

Synopsis
**Workshop “National Perspectives on the Ukraine Crisis: Image Transformation, Foreign
Policy Change and Consequences for European Foreign Policy”**
Kyiv, 11/12 2015

The Workshop was organized by the DAAD-team of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy's (NaUKMA) Political Science Department in cooperation with its long-time cooperation partner, the Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Germany. Focussing on national foreign policies of EU member states during the Ukraine crisis, specific attention was paid to the questions of image transformation, foreign policy change and the impact of the crisis on EU foreign policy (CFSP). Young analysts from universities and other institutions of eight different EU member states and Ukraine were presenting and discussing paper drafts in four regional and one global panel. The following main conclusions stood out from the Workshop's discussions:

1.) Concerning Ukraine's image in EU capitals, the young nation is still not seen throughout as an independent political actor, but very much through a „Russia prism“ by elites and publics alike. Yet, especially the Euromaidan and the "Revolution of Dignity" (2013/2014) have led to a dynamic and yet unfinished process of supplementing the traditional "othering" of Ukraine as a cultural and political entity by tendencies towards "samings";

2.) The foreign policies of individual EU member states in regard to the crisis are characterized by a considerable degree of variety (e.g. „Russophiles“ such as Greeks or Italians, and Russophobes such as Romanians or Brits), a common persistence of historical legacies and preferences (mostly concerning Moscow), and by certain self-defined foreign policy roles (see e.g. Sweden as a champion of Eastern enlargement and democracy promotion or Italy as a country avoiding any foreign policy adventurism);

3.) Instead of a great deal of foreign policy change, consistency of approaches (Sweden, Baltics), turmoil and strong domestic repercussions (Germany, France), or rather gradual change are better descriptions of the effects of the crisis. Nevertheless, where observable change in national foreign policies vis-à-vis Ukraine or Russia occurred, Crimea's annexation as a turning-point and the significant role of specific personalities have been highlighted (such as of Angela Merkel in the German case);

4.) Finally, the Ukraine crisis has had an ambivalent effect on the EU's actorness and effectiveness in foreign policy so far. On the one side, even pro-Ukrainian member states have been satisfied with the agreed sanctions-regime against Russia and the support for Ukraine, while some willingness to establish a functioning division of work among the most important member states seems detectable. The EU response thus has been strongly connected to a successful uploading of policies by pro-Ukrainian and Russia-critical governments (Germans, Sweden, Baltics). On the other side, the heterogeneity of individual member state's policies is still pronounced enough to obstruct more strategic thinking on Brussel's behalf, and prone to forces willing to profit from these divisions.

The participants and the organizers agreed on a joint publication of the individual papers in an edited volume or special edition of a journal during 2016. The main organizer André Härtel will take over the coordination of the proceedings.

Kyiv, 11 January 2016
André Härtel