

The Ukraine Crisis Reflections in the Speeches of USA and Russian Political Leaders

Ingrida Unikaitė-Jakuntavičienė¹ - Rita Matulkaitė²

Abstract

This paper focuses on the rhetoric of USA and Russian political leaders during the Ukraine crisis by analyzing changes appearing in their speeches during the different stages of the crisis. The goal of the analysis is to investigate the speeches delivered by political leaders of the United States and Russia, being important actors in the Ukraine crisis, by identifying both countries' attitudes to one another, further intentions regarding the management of the crisis and changes of topics in each stage. The speeches of the following most influential politicians in foreign policy formation in the USA and Russia are analyzed: President Barack Obama, Secretary of State John Kerry and Vice President Joe Biden, President Vladimir Putin, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov and Prime Minister of Russia Dmitry Medvedev. The speeches were collected from the official websites of U.S. and Russian government institutions. The analysis revealed that from the beginning of the crisis the main tool in the Ukraine crisis was rhetoric. Western parties began to take real actions only later: sanctions on Russia were imposed, international organizations started to play more active role, ceasefire agreements were signed. In terms of communications strategies used by both countries, the USA rhetoric and its communication strategy as well as Russian leaders were using a combination of proactive and reactive strategies.

Key words: Ukraine crisis, political leaders, speeches of leaders, rhetoric of leaders

INTRODUCTION

Though already four years passed since 2013 when the Ukraine crisis started, this crisis is still unresolved. Ukrainian President reminds the leaders of the world that fights in the eastern part of Ukraine are still going on and danger of war is real. Ukraine crisis can be treated as an international conflict, involving not only domestic conflicting powers but also the superpowers such as the USA and Russia, and international organizations. As the head prosecutor for the International Criminal Court has for the first time declared in November

¹ Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ingrida Unikaitė-Jakuntavičienė, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Political Science and Diplomacy, Vytautas Magnus University, Putvinskio 23-607, LT-44243 Kaunas, Lithuania, e-mail: ingrida.unikaite-jakuntaviciene@vdu.lt.

² Rita Matulkaitė, Master of Political science, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Political Science and Diplomacy, Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania, e-mail: rita.matulkaite@vdu.lt.

2016, “This international armed conflict started not later than February 26, when the Russian Federation employed members of its armed forces to gain control over parts of the territory of Ukraine without the consent of the government of Ukraine.” (Report on Preliminary Examination Activities, 2016, 33-43). Therefore, it occurs not inside the country but is of international extent. The Ukraine crisis has gone through the main stages of crisis, regarding the intensity of the crisis. However, as we may notice, the USA and the EU are trying to solve the crisis by diplomatic means avoiding escalation of fighting.

This precaution behavior of foreign actors is natural. It is important to note that at the onset of the crisis the means to solve it usually is mediation, sanctions and intervention of international organizations. Before using military means, verbal means are used to solve the crisis. As Ömer Isyar argues, “nonviolent management includes: (1) military nonviolent behavior; (2) negotiation; (3) adjudication; (4) mediation; (5) non-military pressure; and (6) multiple nonviolence” (Isyar, 2008: 41). These are the examples when the crisis is tried to be solved peacefully through the use of speech.

A *Neoclassical realism*, one of International Relations paradigms recognizes that foreign policy of the state and „processes within states are influenced not only by exogenous systemic factors and considerations of power and security, but also by cultural and ideological bias, domestic political considerations and prevailing ideas “(Kitchen, 2010: 133). Accordingly state leaders define the national interests and conduct foreign policy based on their assessment of relative power, other states’ intentions and pay great attention on the domestic constrains (Taliaferro, Lobell, and Ripsman, 2009:25). Therefore, speeches of politicians and their rhetoric play a prominent role during a time of the crisis. First, the use of certain statements in the speeches of state leaders reflects the entire set of factors influencing foreign policy inside a nation-state – institutions, the relationship between state and society, public perception, and ideology. Second, rhetoric of leaders directly influences the behaviors, attitudes of countries and their diplomatic relations.

The leaders may use proactive and reactive strategies of communication during the times of crisis. Their choice of the communication strategy may be treated as an indicator of their actual behavior, role and intentions in crisis.

A proactive strategy of communication focuses on eliminating problems before they have a chance to appear and on reducing the likelihood of occurrence of the challenging behavior. They are preventative and usually deal with the conditions that precede the behavior (Champlin, 1991, 1). Proactive strategy has a meaning of controlling a situation by causing something to happen rather than waiting to respond to it after it happens. A reactive strategy contrary to the proactive one is based on responding to events after they have happened and is used only once the

behavior occurs. Reactive communication has a goal “to cut short the behavior, to minimize the damage” (Champlin, 1991, 1). The difference between these two approaches is the perspective each one provides in assessing actions and events.

This paper analyzes rhetoric of USA and Russian political leaders in the case of the Ukraine crisis, by paying attention to the communication strategies used and changes of rhetoric during different stages of the crisis. From the beginning of the crisis the main tool in the Ukraine crisis was rhetoric. Only later other tools were started to be used, such as: sanctions, international organizations intervention, ceasefire agreements. Therefore, it is important to analyze the rhetoric of the actors directly and non-directly involved into the conflict. Their activities and rhetoric reflects the domestic constrain of the countries they represent and influence the management of the crisis. Accordingly, it is important to see what their attitudes to the crisis were and what further intentions may be seen. What were Russia’s intentions in the region and what were planned actions of USA in order to change the situation?

The major research questions addressed in the analysis: What rhetorical strategies were used in the speeches of Russian and American political leaders? What can be clarified from the rhetoric of the political leaders in the case of Ukraine crisis? What attitudes prevailed and what are further intentions regarding the management of the crisis? What changes may be seen in each period of the crisis? What attitudes of U.S. and Russia towards one another prevailed?

Answers to these questions are provided in separate chapters explaining the context of Ukraine crisis, data collection methods and analyzing results of the political leaders’ speeches.

