ПОЛІТИЧНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ МІЖНАРОДНИХ СИСТЕМ ТА ГЛОБАЛЬНОГО РОЗВИТКУ

UDC 327.56(4+73):327.51.82

Kandyuk O., Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University

TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS IN XXI CENTURY AND THEIR IMPACT OVER CEE COUNTRIES

Today the region which often called "New Europe" is experiencing a very complex and important period of political history. The majority of these states are on a certain stage of final transformation: cutting off geopolitical forms of the Soviet period and refocusing on one or another form of regional or global integration.

A very similar situation was in the Central and Eastern Europe at the end of the XX century. In both cases the impact of foreign actors, and primarily the United Europe and the USA, whose policy mainly formed further paradigm of development in these regions, was of paramount importance. These states are actually facing the dilemma of choosing between the development of the Atlantic foreign policy vector (the position of the United States is traditionally strong in this region) and deepening integration processes within the European Union, which they mostly belong to.

Keywords*: Transatlantic relations, American foreign policy, European integration, Central and Eastern Europe transformation, Post-soviet space.*

The countries of Central and Eastern Europe while shaping their foreign policy with other European countries face the need to determine their position in relation to two strategic trends, which had been formed throughout the twentieth century – Europeanism and Atlanticism. The pro-European vector in foreign policy usually means closer integration, cooperation and implementation of common policies, whereas active support of strategic alliance with the United States is often described as Atlanticism. Both trends are interrelated and co-exist in European politics, but the degree of their expressiveness falls under both short-term oscillations associated with the political conjuncture and the effect of long-term factors, which allows speaking of more or less "pro-Atlantic" or "pro-European" states.

The discourse, which conditions the situation, has emerged with increasing integration in Europe. By the end of the 80's the necessity to strengthen relations between the European Community and the United States as two independent actors, and make these relations more institutionalized has become obvious. In 1990 the Transatlantic Declaration, which defined the main principles and content of future cooperation, was signed [1].

The declaration stated that the relationship between parties will be based on common historical heritage and common set of values and supported further liberalization of transatlantic trade. The document also outlined the prospects of cooperation in the fields of science, education and culture. It stipulated common responsibility in the fields of environmental protection, counterterrorism, drug trafficking, transnational crime and preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction. The declaration has defined the format of regular meetings of the President of the USA with the head of the European Commission and the head of a chair-state of the European Community. And, finally, the Commission had to provide regular consultations with the U.S. secretary of state. Thus, the EU and the USA organized a permanent information exchange on all matters of mutual interest or provoke problems between the parties.

The end of the bipolarity era eliminated the need to withstand military threat of the "socialist camp" and put forward contradictions of individual interests of allies. These interests are determined by imperatives of economic development and political culture generated by certain historical experience and different views of partners on threats to European and international security.

Establishment of the European Union and its transformation into a separate center of power demanded certain adjustments in relations with the United States. So, in 1995 the "New Transatlantic Agenda" replaced the Transatlantic Declaration [2].

The document particularly confirmed the commitment of the parties to the principle of "indivisibility of transatlantic security". The text of the "New Transatlantic Agenda" shows an obvious concern about possible competition between the European Union and NATO, which had increased with the creation of the EU (and, consequently, with the appearance of the second pillar of the Union - Common Foreign and Security Policy). At the very beginning the document stresses that NATO remains the center of transatlantic security for the allies, which provides all necessary interconnection between the continents. In the "Agenda" the processes of the EU and NATO enlargement were called independent but complementing each other. In the following years such complementarities have been repeatedly confirmed in practice as NATO membership became, in fact, a prerequisite for accessing the EU for some countries. The "New Transatlantic Agenda" had outlined the prospects of economic and political cooperation between the EU and the U.S. much more distinctly than the Transatlantic Declaration. Institutional mechanisms of cooperation were amended by a provision about consultations of parliamentary leaders' of the parties.

