficial and secure for Ukrainian political elite.

The Ukrainian foreign policy vector is being influenced to a large degree by the geopolitical interests of the USA, the EU and Russia. A level of independence in international affairs is in a direct dependence from the balance of the level of trust or confrontation of the USA, the EU and Russia.

Each of those states has its own geopolitical interests in Ukraine.

The Interests of the USA in Ukraine come from national geopolitical interests, main of which is adoption by Ukraine of democratic values as a main guarantee of maintenance of the development of democracy in the worlds, spreading a liberal-democratic form of governance and a state system in the world. The USA advocates the liberal-democratic values but does not impose them with the political, economical or force arguments. The USA interests in Ukraine are directly related to confrontation with the RF, relations with which actually shifted to the stage of moderate “cold war”. Israeli historian, the professor of the University of Tel-Aviv, Ph.D. in history in Oxford University Azar Gat believes: “More important problem is rooted in the rise of big non-democratic states. It’s about old rivals of the West in a cold war – China and Russia where remain the rule of authoritarian, rather capitalistic than communists regimes. ...today, it seems, they are ready to return”.²

Within existing international relations further confrontation between the West and Russia is unavoidable. In this context the interests of the USA in Ukraine satisfy thesis expressed by Zbigniew Brzezinski in his work “End of cold war”,³ that Baltic-Black Sea Union (after collapse of the USSR, possible union of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania) is interesting to the USA as a belt locking Russia with its expansionists intentions in Asia.

Very interesting is the opinion of Russian political scientists. As early as in 2007 Mr. Sergey Karaganov in his article “New confrontation epoch” stated: “West and Russia have entered into the new phase of confrontation which is different from cold war but could be even more dangerous”. He believes that: “West has left hope to turn Russia into a friendly state and now looks at it from the

¹ Huntington S. The Clash of Civilizations / S. Huntington. – M. : LLC «Izdatelstvo AST», 2003. – P. 209-210.

² Gat Azar. The return of great authoritarian states / Gat Azar // Russia in the global politics. – 2007. – № 4. – P. 70–83.

³ Brzezinski Zbigniew. Spadek po Zimnej Wojnie / Zbigniew Brzezinski. – Warszawa, 1993. – P. 281.

stand of “new containment”⁴. Commenting the reaction on February’s speech of the RF’s President Vladimir Putin in Munich, one of the leading specialists of Russia on international affairs Mr. Aleksey Arbatov places the problem in this way: “don’t we stand on the eve of a new cold war?”⁵

Taking into account the presence of danger coming from morally old, thus more dangerous nuclear potential of Russia inherited by it from the USSR, the first place occupies a military and strategic factor which is determining the primary geostratigical interests of the USA in Ukraine and above all in Crimea considering its unique geopolitical location.

The USA does not see Ukraine as a strategic economic partner with all its consequences (trade, investments, technology transfer, science development, education etc.), but conducts in Ukraine consistent policy directed towards adoption by its population of democratic values. This policy, slowly, but gives its results, forms the potential fundamentals for the process, the socialization of the population and the development of civil society in Ukraine.

The Interests of the EU on Ukraine within the global terms agree with the interests of the USA but have some substantial differences.

Choice less for the US and EU remains adoption by Ukraine of liberal-democratic values. For 250 years America has been telling to the world: “Give to me all your tired, poor, depressed and thirsty to breeze free”. But lately it says: “If you’re not with us, you’re against us”.⁶

The relations of Ukraine and the USA national elite cannot consider in a different way as in the form of axiom which was formulated by a modern English political theorist John Danni: “Democracy is a phenomena which we don’t have but which we cannot cease to want”.⁷ Public refusal of Ukrainian political elite from democratic rhetoric inevitably will lead to the collapse of all political elite.

From the practical point of view the EU made more efforts conducting for many years of Ukraine’s independence an open policy to its citizens, thus demonstrating on practice attractiveness and advantages of the democracy. To a certain extent this process could be considered as consolidated, consistent a humanitarian expansion of democracy, justified for post-communist, in a state of oligarchic terror Ukraine. For 20 years the EU countries are job-places for approximately 8 millions of Ukrainian citizens which allowed avoiding a humanitarian catastrophe in the country.

For the years of independence Ukraine has not moved on the way to democracy. Hybrid processes of convergence of the worst traits of soviet

⁴ Karaganov S. New epoch of confrontation / S. Karaganov // Russia in the global politics. – 2007. – № 4. – P. 58 – 69.