1 THE UKRAINE CRISIS AS INTERNATIONAL CRISIS

International crisis is a conflict including two or more actors and a possibility of war. John A. Vasquez argues that an international crisis includes “a change in type and/or increase in intensity of *disruptive* – that is, hostile verbal or physical *interactions* between two or more states, with a heightened probability of *military hostilities*, which in turn destabilizes their relationship and *challenges* the *structure* of an international system <...>” (Vasquez, 2000, 39, italics in original). There are a number of international actors being able to participate in International crisis: “global-level actors, domestic-level actors, individual-level actors, trans-state actors, state actors and individual actors” (Damerow, 2009, 1). There can be directly involved actors, such as Ukraine and Russia in Ukrainian crisis and USA or EU, which are non-direct actors, i.e. they do not participate directly in this conflict.

Brecher excludes four stages of the crisis. These are the following: “onset, escalation, de-escalation and impact” (Brecher, 1993, 25). Onset is the first stage of the crisis. Usually this stage includes some kind of “threat” which is perceived by one or more states (Brecher, 1993, 26). This stage gives the presumption to further actions. The second stage of the crisis – escalation, as Brecher states, this stage includes a higher probability of military intervention and war, and it is a stage which may include not only verbal but also real actions (Brecher, 1993, 26). It can be treated as the highest point of tension of the crisis. The third stage is de-escalation. This stage is “the winding-down of a crisis” (Brecher, 1993, 26). In this stage the crisis is repressed. The idea of de-escalation was already expressed by Brecher (1993) in the following terms: “it denotes the end crisis *period* and is characterized by decreasing stress for the decision maker(s)” (Brecher, 1993, 26, italics in original). The last stage of the crisis is impact, which can be understood as a result, or in other words “post-crisis or beyond crisis” (Brecher, 1993, 27). It is important to note that at different stages of the crisis rhetoric of leaders may be used differently, for instance, at the beginning of the crisis, leaders may negotiate to solve crisis peacefully, i.e. diplomatic means are more tended to be used, including negotiations, meetings, while later, during escalation of the crisis rhetoric is used more subtly, there can appear an aim to threaten another side and military means can be used besides diplomacy.

Ukraine crisis is now in the phase of de-escalation. As David T. Jones points, „During the last 2½ years, there have been multiple truces and ceasefires, which have qualified as reloading breaks rather than conflict Enders“ (Jones, 2017). Thus the crisis continues.

The onset of the crisis can be treated November 21, 2013, when Ukraine’s President rejected a treaty of commerce with EU (Timeline: Ukraine’s political crisis, 2014: 1; subsequently *Timeline: Ukraine’s*). This event caused dissatisfaction of citizens and can be treated as an impulse for further actions by Russia (Timeline: Ukraine’s, 2014). The crisis turned to escalation phase, when Russia started military actions in the territory of Ukraine, in Crimea (Fisher, 2014, 1). While, now the conflict turned to the phase of de-escalation, because military actions are settling down, however, crisis has not come to an end, there appear meetings, negotiations, certain military actions, but the conflict is not as intense as it was at the beginning. The main events which happened during the analyzed 2013-2016-year period are grouped to the periods signifying the stages of the conflict and presented in the Table 1.

Table 1: The major events during the Ukraine crisis

Stage	Period
Rejection of trade treaty with the EU; protests in Maidan	November 21, 2013 – December 1, 2013
President's removal from post and new president's elections; Russia's intervention in Crimea and other parts of Ukraine	February, 2014 – May 25, 2014
Russia's intervention in Eastern part of Ukraine; Malaysian aircraft disaster	May 25, 2014 - July 17, 2014
Russia's military intervention; parliamentary elections	July, 2014 – October 26, 2014
Violations of the Minsk agreements; establishment of Minsk II agreement	October 27, 2014 – February, 2015
The Normandy format meeting was held	March, 2015 – April, 2015
European Union is expanding financial assistance to Ukraine; the expansion of sanctions on Russia	May, 2015 – December, 2016
Acknowledgement that Ukraine crisis is international conflict	November 14, 2016

Source: Prepared by authors using Timelines: Ukraine's political crisis. (2014-2016): <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/ukraine/11449122/Ukraine-crisis-timeline-of-major-events.html>; [http://csis.org/ukraine/index.htm#128](http://csis.org/ukraine/index.htm#128;);

In this crisis two directly involved actors are fighting – Ukraine and Russia. Other major actors of Western countries are also involved: USA and the European Union. It is important to talk about their role in the crisis and what actions were done in order to help Ukraine. As the media indicates, from the beginning these countries have not implemented real actions and used rhetoric in solving the conflict. Alexander J. Motyl noticed:

A direct Western military intervention in Ukraine remains unlikely. But other military assistance has now become possible for the simple reason that, if it did down the plane, Russia has already crossed the very red line that Washington had feared a more robust response in Ukraine would lead it to transgress. The United States, for its part, has ample military equipment in Iraq and Afghanistan, which could easily be diverted to Ukraine. (Motyl, 2014, 2)

The USA tried to solve the problem diplomatically without military intervention and that was done through speech. In the interviews these countries just threaten with sanctions but real actions were taken only in August, half a year from the beginning of crisis (*Timeline: Ukraine's*, 2014, 9). Moreover, there were no military help from NATO or EU. There were opinions about the delay of EU to impose more sanctions “for fear of losing Russian energy that much of Europe is dependent on” (*The Situation in Ukraine and Crimea*, 2014, 7). There were certain factors which did not allow for further sanctions against Russia. Western countries had their own interests and were afraid of danger to their people; therefore, they tried to deal with the crisis diplomatically without military intervention.