The next important step in the development of US-European relations was made in 1998 by adopting the concept of "Transatlantic Economic Partnership" [3]. This new framework of interaction defined a range of areas of economic development and trade, in which the parties shared their fundamental approaches or needed regular exchange of opinions. Great attention was paid to the existing mechanisms of the World Trade Organization and prospects for further development of these mechanisms. In 2005, the partners approved of the "Initiative to Enhance Transatlantic Economic Integration and Growth" which gave grounding for gradual harmonization of standards and regulatory economical mechanisms on both sides of the Atlantic [4]. In 2007, the United States and the European Union created the Transatlantic Economic Council, which was intended to coordinate further development of economic cooperation [5].

END OF BIPOLAR ERA

It's no exaggeration to state that the U.S. foreign policy plays a crucial role in the transformation of the post-bipolar Euro-Atlantic relations. The "programming leadership" strategy which was formed during the first term of presidency of Bill Clinton (1993-1996) and was finally tested during the second term (1997-2000), was focused on the agenda that allowed taking common actions in the national interests of United States.

Foreign policy of the Republican administration of George W. Bush, "the mission determines the coalition" approach, Washington's desire to act unilaterally with the use of force, neglecting UN procedures, international law, as well as interests and positions of other countries, including the closest allies (with Europe being treated as a junior partner) significantly increased tension in the transatlantic alliance.

According to the German Marshall Fund surveys, a dramatic change of European public opinion towards USA from a predominantly positive to negative took place in 2003 [6]. Obviously, such transformation is directly related to the Iraq military intervention and political disagreements between the U.S. and several European countries following the campaign. Since then, policy of the American administration received consistently low scores from Europeans up to the final stage of the presidential race 2008. Negative perception of the United States was not limited only to a rational assessment of its policy. Europeans were increasingly expressing the feeling of some moral superiority over the United States and refused to consider the transatlantic partner as a model of social organization [7]. Anti-Americanism started transforming into a fashionable trend in the European politics.

We should not forget that the citizens of the United States, in their turn, formed a critical view of the European politics. American indignation by the position of France and Germany on the war in Iraq was forgotten with time, but the stereotypical perception of Europe as an obviously weak international actor remained and affected empirical politics. The images of the US being compared to Mars as the one capable of tough actions and of Europe being compared to a weak Venus, suggested by the famous American non-conservative author R. Kagan are occasionally mentioned in the expert discussions nowadays [8].

The election of Barack Obama the president of United States in 2008 undoubtedly had a positive impact on the perception of America in Europe at least in a short-term perspective. Today the majority of European countries are ready to accept leadership of the U.S. if they implement it with consideration

to the opinion of Europe. The EU in its turn expects such steps from the U.S. administration and Barack Obama, who from the very first months of his presidency has repeatedly demonstrated his respect for the partners and willingness to dialogue.

After the re-election of Barack Obama Europe felt a great relief. Although the European support of foreign policy implemented by the Obama administration dropped in 2009, a vast majority of Europeans preferred Obama to his opponent, a Republican candidate Mitt Romney. According to a survey conducted in 12 EU countries before the election, 75% of Europeans responded that they would have voted for B. Obama if they had such an opportunity, and only 8% of respondents would have supported M. Romney [9].

However, the warming of relations has not meant a return to the Cold War agenda. It is necessary to take into account that in Post-cold-war world, Europe is no longer a major U.S. geopolitical priority and this fact can not be masked by positive rhetoric about shared values.

Furthermore, American citizens have become more concerned about domestic policy. As Robert Kagan pointed correctly: "A majority of Americans may prefer a minimalist foreign policy in which the United States no longer plays a leading role in the world and leaves others to deal with their own miserable problems. They may want a more narrowly self-interested American policy" [10].

American strategic "turnover" toward Asia poses a certain dilemma to the Europeans. As it has been pointed out by the Secretary of State Hillary Clinton: "America has not turned from Europe to Asia, it has turned together with Europe to Asia". But it is unclear whether the Europeans want to be part of such a turn. Europeans definitely want to increase their trade with Asia, but not so many are willing to help the U.S. in the "pacification" of China, and be involved into a strategic confrontation in the region. At the same time, the Europeans are afraid of inequality with the "G-2", which is controlled by China and the United States.

Not willing to join the Asian turnover, Europeans, however, can take responsibility for solving problems with their eastern and southern neighbors, which were previously utterly dependent on the United States. As it was stated by the former German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer: "Europe must grow up and develop its own possibilities of self-defense since others will soon have neither the desire nor the possibility to do it for us" [11].

