

**Leleko V. V.**,  
postgraduate student of the  
Department of international relations  
Oles Honchar Dnipropetrovsk national university  
(Dnepropetrovsk, Ukraine),  
E-mail: mv\_dnu@i.ua

### **Ukrainian crisis as a new challenge for the international security system**

***Abstract.** The influence of the events of 2014 in Ukraine, including annexation of the Crimea and Donbas military aggression is the latest trends in the international security. Outlined ideological conditions specified events and their most probable motives. Underlined the particular importance of imposing international system, uncontrolled geopolitical competition and recognition of the power rivalry between the major centers of power as legitimate norms of international relations. The main benefits and challenges was found there in Ukraine and the new place of Ukraine in the international security structure, particularly NATO membership status and capabilities of US allies. Specified on the future vision of the European defense union.*

***Key words:** international security, centers of influence, NATO, annexation, separatism*

The events of 2014, including the annexation of Crimea and Donbas military aggression, became a turning point in the history of independent Ukraine, and the final touch in a fundamental change foreign policy vector. Non-aligned status of our country and force of the Budapest Memorandum as guarantees of inviolability of borders, has proven own legal and real inability to protect Ukraine from territorial encroachments of other countries. In turn, the hybrid war against Ukraine Russia showed weakness, and by definition, some political analysts, system crash general international law and questioned the effectiveness of the entire system of international security.

These events came as no surprise to quite a large number of international scholars and politicians, who began to talk about the prospects of revenge immediately after the fourth enlargement. Back in 1998 J. Kenan, author of the policy of containment, which was the basis of US relations with the Soviet Union during the "Cold War", said that "NATO enlargement - is the beginning of a new Cold War. I think that Russians

eventually react quite negatively, and this will affect their policies". Kenan also predicted that NATO enlargement would end democracy in Russia [1].

In particular, the Ukrainian scientist E. Kaminski back in 2009 wrote: "There is serious motivation hypothetical possibility of beginning the essential changes in US policy toward Ukraine. This is the first hypothetical prospects of a new surge of political and ideological confrontation between Moscow and Washington, including a return bilateral relations "struggle for influence" in the former Soviet Union" [2].

Two years before the annexation of Crimea Z. Brzezinski in his book "Strategic Concept: America and the crisis of global power" (2012) predicted the revival of Russia's imperial ambitions, increased its pressure on Europe and worsening security problems for the countries of Eastern Europe, especially Ukraine and Baltic [3].

The failure of the pro-Kremlin policy of President Yanukovich led to a change of power in Ukraine in February 2014 and immediately became clear Euro-Atlantic course of the new government. So the likelihood that the country will remain on the periphery of the system of "concentric circles" Euro-Atlantic community has become very small.

Demonstrating opposition to the dominant status of the US in the international system, Putin resorted to active offensive tactics that pursued the goal to force the West to recognize the falsity of the idea of expanding NATO to split the western achieve solidarity and refusal of the US and EU attempts to spread its influence in Eastern Europe.

The coming to power of leaders of the Ukrainian opposition in February 2014 in Moscow interpreted as a revolt that led to the transition of Ukraine under the protectorate of the USA and NATO. Instead, the inclusion of Crimea and Sevastopol into the Russian Federation was presented as action in defense of compatriots.

Today, against the backdrop of war in the Donbass, one of the scientists and the politicians determine the violation of territorial integrity Ukraine starting point of a new "cold war," said another of the Third World - a new type of war that is unfolding in other dimensions. Important to understand the main driving force for this war is the knowledge of its motive. How determines M. Fesenko, "Most likely, analysts Russian military intelligence determined that now is the right time to achieve superpower status

and restore the former sphere of influence: a) because the US and NATO missile defense system set up, and in the near future, it will do; b) because the former Socialist camp a couple of years and may be economically stronger arm; b) because there is a difference in views on the world order between European elites, because they are not capable of bold leadership" [4].

In fact, Russia has launched a so-called "hybrid war" with Ukraine at all levels denying the fact of military aggression. However, according to A. Vlasyuk, more obvious is the fact that "the actions of the Russian Federation in the military, foreign policy, economic sphere aimed at destabilizing not only Ukraine but the whole European project, the European Union as a whole. Moreover, how actively and persistently Russian Federation took on a "mission" really calls into question the very future of European political and security space if the EU can not respond in time for this "[5].

At the conclusion Fesenko says that the goal was to experiment begun imposing international system uncontrolled geopolitical competition and recognition of the power rivalry between the major centers of power as legitimate norms of international relations.

In contrast to the hyperactive US and EU positions in the internal political crisis in the country from November 2013 to February 2014, after losing Ukraine Crimea Euro-Atlantic community leaders were not ready to deploy to the conflict in Ukrainian-Russian relations and the spread of Russian expansion. Ukraine is not part of any regional security system, so the only body which can appeal in case of military aggression - is the United Nations. It is the Security Council bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security (Art. 24 of the UN Charter). The Security Council is the only UN body that has the right to start the action, prevention and enforcement, on behalf of the UN, including the combined armed forces of states - members of the United Nations [6, p. 24]. As we have seen, the six attempts to pass a UN Security Council resolution on Ukraine, all six were veto Russia - the aggressor countries, which thus blocked any legally and practically significant reaction.

Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago J. Mirshaymer noted that neither the US nor its allies in NATO are not prepared to use force to defend Ukraine, since the protection of the state listed as "strategic interests or priorities" of the West. It also reiterated the leaders of NATO and Obama.