The means used to solve the conflict also are a concern of a discussion. From the onset of the crisis, there were used the following diplomatic means: rhetoric, negotiations, sanctions, various meetings and agreements. Military means were not used by now. Moreover, international organizations were used as a tool to stop a further spread of the conflict. For instance, NATO supported Eastern Europe by strengthening security of these countries (Belkin, Mix and Woehrel, 2014, 6). The European Union also reacted to the crisis by imposing sanctions and embargoes on Russia. By doing this, organizations tried to stop further Russia's actions, expecting that it will influence Russia's economy and it will stop further military actions.

Another important concern is reasons of Russia's annexation of Crimea and military intervention in the region of Donetsk. There is a theory that Russia aimed to get back territories which had belonged to it before, during the period of Soviet Union. However, Russia denied the fact of Ukraine's invasion (Taylor, 2014, 1). Then another question arises, why did Russia chose Crimea region? This is because of geographical and historical reasons. As Adam Taylor argues:

Given that Crimea has a modern history intrinsically linked with Russia, contains the largest population of ethnic Russians within Ukraine, and harbors a significant portion of Russia's navy in Sevastopol, Crimea is clearly an important place in that narrative. (Taylor, 2014: 1)

It is simply because of the reason that a lot of Russians live in that area and that this region has a border with Russia. The same situation is with Donetsk. Ukraine is divided into two sides: pro-Russian and pro-Ukrainian and this can be seen in Ukraine's early history (Fisher, 2014, 2). As the president Putin's rhetoric indicates, he wants to protect Russian people living in these regions.

Given the facts presented above, Ukraine crisis can be treated as an international conflict, which includes the superpowers and international organizations. Therefore, it occurs not inside the country but is of global extent. Crisis has

gone through the stages, regarding the intensity of the crisis. However, as we can see from the examples, the USA and the EU are mainly solving the crisis by diplomatic means. Russia till now does not acknowledge its invasion, though the facts are different. As it was mentioned in the introduction, the head prosecutor for the International Criminal Court has for the first time in November 2016 declared the conflict in eastern Ukraine “an international armed conflict between Russia and Ukraine”. The Ukraine crisis seems to sharpen tense relations between the United States of America and the Russian Federation. Therefore, the further analysis aims at analyzing the relationship of these countries in the case of this crisis by paying attention to the rhetoric of the leaders of Russia and USA.

2 METHODS AND DATA COLLECTION

The analysis of rhetoric has been carried out in the period from November 21, 2013 till July, 2015. The paper will focus on the speeches of USA and Russian political leaders in the case of Ukraine crisis reflections. There will be analyzed speeches of most influential foreign policy makers, from the USA: President *Barack Obama*, Secretary of State *John Kerry* and Vice President *Joe Biden*. From Russian politicians in the analysis will be included speeches of President *Vladimir Putin*, Russian Foreign Minister *Sergey Lavrov* and Prime Minister of Russia *Dmitry Medvedev*. The speeches of the highest rank politicians were chosen because they are the most influential regarding foreign policy formation and most of the speeches regarding the crisis were delivered by these politicians. The speeches were selected from the official websites of U.S. and Russian government institutions. The texts are in English; in the case of Russian texts were used officially translated texts. The keyword for the texts selection was – Ukraine. The more general word, related not only with Ukraine crisis was used in order to see more statements of politicians in various contexts, not only while speaking exclusively about the crisis in Ukraine.

Two hundred ninety-nine texts were chosen for the present analysis. The biggest amount of speeches was delivered by Russian Foreign Minister *Sergey Lavrov* – 113 speeches and by President of Russia *Vladimir Putin* – 65 speeches. This fact that Russia’s politicians are tended to speak more about the crisis in Ukraine also can have certain implications regarding the view on the crisis (directly involved actor). While President of U.S. – *Barack Obama*, during this time span delivered 26 speeches which were related to the crisis in Ukraine, Vice President *Joe Biden* - 27 speeches, Secretary of State *John Kerry* - 46 speeches and Prime Minister of Russia *Dmitry Medvedev* - 22 speeches (See table 2).

Table 2: The number of speeches delivered by Russia and U.S. political leaders

Russia	Number of speeches	U.S.	Number of speeches
President Vladimir Putin	65	President Barack Obama	26
Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov	113	Secretary of State John Kerry	46
Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev	22	Vice President Joe Biden	27
Total:	200	Total:	99

Source: prepared by the authors according to the data analysis


The speeches will be analyzed using analysis of rhetoric. The attention will be paid to the arguments used in certain situations during the conflict and what it tells about the situation. It will be examined which rhetorical appeals are used by political leaders in certain situations.

For the analysis will be used speeches from the onset till the de-escalation of the crisis, distinguishing them into seven periods (see Table 1).

3 THE SPEECHES OF LEADERS FROM THE ONSET OF THE CRISIS TO THE DE-ESCALATION OF THE CRISIS

This part of the article will discuss the results of the analysis of speeches by presenting the data of each crisis period in a separate subchapter. The numbers of speeches which were collected and analysed according to the crisis periods are presented in graph 1.

Graph 1: Number of speeches according to the crisis periods



3.1 The onset of crisis in the speeches of politicians

The first period from **November 21, 2013 till December 1, 2013** is associated with a beginning of the crisis in Ukraine (The main events were when Ukraine refused to sign trade agreement with the EU, which later evolved into mass protests in Kiev, Maidan Square.). However, during this period only one announcement regarding the situation in Ukraine appeared “Readout of Vice President Biden’s Call with Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich”. In this text U.S. expressed a support of Ukraine and provided ideas about its further steps in order to help Ukraine. This was a proactive strategy of USA communication.