⁵ Arbatov A. Will new cold war burst out? / A. Arbatov // Russia in the global politics. – 2007. – № 2. – P. 38–51.

⁶ Brzezinski Z. Last sovereign at the crossroads / Z. Brzezinski // Russia in the global politics. – 2006. – № 1. – P. 8–26.

⁷ Dani John. Cit.: P.J. Danleavy and B. O’Leary. Theories of the State: the Politics of Liberal Democracy / P.J. Danleavy, B. O’Leary. – London: Macmillan, 1987. – P. 70.

totalitarianism with the worst traits of the wild capitalism took place.⁸ Modern Ukraine is a “corrupted state” and after 19 years of acquiring independence it poses real threat to the values of liberal-democratic world. Ukraine has transited through station called democracy and is stuck in the world called “corrupted state”⁹ with all its consequences.

Ukraine is a new state and it cannot be formed solitarily. All states emerge and function only within the international systems uniting them. Mr. Charles Tilly has marked that international systems act as factor of emergence and development of states.¹⁰

It is particularly topical, it has not just abandoned old system of the USSR, it is completely a new state which has never been a member of any of the international systems as an independent subject of international relations. According to Mr. Charles Tilly the condition for emergence and functioning of sovereign states is not only the monopolization of power within clearly outlined territory but also the recognition of the law on similar monopoly from the side of similar monopolists from outside of their territory and from the side of various political actors inside their territory. In this context the factor designating the vector of emergence and the development of the state is principal for Ukraine. Mr. Tilly pays attention to the fact that accession of the states to international systems does not simply turns to their recognition by other sovereigns but also affects the processes of state building in the new members of international systems and affects the transformation of old, since stuffing of the system of state would substantially restrict more later the participants of state building.¹¹

In other words when and how this or that state entered into the commonwealth of states, which place it took in it, what examples were offered and maybe imposed by the international system, all this substantially has an impact on a state building.

Ukraine has not decided into which of commonwealth of states it wants to enter. The process of socialization is slow, society does not master the democratic values and political elite opposes process of their “light” imposition. This uncertainty is conditioned by the objective factors: the country remains in the old system of collapsing military post-communist civilization of CIS countries which stays in the illusion of one’s own infallibility, and at the same time unintentionally

⁸ Soros J. Press-conference in Kyiv / J. Soros // UNIAN. – 2005. – 8 Nov. – Cit.: Kniazhytskiy N.: «Has Leonid Kuchma become the winner of the “orange revolution”?» Fakty I komentarii. – 2005. – 7 Dec.

⁹ Machiavelli N. Discourse on first decade of Titus Livius / N. Machiavelli. – M. : Mysl’, 1996. – P. 155-157.

¹⁰ Tilly Ch. Reflections on the History of European State-Making. The Formation of National States in Western Europe / [ed. by Ch. Tilly]. – Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1975. – P. 45.

¹¹ Tilly Ch. Reflections on the History of European State-Making. The Formation of National States in Western Europe / [ed. by Ch. Tilly]. – Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1975. – P. 45.

reproduces the same barbarism and evil, struggle with which was announced by Mikhail Gorbachev at the time of the beginning of the USSR's collapse.

Undoubtedly that the international recognition or rejection in such influences generation or the transformation of main political institutes of the emerging state of Ukraine, influences a political agenda, scale, pace and vector of state building. In 1990s Europe responded to the call of M. Gorbachev: "Europe can show a worthy example. The world is at the crossroads now, and where it would go pretty much depends on the political stand of Europe.

Nobody would be able to substitute Europe neither in a world policy nor in a world development. The role of Europe can be and has to be constructive, innovative and wholesome".¹²

In 1990s, the West was seriously considering the process of integration of Ukraine into the EU. Zbigniew Brzezinski in his work "The Grand Chessboard" wrote:

"Approximately between 2005 and 2010, Ukraine, especially when it will reach a substantial progress inside the country reforms thus would clarify itself as a country of Central Europe, shall be ready for the serious talks with the EU and the NATO".¹³

Modern Ukraine is an agonizing fragment of soviet empire with all its consequences. Under the absence of state building experience, as Z. Brzezinski wrote: "The space which belonged to the czar empire for centuries and to the Soviet Union for three quarters of a century, is now filled with a dozen of states, majority of which (except Russia) is barely ready for the acquisition of true sovereignty; the population of these states is also different: from quite big Ukraine having 52 million".¹⁴

Old nomenclature system of coordinates existing in Ukraine does not allow the transforming political institutions, re-socialization of its citizens and accordingly to expect a place in the European system of international relations. In its turn the EU in the condition of evolution of Ukrainian statesmanship to the level of "corrupted state"¹⁵ for the sake of its own security has to distance itself from Ukraine.