To force Russia to stop arming separatists in eastern Ukraine, the West has applied economic sanctions, which initially affected mainly the interests of officials, state banks, energy companies and defense companies. Broader sectoral sanctions were introduced only in the autumn of 2014. According to J. Mirshaymera, ways of resolving the crisis can still be found if the West fundamentally change its approach and try to make Ukraine a "neutral buffer state between NATO and Russia, which Austria was the era of the Cold War." As a means of implementing this concept offered publicly deny plans to expand NATO to Ukraine and Georgia, to provide assistance in the form of a massive economic rescue plan for Ukraine, funded by the EU, IMF, Russia and the US [7].

However it is advisable to note that after the military aggression of Russia against Ukraine as Ukrainian authorities and society, the question of finding allies that can help is in the military conflict was a priority, further pushing Ukraine into NATO. In December 2014 the Parliament of Ukraine's neutral status has been canceled, which was an important political and legal step towards NATO. However, this step - one among so many equally necessary. According to Jens Stoltenberg, NATO Secretary General, to join NATO, Ukraine must meet the standards of the organization. Among the conditions that must be done Kyiv - is to reform, to organize the fight against corruption and to increase the efficiency of the state apparatus. He noted that the preparatory process leading application for NATO membership, can take up to six years. In addition, Ukraine should necessarily solve territorial problems, which is a prerequisite for membership in NATO. So the prospect of joining the North Atlantic alliance postponed indefinitely.

However, in the past six months, there is another possible niche in the international security architecture for Ukraine. Congress and the US Senate have repeatedly went up status for Ukraine strategic US ally outside NATO protein corresponding bill vetoed

Obama. Domestic scientist V. Golovchenko also convinced that the real guarantee Ukraine's security status can US ally outside NATO. However, this chance will take concrete shape only if the Republicans win the presidential elections in 2016 in the United States, because Republicans, including J. McCain supporters and lobbyists are giving Ukraine this status [4].

The failure of the existing system of international security to prevent the real war has set new tasks to NATO and the EU. Against a background search Ukraine allies, sounded the thesis of creating a military bloc is for the European Union. "Further integration of EU member states should have the effect of creating a European Defense Union", - the former Secretary General of the EU Council Javier Solana and analyst for Foreign Policy Steven Blokmen. In their view, security and defense is the weakest link of the European integration project, "The years of uncoordinated cuts in expenditure on national defense undermined the role of the EU as a security actor is now multipolar world whose center of economic gravity is moving away from Europe towards Asia. Differences between Member States in the perception of threats, differences in the intentions and preferences, and in some cases, the lack of mutual trust and solidarity prevented the emergence of a common strategic culture and prevent the creation of joint structures, processes and assets at EU level "[8]. This idea is gaining more and more supporters, and at its June summit of the European Council should define an action plan that will consist of practical and realistic steps for phased development, from design and ending with the launch of a European Defense Union.

In conclusion, we can say that it is too early to make final conclusions about the role of aggression in eastern Ukraine in the global sense, as validly predict its end. However, one can confidently say that the architecture of international security got deep fissure system of international law has shown its inability to really settle difficult situations, and key actors in international politics facing the difficult choice of further development strategy.

#### **REFERENCES:**

1. Tayler, J. (2014) *The Seething Anger of Putin's Russia in The Atlantic*, available at : [www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2014/09/russia-west-united-states-past-futureconflict/380533/](http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2014/09/russia-west-united-states-past-futureconflict/380533/) (Accessed 22 September 2014)
2. Kaminskyi, Ye.Ye. (2009) *Vizyt Dzho Baidena do Kyieva: dyplomatychna rutyna, pidtverdzhennia sumnoi tradytsii chy novyi realizm u politytsi SShA shchodo* [Joe Biden's visit to Kyiv diplomatic routine confirmation of the sad tradition or a new realism in US policy on Ukraine], available at : [www.radiosvoboda.org/content/article/1780538.html](http://www.radiosvoboda.org/content/article/1780538.html) (Accessed 7 January 2015)
3. Brzezinski, Zb. (2012) *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power*, Basic Books, N.Y.
4. Fesenko, M., 'Ukraina yak faktor transformatsii mizhnarodnoho poriadku' [Ukraine as a factor in the transformation of the international order], *Zovnishni vidnosyny* [External Relations], available at: <http://uaforeignaffairs.com/ua/ekspertnadumka/view/article/ukrajina-jak-faktortransformaciji-mizhnarodnogo-porjadku-1/#sthash.L3CSeYGP.dpuf> (Accessed 16 January 2015)
5. Vlasiuk O., *Rosiia znyshchuie suchasnu systemu mizhnarodnoi bezpeky*, [Russia destroys the modern system of international security], available at : <http://blogs.ukrinform.com/blog/oleksandrvaslyuk/rosiya-znyshchuye-suchasnu-systemu-mizhnarodnoyi-bezpeky> (Accessed 16 January 2015)
6. *Statut Orhanizatsii Obiednanykh Natsii vid 26 cherv. 1945 r.* [The United Nations Charter on 26 Jun. 1945] available at : [www.rada.gov.ua](http://www.rada.gov.ua). (Accessed 16 January 2015)
7. Mearsheimer, J.J. (2014) 'Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault. The Liberal Delusions That Provoked Putin', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 93, №. 5, pp. 77-89.
8. 'Chy buty Yevropeiskomu oboronnomu soiuzu?' [Whether the European Defence Union is to exist?], *Yevropeyskyi prostir* [European space] available at : <http://eu.prostir.ua/library/267764.html> (Accessed 16 January 2015)
9. Chekhovych, T. (2013) 'Problemy ta zabezpechennia mizhnarodnoi bezpeky mizhnarodnopravovymi zasobamy' [Issues of international security and international

legal tools] *Naukovyi visnyk Natsionalnoi Akademii vnutrishnikh sprav* [Scientific  
Bulletin of the National Police  
Academy], № 1.