3.2 The crisis escalation period in the speeches of politicians

The second period from **February, 2014 to May 25, 2014** can be treated as an escalation of the crisis because during this time Russia’s military intervention has started in the Eastern part of Ukraine. The topics which were prominent during this period in the speeches of USA leaders were: *intensification of alliance with Europe, NATO and the EU intervention, sanctions on individuals and entities responsible for violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine and further sanctions on Russia, U.S. further steps to de-escalate the crisis and U.S.*

financial aid to Ukraine. Whereas topics apparent in the speeches of Russian leaders were *reaction to sanctions imposed by U.S. and the EU on individuals and entities responsible for violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, negative attitude to the U.S. taken actions and accusations of Western media for the spread of propaganda, Russia sees itself as a helper of Ukraine and denies its military actions, and deteriorating U.S. – Russia relations.*

U.S. was the first actor who started talks in order to threaten Russia and make it withdraw from Ukraine. U.S. politicians frequently used emotional appeals to show their closeness to Ukrainian people and a will to help them:

- The events of the past several months remind us of how difficult democracy can be in a country with deep divisions. But the Ukrainian people have also reminded us that human beings have a universal right to determine their own future. (President Barack Obama, February 28, 2014)
- Now, I believe there's still a path to resolve this situation diplomatically in a way that addresses the interest of both Russia and Ukraine. That includes Russia pulling its forces in Crimea back to their bases, supporting the deployment of additional international monitors in Ukraine, and engaging in dialogue with the Ukrainian government, which has indicated its openness to pursuing constitutional reform as they move forward towards elections this spring. (President Barack Obama, March 17, 2014)
- But the truth of the matter is we, the United States, stand with you and all the Ukrainian people on a Ukraine united. And I'll say at the top we do not recognize -- we do not recognize -- Russia's actions in the Crimea. (Vice President Joe Biden, April 22, 2014)

Their aim was to show Ukrainians that they can be trusted and are willing to reach a peaceful resolution of a crisis; publicly condemn Russia's illegal actions. The last argument is emphasized by the use of repetition of phrase "we do not recognize". Another rhetorical device – personification, is used to show the responsibility for the opinion expressed by U.S. that the whole country is supporting Ukraine. Personification and pronoun "our" is used by U.S. leaders to show their nations' leadership and solidarity.

However, Russia's position was absolutely different. They denied the intervention in Crimea and accused U.S. of spreading accusations on them. As Russia's Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov states:

Russia has nothing to hide. But we would probably like to know more about the everyday activities of western countries in Ukraine,

including the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice-President of the European Commission, Catherine Ashton, whom I respect. (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 20 February, 2014)

He was speaking trustworthy using ethical appeals and appropriate language understandable to the audience to persuade it, to make it believe his statement. This idea was even strengthened by the following expression:

The world of today is not a junior school where teachers assign punishments at will. Belligerent statements such as those heard at the Nato foreign ministers meeting in Brussels on 1 April do not match demands for a de-escalation. De-escalation should begin with rhetoric. It is time to stop the groundless whipping-up of tension, and to return to serious common work. (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, April 7, 2014)

De-escalation did not appear because one party was not admitting its actions; therefore, the speeches reflected increasing confrontation between U.S. and Russia. This can be seen in the following statement of Prime Minister of Russia Dmitry Medvedev:

“In my opinion, this is a loud echo of the cold war or, properly speaking, a rudiment of the old confrontation mentality. But from a practical point of view, these sanctions will not do anyone any good” (Prime Minister of Russia Dmitry Medvedev, 24 May 2014).

The allusion to the historical event, the Cold War, confirmed the confrontation of U.S. and Russia, having in mind that these current events may lead to similar situation that occurred during the Cold War. Politician used historical analogies; he was invoking facts which suggested that deteriorating U.S.-Russian relations were not without reason, i.e. because of imposed sanctions. This idea was enhanced by the President of Russia Vladimir Putin’s idea who suggested that:

“Our western partners, led by the United States of America, prefer not to be guided by international law in their practical policies, but by the rule of the gun” (President Vladimir Putin, March 18, 2014).

Metaphor “the rule of the gun” was used to depict U.S. will to help Ukraine, even if tools would be contradictory to international norms. President Putin used blackmail to show his country’s position. Another quote promoting this idea was the following: “But there is a limit to everything. And with Ukraine, our western

partners have crossed the line, playing the bear and acting irresponsibly and unprofessionally” (President Vladimir Putin, March 18, 2014). President used metaphor “playing the bear” to express the idea of U.S. negative actions seeking to affect Russia and treated U.S. as a cause of events in Ukraine.

On the other hand, U.S. representative suggested that Russia’s actions will influence U.S.-Russian relations:

“Unless immediate and concrete steps are taken by Russia to deescalate tensions, the effect on U.S.-Russian relations and on Russia’s international standing will be profound” (Secretary of State John Kerry, March 1, 2014).

The crisis in Ukraine where common agreement to a conflict resolution should be accepted has been seen as a battle between the two superpowers: U.S. and Russia, where each side is not putting efforts to come to a common agreement. Both sides were just blaming each other without taking certain actions to change the situation.

Another topic prominent during this period was first sanctions on Russia’s individuals and entities responsible for violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, imposed by U.S. and EU. In the following extract, President Obama states that the first steps to de-escalate the situation were taken:

Today, I’m announcing a series of measures that will continue to increase the cost on Russia and on those responsible for what is happening in Ukraine. First, as authorized by the executive order I signed two weeks ago, we are imposing sanctions on specific individuals responsible for undermining the sovereignty, territorial integrity and government of Ukraine. We’re making it clear that there are consequences for their actions. (President Barack Obama, March 17, 2014)

This quote informs that U. S. after several months of rhetoric activities starts to implement real actions. Russia responded to U.S. imposed sanctions:

We are worried about this situation, because it provides proof of double standards. Instead they are threatening sanctions (the United States have already introduced them against some representatives of the Ukrainian authorities) thus creating additional stimuli for the opposition to remain stubborn, and indirectly (or even directly) stimulating the militants to continue their outrages. The European Union is also going to discuss the introduction of sanctions against the Ukrainian authorities, doing this in parallel to sending another

“uninvited” mission to Kiev. How can you expect your services to be in demand, if the threat of sanctions makes this operation look like blackmail? (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 20 February, 2014)

Russia did not think that sanctions would change the situation. They conversely thought that military actions would sharpen. Even before the President’s Obama announcement of sanctions, these talks attained negative reaction from the President of Russia:

Regarding sanctions. It is primarily those who intend to apply them that need to consider their consequences. I believe that in the modern world, where everything is interconnected and interdependent, it is possible to cause damage to another country, but this will be mutual damage and one should bear this in mind. (President Vladimir Putin, March 4, 2014)

By expressing opinion about U.S. will to introduce sanctions, President Putin talked as if threatening U.S., saying that it “will be mutual damage”, meaning that sanctions will affect not only Russia but Europe as well. Ethical arguments in his speech created an impression about him as having power because he talked credibly.