European integration as an unprecedented form of globalization has dramatically changed the political and economic realities of the continent. Europe is becoming more and more self-absorbed and too focused on its own internal processes to pay enough attention to the Euro-Atlantic Partnership. All-European structures are becoming more powerful, so more intensive and deeper integration process require the creation of new, more effective institutions. All of this stimulates processes of gradual disintegration of transatlantic relations in the form they were first made and functioned successfully during the Cold War.

A significant factor in those processes is foreign policy of the U.S., which appears in a certain duality. On the one hand, all American administrations irrespective of their political party affiliation supported and continue to support closer European integration and consider the European Union as their main geopolitical partner. On the other hand, the realities of global politics are forcing the United States to strategic "turnover" toward the Middle East and the Pacific Asia, which automatically brings European vector out of the U.S. foreign policy focus.

In such geopolitical situation especially difficult and controversial is the position of the new democracies of the Central and Eastern Europe. These states are actually facing the dilemma of choosing between the development of the Atlantic foreign policy vector (the position of the United States is traditionally strong in this region) and deepening integration processes within the European Union, which they mostly belong to. Most indicative in this sense is the case of Poland.

POLISH EXPERIENCE

Experts noted some evidence of independent Polish foreign policy already in the 1950s – 1980s. In particular, its vision of the United States as a support provider, which was unacceptable to the Soviet Union. Small countries in the first half of the 60s both in the East and the West feel like hostages of superpower confrontation. Thus, the policy of Poland reflected their increasing desire of autonomy and cooperation beyond the coalition [12].

Analysis of the political discourse inside the country shows that Poland has made a right choice

after the collapse of the USSR. Taking into account distant perspectives of European integration and weakness of WEU as a framework of European security, Warsaw has chosen NATO as a major acting European security institute. Such a choice became possible as a result of dissolution of the "Eastern threat" and was necessary to neutralize the "German factor" through co-membership with Germany in same military and political alliance. Choosing the NATO as the main partner meant choosing the US as a strategic ally at the European and international arena.

It should be noted that priority was given to relations with the NATO and the United States despite the fact that in the 1990s Central and Eastern Europe, as well as Poland, believed that America and Europe simply shared leadership in the region and therefore the task of joining the NATO and the EU were complementary and did not presume any competition. But even then such Atlanticism in the system of objectives of the Polish foreign policy promised serious challenges to the future of Poland's membership in the European Union, and particularly in light of plans to establish an independent European security policy. Domination of the NATO and the US in the foreign policy of Poland in the 1990s was formed due to several factors. First, Polish people considered cooperation with the United States as the most reliable security guarantee because of a very negative European historical experience of Poland: “US holds a distinctive place in the Polish strategic policy. If we refer to history, the idealism of President Wilson, America's involvement in World War II, the Cold War announced to the communism, and the expansion of NATO – all this indicate the US as an advocate of a free and democratic Poland… Europe on the contrary has a mostly unattractive historical image: It indulged Hitler, tolerated Stalin's regime, and in 1939 left Poland stand alone. United States seems to be more trustworthy in terms of security… [13].” That is why Poland believed that the presence of the US and the NATO in Europe should be an essential component of the European security. Poland expected to use the United States as the guarantor of its own security, not only in relations with Russia, but also in its relations with Germany. As an example of typical statements on this matter we can quote Krzysztof Pilawski, an editor of the «Trybuna» newspaper (Warsaw): "Poland is situated between Germany and Russia, and we have a sad experience. Historically, Poland lost its independence several times because of it. And all politicians, right and left, thought and still think that America is the main guarantor of security for Poland [14]." Second, the primacy of the NATO in the Polish foreign policy was closely connected with the expectations that the United States will be interested to have additional support in the European Union represented not only by Poland but also by new EU members from the Central and Eastern Europe. Finally, we should take into account almost ten million of the Polish Diaspora in the United States.