Modern Ukraine is a state with the patrimonial form of governance which is being associated with an epoch of collapse of the Roman Empire, times of Augustus rule, where term *patrimonium* meant private treasury of the emperor which he disposed of without reporting to the senate.¹⁶ Principles of power organization in Ukraine are described by Max Weber, where under patrimonialism rest on administrative personnel and military formations coming forward as a

¹² Gorbachev M. S. Perestroika and new thinking for our country and for the whole world / M. S. Gorbachev. – M. : Politizdat, 1987. – P.199–219.

¹³ Brzezinski Z. The Grand Chessboard (The Primacy of America and Its geostrategic imperatives) / Brzezinski Z. – M. : Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenia, 1998. – P. 105-106.

¹⁴ Brzezinski Z. The Grand Chessboard (The Primacy of America and Its geostrategic imperatives) / Brzezinski Z. – M. : Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenia, 1998. – P. 111.

¹⁵ Machiavelli N. Discourses on first decade of Titus Livius / N. Machiavelli. – M. : Mysl', 1996. – P. 155-157.

¹⁶ Kamenka E. Bureaucracy / E. Kamenka. – Oxford, 1989. – P. 63.

weapon of personal power of the master allows to the last ignoring direction of tradition in some cases.¹⁷

The shape of organization of political power in Ukraine is described by me as a power of cliques and clans in the work “Influence of “mutation” of communism on the global system of international relations (Extrapolation of the “evil empire” in the environment of the global world)”.¹⁸

Electing the President Viktor Yanukovich made patrimonial regime to lie firmly. Appointment to state post appears to be a “mercy” of the ruler, which he shows only to those on whose loyalty he can count. Principle of loyalty permanently has primary meaning in patrimonial power structures.

Strengthening of Yanukovich’s power intensifies the problem of establishment of democratic values in Ukraine. Mr. A. Toynbee draws historical parallels: “Since the level of human prosperity is usually being estimated according to the scale of power and wealth it happens that already learnt chapters of history of tragic social decline in the everyday public consciousness is being perceived as a periods of remarkable rise and fall. This sad delusion can continue for many centuries. But sooner or later the delusion passes. Light comes, when incurably sick society starts the war against itself. Society starts to eat itself”.¹⁹

Modern Ukraine is a state with the highest in the world level of corruption. (*In the report of “Barometer of the global corruption 2009”, published by human rights organization Transparency International. According to the document, Ukraine is recognized as the most corrupted among “new independent states” and other states included in the list*).²⁰ As early as in 2008 Ukraine was called “defective democracy” with a low level of social and economic development in the “Index of transformation” of the Bertelsmann foundation.

German expert, University of Ludwig Maximilian fellow, Martin Bruises believes that the main “defect” of Ukrainian democracy is unbalance of power branches, permanent conflict over constitutional privileges. Absence of consensus in this matter makes democracy in Ukraine vulnerable. It creates conditions for erosion of democratic process and gradual restoration of authoritarian features of the power. “Main reason for that could be establishment of present practice, when the power in the country is being executed in circumvention of democratic institutions, namely on the basis of informal agreements of authoritative elites”. According to the words of Martin Bruises, further reform process in Ukraine is impossible without employment of decisive measures to fight corruption”.²¹

¹⁷ Weber M. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* / M. Weber. – Tübingen, 1976. – S.133, 134.

¹⁸ Zazhygaev B.V. The influence of «mutation» of communism on global system of international relations (Extrapolation of the “Evil empire” in the global world)» / B.V. Zazhygaev // *Vestnik KyMU*. – 2010. – Issue 10. – P. 20 – 73.

¹⁹ Toynbee A. J. *A Study of History* / [transl. from Eng.] – M. : Progress, 1991. – P. 347.