Later besides sanctions on individual economic sanctions were implemented on Russia. Another round of sanctions was devoted to affect Russia’s economic sector:

As part of that process, I signed a new executive order today that gives us the authority to impose sanctions not just on individuals but on key sectors of the Russian economy. This is not our preferred outcome. These sanctions would not only have a significant impact on the Russian economy, but could also be disruptive to the global economy. However, Russia must know that further escalation will only isolate it further from the international community. (President Barack Obama, March 20, 2014)

The pronoun “our” suggested that the responsibility falls to the whole nation and even to other Western countries, while the executive order was signed by the President Obama. Even if these sanctions would have a profound impact on the global economy; it was the cost to withdraw Russia’s military from Ukraine and to make Russia isolated. However, Russia was not taking these U.S. and EU actions seriously and did not make conclusions out of it:

I don't think that economic sanctions are being considered seriously from the point of your responsibility of the West in the international economic system. The discussions, as I can perceive them, are based on the desire to get revenge, which is obviously very bad for politicians, which is not professional for anyone who wants to be engaged in serious politics and which would probably have some effect, no doubt. I believe if they stop the dollar transactions for the Russian banks and for the Russian companies, of course it would cause difficulties. That would be replacement. And Visa and Mastercard are already concerned that they would lose the market. [...] My point is that if the West, just for the sake of revenge, is ready to sacrifice its reputation as a reliable partner for the entire world economy, and for the entire world financial system, if the USA is prepared to sacrifice its reputation as the holder of the key reserve currency, then it's up to them to decide. (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 14 May, 2014)

Russia's Foreign Minister treated sanctions as a blackmail aiming to show U.S. domination in international arena. They were acting as nothing has happened. Russia considered U.S. actions as an obstacle for diplomatic solution to a conflict. Another politician, Prime Minister of Russia Dmitry Medvedev, similarly suggested:

I'd like to remind you that our trade with the EU amounts to about \$400 billion. EU countries and companies have invested a great deal in the Russian economy on behalf of the states and businesses of the European Union, so these relationships are being hit hardest. Who is this helping? I believe no one, because these sanctions are clearly damaging business interests, primarily European businesses. I have heard some of my high-ranking friends and colleagues say that the sanctions are not a big deal, and even though our businesses may suffer, it will give us an opportunity to show our solidarity. Frankly, this sounds a lot like the solidarity showed in the old socialist bloc. [...] A number of Western countries are talking about solidarity. And if this solidarity comes at the expense of their own businesses, so be it. Clearly, we won't benefit from it either. (Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev, 24 May, 2014)

The repetition of word "solidarity" was used to show negative attitude to U.S and EU actions and to emphasize this phrase in a negative light. Historical reference to socialist bloc was made to remind the Cold War period and Russian – U.S. relations which will be deteriorating if sanctions would be further imposed.

In this stage U.S. talked about diplomatic solution of a conflict and was taking proactive strategy supporting Ukraine financially, while Russia treated United States as a major threat to Ukraine, and this attitude has been seen throughout all the speeches of Russian leaders during this time span. The period can be characterized as an economic war, led by U.S. to affect and weaken Russia's economy. However, no military help was provided to Ukraine.

3.3 The continuation of crisis escalation in the speeches of politicians

The third period, **May 25, 2014 - July 17, 2014**, can be named as the further escalation of the crisis. The main event during this period was the presidential elections which were held on May 25: "Petro Poroshenko wins the Ukrainian presidential runoff" (*Timeline: Ukraine's*, 2014, 6). Another major event was the crash of Malaysian aircraft on July 17.

The most prominent topics in the speeches delivered by U.S. politicians during this period were as follows: *support to Ukraine, peaceful solution to a crisis without military intervention*. While in the speeches of Russian politicians more topics were reflected: *Russia's negative attitude to Western partners, as to enemies and causers of the war in Ukraine; U.S. was seen as an actor wishing to confront Ukraine; Russia sees itself as a major actor in conflict resolving; criticism towards Ukraine's decision to sign an association agreement with the EU, criticism on decisions made during the Geneva meeting on April 17, influence of sanctions on U.S. – Russian relations; denying of Russian troops in the territory of Ukraine, Russia's negative attitude towards Ukraine in NATO alliance; denial of annexation of Crimea and providing financial aid to Ukraine*.

During this stage, until the catastrophe of Malaysian aircraft, no speeches were delivered by the leaders of the United States. Just one speech delivered by Secretary of State John Kerry appeared. He expressed U.S. support to Ukraine and talked about peaceful solution to a crisis, without military intervention:

The United States respects Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, condemns and rejects Russia's occupation and attempted annexation of Crimea, and remains committed to working with Ukraine and other partners to find a peaceful resolution to the conflict.
(Secretary of State John Kerry, May 26, 2014)

After half a year of Russia's unlawful actions in Ukraine U.S. talked about diplomatic solution and was not hastening to undertake other means than rhetoric and imposed sanctions. The argument was emphasized by the use of personification: "The United States respects", thus showing "America's historical

ambition for leadership by reaffirming support for the U.S. as a leading nation to fight any future threat” (Lehmann, 2012, 4). By using personification, the nation’s support to Ukraine was emphasized, making the speech more persuasive and the connection between the people and the speaker – stronger.