The Pro-American foreign policy stance promised to cause problems in the relations between Poland and the EU. The European countries at last found the opportunity to increase its international weight significantly beside NATO, and even in spite of the “superpower” of the US. In the context of essential reformation of the international relations the dynamics of integration processes determined the role the United Europe would be able to play by the beginning of the XXI century. The European Union was given a chance to oppose the American concept of the "unipolar world" with its own concept of the "multipolar" world with the EU being one of the "centers of power". Eastern expansion from the viewpoint of the European leaders was meant to contribute to the implementation of this chance. Thus, the position of Poland, as an ally and an "agent" of the US in the region raised serious concerns in 1990s that echoed in 2007, when a discussion about the deployment of the US missile defense had started in Poland. The opponents of the project in Europe described Poland as a country which is not totally European and wants to betray the unity of the continent in exchange for a promise of closer relations with Washington. The predominant commitment of Poland to the United States, especially in the aspect of European security, provoked speculation that the apparent Poland’s pro-atlantic position undermines the unity of Europe and thus upsets the plan to transform Europe into one of the "centers of power" that would counterbalance the hegemonic aspirations of the United States.

However, if on the issues of security the USA were stronger, in terms of a possibility to satisfy the longstanding national ambitions in Europe priority was given to the European Union. The desire to join the EU, among other things, was caused by an ambitious goal of Poland to affect the formation of the eastern EU policy. Such an intention seemed quite reasonable – Poland's eastern border became the longest eastern border of the EU. The new eastern neighbors of the European Union are the old neighbors of Poland, with whom it has been connected by centuries of rather complex relationships.

Undoubtedly, Poland had every right to expect that its interests would be considered while forming the Eastern policy of the expanded European Union.

Poland cannot change its geopolitical position and this position alongside with its historical experience left no alternatives for the country in the early 90s. Survival under the conditions of external and internal instability resulted in both the Atlantic and the European choice of Poland. This choice could really guarantee security and provide a unique opportunity to affect the relations between the West and Russia in a way that does not pose a threat to the interests of Poland. That choice has both challenges and opportunities.

Opportunities of Poland to ensure security and gain influence on the formation of the EU's eastern policy, however, depended on relations the between the European Union and the United States, between Russia and the "old" EU member states. In this situation, especially in the case of shortsighted foreign policy decisions, Poland could face a very painful choice between the US and Europe, and the relationship between the European Union and Russia in this case could be formed without consideration of interests of the Polish side.

After joining the NATO, basic directions of the Polish foreign policy, which had been determined back in the 90s, have become even more evident: reliance on the NATO and the US, active support of further NATO expansion to the east, as well as ambitions of becoming a regional leader in the so-called "New Europe". Poland's joining the EU coincided, on the one hand, with the emergence of new global threats, and the increase of global leadership and unilateralism of the United States, but on the other - with the aggravation of the transatlantic controversy, especially with regard to the US military operations in Iraq. It seriously encumbered Warsaw's ability to maintain balance in the Euro-Atlantic relations, which was the basic principle of its foreign policy. The loss of US interest and weakening of the NATO became Poland's biggest concern because of its inability to adapt to a new situation in the field of international security.

Strictly speaking, Poland's NATO-centrism, Atlanticism and pro-Americanism increased after the events of September 11, and even more – during the war in Iraq. But practically, during this period Poland's NATO-centrism did not correspond either to the US approach, relying on ad hoc coalitions, or to the concept of the European leaders (primarily Germany, France) interested in strengthening the role of the European security structures. These external circumstances, as well as a distinct vision of the situation in the country led to changes in the foreign policy with the advent of the Donald Tusk government. A more open pro-European position and certain warming of relations with Russia didn't mean, however, the rejection of the traditional Polish Atlanticism.

Thus, despite the relative dichotomy in the Polish foreign policy, Warsaw has done a lot on the international arena. Poland remained if not the most loyal (considering Baltic States and Romania's position) but anyway the most powerful American ally and lobbyist in Europe. At the same time it managed to engage in the European integration process to the uttermost and earn maximum benefits, with regional leadership in so-called "New Europe" and the role of a locomotive of the EU's eastern policy to be named among the major ones. As polish political scientist Bartlomiej Nowak aptly remarked: "Poland had gotten unstuck from its "Post-Cold War warrior" label and, for the first time in its history, did not feel that its geographic location between Germany and Russia was geopolitical determinism" [15].