²⁰ Barometer of the global corruption – 2009: [E-resource]: Access: <http://tsn.ua/ua/ukrayina/ukrayinu-viznano-naibilsh-korumpovanoyu-krayinoyu-svitu.html>

²¹ Brusic Martin. German experts called Ukrainian democracy “defective” [E-resource] / Deutsche Welle. – Access: <http://www.dw-world.de/>

In the expert rating of “failed” states of the world - Failed States Index 2009, which reflects ability (and inability) of government to control the unity of the territory and also demographic, political and economic situation in the state, Ukraine occupies 110th place and is in the orange zone – dangerous risks level. According to a line of points it is in the critical level. This first of all concerns the following:

Point 3. Stable and permanent migration of people;

Point 4. Presence of unsatisfied and revengeful groups;

Point 5. Uneven economic development;

Point 6. Sharp deterioration of state of economy;

Point 7. Lawlessness and criminalization of the country;

Point 11. Strengthening of group and/or clan elites;

Point 12. Interference of other states or external players.

Especially dangerous are such tendencies as presence of unsatisfied and revengeful groups, lawlessness and criminalization of the state, strengthening of group and/or clan elites which are reaching top values.

In comparison with EU these indicators are incomparable and exceed EU countries by times. Virtually all EU countries are within the zone of “stable and the most stable countries”.²²

American political scientist Noam Chomsky summed up several typical features of failed state in the following way:

- firstly, its inability or unwillingness of the state to protect its citizens from violence and even from death.
- secondly, inclination of the power to consider itself above the rule of law – both national and international.
- and, thirdly, such state is suffers from serious “deficit of democracy which leaves formally acting democratic institutions without real maintenance”.²³

There are no democratic transformations in Ukraine. In accordance with the law of Parkinson “a tree simply stopped to grow due to end of biological cycle development” of empire.²⁴ A. Toynbee calls such civilizations stoned. “Stoned civilizations are static because they have lost life in a result of unfortunate try to move from one state to another. They are dead. And their death can be neither refute nor overcome. Their fate is collapse, but they would be decaying with different speed: some like body, some like tree trunk and others like a stone on the wind”.²⁵

²² Homsy Noam. Rating of “failed” states of the world. [E-resource]. – Failed States Index 2009. <http://gtmarket.ru/news/state/2009/06/24/2045>

²³ Homsy Noam. Rating of “failed” states of the world. [E-resource]. – Failed States Index 2009. <http://gtmarket.ru/news/state/2009/06/24/2045>

²⁴ Parkinson S. The Law of Parkinson and other pamphlets / S. Parkinson. – M., 1976. – P. 299.

²⁵ Toynbee A. J. A Study of History / [transl. from Eng.] – M. : Progress, 1991. – P. 100.

Transformation of Ukraine into the EU on the modern stage is impossible. George Soros, as far back as in 2004, expressed an opinion that Ukraine "... is not ready to join the EU".²⁶ Trust to Ukraine during Yushchenko government was undermined, and Yushchenko himself "during the visit in Brussels at the end of 2009 agreed to strike off as unrealistic from the agenda of Ukraine-EU summit a question of signing an agreement on association between Ukraine and EU".²⁷ Such stand of EU is prolonged after shift of power in Ukraine: "Previously President of European Commission Jose Manuel Barrossou and President of Ukraine Yanukovich agreed that Association agreement between EU and Ukraine shall be signed not earlier than in 2011".²⁸

In its modern view Ukraine represents real humanitarian threat to EU. Credibility's lost.

It is not about membership of Ukraine in EU but about a construction of virtual, but quite real "Berlin wall" and at this time by West aiming to preserve its way of life, barrier from collapsing, corrupted state, embodying real threat to emerging world poles according to N. Machiavelli.²⁹

²⁶ Soros J. Press-conference in Kyiv / J. Soros // UNIAN. – 2005. – 8 Nov. – Cit.: Kniazhytskiy N.: «Has Leonid Kuchma become the winner of the "orange revolution"?» Fakty I komentarii. – 2005. – 7 Dec.

²⁷ Annual forecast "Russian and the world: 2010", prepared by IMEMO RAN and FTTP in cooperation with CCI RF. – [E-resource]. – <http://www.imemo.ru>

²⁸ Yanukovich: Ukraine steadily moves towards Eurointegration [E-resource] // Korrespondent. – <http://korrespondent.net/ukraine/politics/1118963>

²⁹ Machiavelli N. Discourse on first decade of Titus Livius / N. Machiavelli. – M. : Mysl', 1996. – P. 269.