The Russian leaders’ attitude to U.S. as to enemies and causers of the war in Ukraine was strengthened:

Crisis elements, which characterise the modern stage in international relations, are to a large extent associated with the fact, and the seemingly evident truth – the right of people to independently determine their fate – is still doubted. The attempts to extend the geopolitical space of our western partners, including using force, unfortunately, continues. (Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 28 May, 2014)

Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov argued that the situation in Ukraine is a fault of Western countries, having in mind the U.S. will to show its power in international arena. The appeal to logical appeals was apparent in his speech, because the politician was basing his argument upon facts. Another quote also promoting this idea was the following: “There are overseas partners – our US colleagues – who, according to the evidence, still prefer to push the Ukrainian leaders to confrontation” (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 28 June, 2014). Here, Foreign Minister Lavrov also promoted the idea that the United States is an actor without which the conflict cannot be resolved.

In this period Russia was still denying its military intervention and treated itself as a major contributor to a conflict resolution. Russian Foreign Minister expressed this idea by stating that: “It is at least misleading to say that Russia is doing nothing to promote the peace process” (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 28 June 2014). Russia sees a peaceful resolution of a conflict:

I would like to specifically underline that only on the basis of a dialogue between directly involved persons, primarily the Ukrainian authorities and representatives of the South-East of Ukraine, can a sustainable settlement of the crisis in general, the conditions of the announcement of peace, the consideration of the interests and expectations of all the Ukrainian nationals, no matter where they live, be agreed upon. (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 2 July, 2014)

Russian representatives wanted to make audience believe that their role in the crisis was to make peace, thus denying their military actions in Ukraine. The negation of military intervention can be seen in the following Vladimir Putin’s interview with Radio Europe 1 and TF1 TV channel:

Question: But, Mr President, the United States and the White House claim they have evidence that Russia intervened in the conflict, sent its troops and supplied weapons. They claim they have proof. Do you believe that?

Vladimir Putin: Proof? Why don't they show it? The entire world remembers the US Secretary of State demonstrating the evidence of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, waving around some test tube with washing powder in the UN Security Council. Eventually, the US troops invaded Iraq, Saddam Hussein was hanged and later it turned out there had never been any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. You know, it's one thing to say things and another to actually have evidence. I will tell you again: no Russian troops...

Question (via interpreter): Are you saying the US is lying?

Vladimir Putin: Yes, it is. There are no armed forces, no Russian 'instructors' in southeastern Ukraine. And there never were any. (President Vladimir Putin, June 4, 2014)

The President was using logical arguments. He mentioned facts from history to show that U.S. makes mistakes and that their facts can be misleading, despite facts were different. He was stating that there were no Russia's military personnel in Ukraine.

Economic sanctions imposed by U.S. and European Union attained negative attention from Russia and it contributed to the deteriorating diplomatic relations of these two countries. In this case countries' interests seemed to be more important than the settlement of the crisis. Prime Minister of Russia Dmitry Medvedev expresses his attitude on the imposed economic sanctions:

The sanctions, or sector sanctions, as they are referred to, that have been imposed by the United States against large Russian defence industry enterprises, power companies and certain banks, will only further arouse anti-American and anti-European sentiments. This is absolutely clear. Russian society will become more consolidated against those countries and individuals who are trying to limit our country, acting against our people's interests. As a result, we will see our relations with the countries that apply such sanctions return to the level of the '80s. This is sad. (Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev, 17 July, 2014)

Prime Minister threatened U.S. with their response to sanctions instead of taking actions to solve the conflict and to admit country's mistakes. President

Putin also treated the U.S. imposed sanctions as blackmail and emphasized that sanctions were negatively influencing U.S. – Russia relations:

As for various sanctions, I have already said that they generally have a boomerang effect and, without a doubt, in this case, are driving the Russian-US relations into a stalemate and seriously damaging them. I am certain that this is harmful to the US Administration and American people's long-term strategic national interests. (President Vladimir Putin, July 17, 2014)

The President Putin's position regarding sanctions showed that the country was not willing to stop actions and thought that these sanctions will affect U.S. economy as well. This argument was substantiated using metaphors: "boomerang effect" and "driving the Russian-US relations into a stalemate". The metaphor "boomerang effect" was used to show that sanctions will influence not only Russia's economy but also U.S. The subsequent metaphor refers to a chess game. Metaphor of a stalemate is widely used by politicians in "a situation where neither opponent can win"; it is often used during war (Chess Metaphors, 1).

In conclusion, during the third period were no changes made in the resolution of a conflict. Russian leaders did not acknowledge Russia's intervention. The crisis was seen as a battle where two superpowers fight for power. Despite the United States imposed sanctions, Russia had no wish to withdraw its troops from Ukraine. On the contrary, sanctions seemed to enlarge Russia's aggression. Regarding the rhetoric of the leaders, U.S. in this period also emphasized their strength as a nation, which was capable to help Ukraine. Moreover, the Russian leaders' attitude to U.S. as enemies was even strengthened, this was reinforced by the use of logos, and i.e. leaders were using certain facts and arguments to prove their ideas and to make them more persuasive.