In addition to the traditional objective of restraining Russia and expansion of the Western borders to the East, the priority of the Eastern vector in the Polish foreign policy is also conditioned by the fact that Warsaw is considering Eastern policy as an instrument to restore the Euro-Atlantic balance. Long-term intentions presume that interests of the United States and Europe on the post-soviet territory coincide in many respects. Eastern policy, according to the aspirations of Warsaw, will allow taking its place in the NATO and the EU, and also implementing its foreign policy ambitions. Poland is seeking to acquire a special function in the European Union using the "Eastern policy" and the "Neighborhood Policy" and it largely succeeds in it, despite the fact that the Eastern policy itself is far from ideal.

STRATEGY FOR UKRAINE

It's interesting that in the first decade of the XXI century the new independent eastern European states (the Baltic States, Ukraine, Moldova, and maybe eventually Belarus) have started playing the same role in determining the European foreign policy and security structure, as it was played by Poland

and other CEE countries in the 90s. Being an object of “integration competition” between Russia (CIS) and the West (NATO, EU), the European NIS as independent, sovereign entities significantly affect the policy of Russia, the EU and the United States and the relationship between them.

As a key state, Ukraine has always been a country the position of which the region's future depends on. Trying to maneuver between Europe and Russia, Ukraine is trapped in his own uncertain foreign policy and has become hostage of its geographical position. In addition, it has become the last frontier for Russia. To retain control over Ukraine for the Russian Federation is the question of taking back Soviet Empire or geopolitical collapse.

Key recommendations for Ukraine in this difficult geopolitical situation could be the following:

• While looking for support in foreign policy, priority should be given to the United States. First, because American interests in the region sound more in tune with the Ukrainian ones (restraint of Russia and weakening of the Putin regime); Second, the USA have turned out much more prepared for the Russian aggression than Europe.

• Ukraine should strongly support and boost the development and institutionalization of relations within the framework of the so-called "New Europe". This format will allow developing a consolidated position and creating an additional instrument to influence the countries of the "Old Europe" in terms of defending Ukraine’s interests. Besides, the understanding of region’s importance comes over Atlantic. As AEI fellow Dalibor Rohac mentioned: "Instead of reinvigorating NATO and the EU, "New Europe" risks becoming a liability" [16].

• Nevertheless, the official foreign policy position should be strictly focused on the European integration and becoming a member of the European Union. This is the imperative of striking importance, because it’s Europe that responsible for Ukraine's geopolitical future. As former Secretary General of NATO Javier Solana underlined: "…Ukraine’s problems are properly our problems. A Ukraine that is politically stable, independent, and economically prosperous—and has good relations with Russia and the EU—is crucial to the security of the Eurasian continent" [17].

Thus, the experience of Poland is rather useful for Ukraine with regard to determining its foreign policy that would be based on the achievement of its national interests using the balance between the Atlantic and the European components. With a similar paradigm, Ukraine could build a far-reaching foreign policy strategy that would remain relevant within at least a couple decades.

Summing up, it should be noted that the newly appeared "Russian threat" has consolidated transatlantic partners, and despite some discrepancies in the methods and estimates, Americans and Europeans have come to share a common vision of the situation for the first time in many years. Although, it should be understood, that the Russian Federation will not become a new Soviet Union and, being unable to produce enough threat, will not be able to unite Europe and the United States for a long time. Therefore, the coming decades will inevitably pass in an atmosphere of US-European competition. In such a geopolitical situation the most appropriate foreign policy approach for the new democracies of Post-Soviet space is the one of balanced partnership with the US and the EU.

References:

1. Transatlantic Declaration on EC-US relations, 1990. – Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/us/docs/trans_declaration_90_en.pdf

2. The New Transatlantic Agenda. – Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/us/docs/new_transatlantic_agenda_en.pdf

3. Transatlantic Economic Partnership, 1998. – Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/us/docs/trans_econ_partner_11_98_en.pdf

4. The United States and the European Union Initiative to Enhance Transatlantic Economic Integration and Growth, Washington, June 20, 2005. – Available at: http://www.eurunion.org/partner/summit/Summit0506/EconomicInitiative06-17.doc

5. Framework for advancing transatlantic economic integration between the European Union and the United States of America, Washington. April 30, 2007. – Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/us/sum04_07/framework_transatlantic_economic_integration.pdf

6. Transatlantic Trends. Key Findings 2008, German Marshall Fund, 2008. – Available at: http://www.gmfus.org/trends/doc/2008_English_Key.pdf

7. F. Romero, What do we share? Friends again? EU-US relations after the crisis, Ed. by M.Zaborowski, Paris, EU Institute for Security Studies, 2006, P. 32 – 33.