3.4 The peak of tension between U.S. and Russia in the speeches of politicians related to the crisis

The fourth period, from **July 17, 2014 to October 26, 2014**, denotes the further escalation of a crisis after the Malaysian aircraft disaster which attained a lot of media attention and also more attention from Western countries. Another major event that should be included was parliamentary elections in Ukraine (26 October), there the votes were casted for "a pro-Russian reform agenda, granting electoral victories to President Petro Poroshenko's bloc and the People's Front headed by Prime Minister Arseniy Yatsenyuk" (The Ukraine Crisis Timeline, 2014, p. 1). Major topics which were notable in the speeches of the U.S. leaders

were the following: *The Crash of the Malaysian Airlines Flight and suspicion to Russia; the will to minimize Russia's power and position in international relations; Russia is seen as a main cause of the crisis and therefore an enemy of U.S; the peaceful resolution of a crisis; impact of imposed sanctions on Russian economy; further economic sanctions on Russia.* Whereas in Russian politicians' speeches among the prominent topics appear *deteriorating U.S.-Russia relations; Russia is against Ukraine in NATO alliance; denial of Russian troops in the territory of Ukraine, response to U.S imposed sanctions, negative attitude towards Ukraine agreement with EU.*

The main topic marking the beginning of this period was the Crash of the Malaysian Airlines Flight. The catastrophe happened when Russian soldiers seemingly confused the Ukrainian airplane with the Malaysian airlines (Motyl, 2014, 1). This event did not pass without Western remarks and accusations to Russia. The day after catastrophe happened U.S. started to suspect Russia:

What we know right now, what we have confidence in saying right now is that a surface-to-air missile was fired and that's what brought the jet down. We know -- or we have confidence in saying that that shot was taken within a territory that is controlled by the Russian separatists. (President Barack Obama, July 18, 2014)

The repetition of pronoun "we" showed President's absence of responsibility, as if he is afraid to tell his position regarding this question. Another argument was stronger, showing clearer President's position:

So it is not possible for these separatists to function the way they're functioning, to have the equipment that they have -- set aside what's happened with respect to the Malaysian Airlines -- a group of separatists can't shoot down military transport planes or, they claim, shoot down fighter jets without sophisticated equipment and sophisticated training. And that is coming from Russia. (President Barack Obama, July 18, 2014)

In this statement U.S. position was clearly stated. It suggested that Russia was responsible for this event. President used logos, he was appealing to facts. Whereas, Russia did not acknowledge this "mistake", the President of Russia Vladimir Putin, just claimed that: "it is unquestionable that the state over whose territory this took place is responsible for this terrible tragedy" (Motyl, 2014, 1). Russian leader did not apologize for this brutal event, what is more, he accused Ukraine for this event, claiming that it was the country's responsibility, and it attained negative attitude from USA and other countries.

Moreover, after this event Russia even enlarged its military capabilities: “in the early morning hours of Sunday, July 13, about 100 Russian armoured personnel carriers and other vehicles crossed from Russia into Luhansk province in Ukraine” (Motyl, 2014). Russian actions caused huge discontent, especially by USA and the countries of EU. Therefore, after this event U.S. has imposed additional economic sanctions on Russia. Barack Obama announced new sanctions on Russia over Ukraine, on Russian Financial Institutions and on Defence Technology Entity:

Today, and building on the measures we announced two weeks ago, the United States is imposing new sanctions in key sectors of the Russian economy: energy, arms, and finance. We’re blocking the exports of specific goods and technologies to the Russian energy sector. We’re expanding our sanctions to more Russian banks and defence companies. And we’re formally suspending credit that encourages exports to Russia and financing for economic development projects in Russia. (President Barack Obama, July 29, 2014)

The use of personification depicted U.S. as a nation which was willing to help Ukraine in order to solve the crisis. While the repetition of pronoun “we” showed unity of U.S. with Ukraine and their willingness to show power over Russia. Moreover, EU has imposed first economic sanctions on Russia:

At the same time, the European Union is joining us in imposing major sanctions on Russia -- its most significant and wide-ranging sanctions to date. In the financial sector, the EU is cutting off certain financing to state-owned banks in Russia. In the energy sector, the EU will stop exporting specific goods and technologies to Russia, which will make it more difficult for Russia to develop its oil resources over the long term. In the defence sector, the EU is prohibiting new arms imports and exports and is halting the export of sensitive technology to Russia’s military users. And because we’re closely coordinating our actions with Europe, the sanctions we’re announcing today will have an even bigger bite. (President Barack Obama, July 29, 2014)

EU’s role, as a partner of U.S. was also expanding. Using the EU sanctions, it was tried to finally come to an agreement with Russia.

However, Russia’s response to sanctions was not changing; This can be seen in the following statement from the interview by Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov to Bloomberg TV:

Q: Let's talk about the sanctions. Is there a sense of urgency to getting the sanctions lifted or is this just simply Muscovites not being able to get mozzarella?

A: You know, from time to time my American interlocutors say, "Why don't we sit down and develop some criteria?" I ask, "What criteria?" "Well, criteria which would be used, you know, to see when we can lift sanctions" meaning that Russia would have to do something to satisfy those criteria.

We are not going to do this. And I just laughed in their faces and said, "Guys, you did this and you decide what to do further." We are not going to change our position. We believe it's an honest position. We think about first of all, Ukrainian people. We would be doing whatever we can to promote this meaningful process to negotiate full settlement. But we will do this because we are very close to Ukrainians. They're our brothers and sisters. And we would never do this just to please somebody on the other side of the ocean. (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, September 27, 2014)

Sergey Lavrov clearly stated his position, i.e. that Russia does not intend to withdraw from Ukraine. Russia argued that it was helping Ukraine - not damaging it. He showed unity, closeness with the Ukrainian people – emotional appeal reinforced his argument. Russia imposed retaliatory measures on U.S. and EU. Vladimir Putin decided to limit imports from these countries and to use their domestic market more effectively:

Concerning the pressure exerted [on Russia] by the economic measures you mentioned, these measures are indeed very primitive and in my opinion ineffective and harmful. I agree with you that they pursue the goal of ensuring and maintaining US global domination, and perhaps they even seek to consolidate their competitive advantage on global markets by squeezing us out a bit from the European market and pulling Europe a bit closer their way. (President Vladimir Putin, August 14, 2014)

President of Russia differently interpreted U.S. intentions; he suggested that this is the will of U.S. to show its power in international arena. President uses his personal opinion and experience – ethos, to persuade the audience.