8. R. Kagan, Of Paradise and Power: American and Europe in the New World Order, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003, 176 p.

9. 75% of Europeans Would Vote for Obama: Report. – Available at: http://www.cnbc.com/id/49003594

10. R. Kagan, President Obama's foreign policy paradox, Washington post, March 26, 2014. – Available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/west-must-prepare-for-a-long-struggle-with-russia/2014/03/26/5901d78c-b4fc-11e3-b899-20667de76985_story.html

11. J. Fischer, Provincial Europe. – Available at: http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/europe-s-missing-foreign-and-security-policy-by-joschka-fischer

12. Foreign Policy of the Republic of Poland in 1991 / Sejm Expose by the Polish Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski Warsaw, June 27, 1991, Poland's Security Policy. 1989-2000, Ed. By Roman Kuzniar, Warsaw. – 2001, P. 567-569

13. L. Kulesa, Missile Defense Dossier. The Polish Perspective, PISM papers, 2007. – Available at: http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Publications/Detail/?lng=en&id=141188

14. K. Pilawski, Wypędzona historia, Tygodnik Przeglad, Luty 21, 2011. – Available at: http://www.tygodnikprzeglad.pl/krzysztof-pilawski-wypedzona-historia/

15. B. Nowak, Polish Foreign Policy: End of the "Golden Years", January 27, 2015. – Available at: http://www.transatlanticacademy.org/node/771

16. D. Rohac, What Happened to New Europe?, The American Interest, May 8, 2015. – Available at: http://www.the-american-interest.com/2015/05/08/what-happened-to-new-europe/

17. J. Solana, Ukraine: Just a little historical perspective, July 13, 2015. – Available at: http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/order-from-chaos/posts/2015/07/13-ukraine-historical-perspective-solana

Кандюк О. Трансатлантичні відносини в XXI столітті та їх вплив на країни Центральної та Східної Європи.

Сьогодні регіон, який часто називають "Новою Європою", проходить дуже складний період політичної історії. Більшість держав цього регіону знаходяться на певній стадії завершальних перетворень, долаючи геополітичні форми радянського періоду та повторно фокусуючи на тій або іншій формі регіональної або глобальної інтеграції.

Подібна ситуація склалась в Центральній і Східній Європі у кінці XX століття. В обох випадках вплив іноземних акторів, і передусім Євросоюзу та США, чия політика головним чином сформувала подальшу парадигму розвитку в цих регіонах, мав першорядну вагу. Ці держави фактично стояли перед дилемою вибору між розвитком атлантичного вектору (позиція США традиційно сильна в цьому регіоні) зовнішньої політики та поглибленням процесів інтеграції в межах Євросоюзу, до якого вони здебільшого належать.

***Ключові слова**: трансатлантичні відносини, зовнішня політика США, європейська інтеграція, Центрально- та Східноєвропейські трансформації, пострадянський простір.*

Кандюк А. Трансатлантические отношения в XXI столетии и их влияние на страны Центральной и Восточной Европы

Сегодня регион, который часто называют "Новой Европой", испытывает очень сложный период политической истории. Большинство государств региона находятся на стадии заключительных преобразований, преодолевая геополитические формы советского периода и повторно фокусируя на той или иной форме региональной или глобальной интеграции.

Подобная ситуация сложилась в Центральной и Восточной Европе в конце XX столетия. В обоих случаях воздействие иностранных актеров, прежде всего Евросоюза и США, чья политика главным образом сформировала дальнейшую парадигму развития в этих регионах, имело первостепенную важность. Эти государства фактически стояли перед дилеммой выбора между развитием атлантического вектора (позиция США традиционно сильна в этом регионе) внешней политики и углубленим процессов интеграции в пределах Евросоюза, к которому они по большей части принадлежат.

***Ключевые слова**: трансатлантические отношения, внешняя политика США, европейская интеграция, Центрально- и Восточноевропейские трансформации, постсоветское пространство.*