During this period, Russia's actions do not change. The country did not acknowledge military intervention and military activities were still ongoing in the Ukraine's territory. This idea is supported in Sergey Lavrov's speech:

There are many volunteers there, many of them Russians. There was one American shown yesterday on TV. He was interviewed, but he was wearing a balaclava. There are some Russians fighting on the side of not the Ukrainian Army but those battalions which oligarchs created and keep financing. There are many Poles, Lithuanians many Europeans are fighting there on the side of those battalions. (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov September 27, 2014)

Foreign Minister did not deny the fact that Russians were fighting against Ukraine but he suggested that this was a group of people which were supported by oligarchs, not a Russian army; in other words, he used propaganda to show that Russia was not directly involved. He was supporting an argument using facts, making the statement trustworthy. Moreover, President of Russia Vladimir Putin denied annexation of Crimea:

I actually said this many times before, but I will use this opportunity to repeat that we never annexed Crimea. We did use our Armed Forces, but only to give the people living here the opportunity to express their views regarding their future. This may have been the first time such a comprehensive plebiscite was ever held here, a comprehensive referendum on issues vital for the people living here. (President Vladimir Putin, August 14, 2014)

President claimed that referendum of the annexation of Crimea was legal and that it happened because of the will of the Ukrainians living in Crimea. President was using emotional appeals. He showed unity with the people and his will to help the people of Ukraine to reinforce the idea that Russia was a helper in this situation. U.S. also did not change its position in this period. In the speeches of U.S. politicians dominated a will to solve the crisis peacefully, using diplomatic means. This idea can be seen in the speech of the President Barack Obama:

I made clear to President Putin that our preferred path is to resolve this diplomatically. But that means that he and the Russian government have to make a strategic decision: Are they going to continue to support violent separatists whose intent is to undermine the government of Ukraine? Or are they prepared to work with the government of Ukraine to arrive at a cease-fire and a peace that takes into account the interests of all Ukrainians? (President Barack Obama, July 18, 2014)

On the whole, during this period situation did not change much. Russia still did not acknowledge military intervention, instead blaming other countries

for it. Whereas U.S. efforts to stabilize the situation were the same as in the earlier periods: to weaken Russia by influencing its economy, using sanctions. Moreover, this period denoted the highest point of tension between U.S. and Russia. The situation in Ukraine made U.S. to change its position regarding Russia and the period of the reset of these countries' relations came to the Cold War period. Regarding rhetoric, in this period more historical references were used, for example, many times were used allusions to the Cold War period, to show the deteriorating these two countries' relations. Furthermore, U.S. was more openly expressing its attitude towards Russia's illegal actions. Leaders of both countries were using logical appeals, certain facts to show clearer position. U.S. was commonly using personification and pronoun "we", by using these rhetorical devices it wanted to show its position that it can stand against Russia and protect Ukraine's interests. Russian leaders used pathos to affect people using emotional language and ethos to persuade the audience.

3.5 The discussion of violation of the ceasefire agreements in the speeches of politicians

The fifth period, from **October 27, 2014 till February, 2015**, was the most intensive regarding the discussion of negotiations and agreements for the crisis settlement, therefore the number of speeches in this period was the highest. Moreover, the following period was marked by intensification of military actions by Russia.

The topics which were prominent in the texts during this period in the speeches of USA leaders were as follows: *further sanctions on Russia due to violation of the Minsk agreements; U.S. isolationism policy towards Russia; U.S. tries to affect Russia economically without military actions but for the first time the idea of providing lethal weapons to Ukraine is considered; U.S. position is getting more strict after the constant violations of the Minsk agreements; stronger alliance with Germany to resist the common enemy – Russia; cooperation with NATO to make Russia keep its agreements, situation after Minsk II agreements, and intensive U.S. cooperation with the EU.* Whereas topics apparent in the speeches of Russian political leaders were *blaming West for the crisis in Ukraine (sees it as U.S. will to reshape the world) and calling it a civil war, impact of sanctions on Russian economy, Russia argues that it did not commit any violation of international law, Minsk agreements were created by Russia, Russia's active role in solving the crisis – as the country itself sees it, claims that Russia provides financial assistance and West only promises it, sanctions of U.S. would have been put even if crisis would not have appeared*

in Ukraine - call it a containment policy, Western propaganda regarding the crisis in Ukraine.

October 26 Parliamentary elections were one of the most important events related to the future of Ukraine. After the elections, the statements of the Western politicians reflected the content with the results:

The Ukrainian people demonstrated their clear preference for democracy, political and economic reform, and self-determination at the ballot box during the October 26 parliamentary elections. Today's announcement on the formation of a new government sets the stage for the difficult but necessary process of implementing reforms and delivering results. The United States will support Ukraine's new government to stabilize its economy, strengthen democratic institutions, and fight corruption. We will also continue to stand for Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity in the face of Russian aggression, and support the aspirations of Ukraine's citizens for a secure, democratic, prosperous, European future. (Vice President Joe Biden, December 02, 2014)

U.S. leaders were content with the results of the elections, because it was an important step for Ukraine's future reforms. U.S. demonstrated its support by using rhetorical device - personification, giving power to the country's opportunities to make a change. Russia also recognised the results of the elections but its mood differed. The leader thought that country should not be thrown between East and West:

The elections seem to be valid, though not in every part of Ukraine. I think Russia will recognise their results as it is critically important for Ukraine to obtain, at long last, a leadership that will not engage in petty infighting and drag the country from east to west and back again, but one that will address real Ukrainian problems. Ukraine needs a government that will think how the nation should regain unity. It needs a government to guarantee an equal status to all Ukrainian citizens irrespective of the language they speak and political convictions they have. No one should be victimised on political and other grounds, as has been the case until recently. (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 27 October, 2014)

The Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov penetrated U.S. will that Ukraine should be with the Western side.

Another topic which was prominent during this period of time is violation of the Minsk agreements. Ceasefire agreement was signed on September 5, 2014 (Ukraine ceasefire agreement signed in Minsk, 2014, 1). From the beginning of the truce, both sides of the parties argued on constant violations of the agreements; U.S. transferred guilty to Russia and vice versa. U.S. position was getting stricter after the constant violations of the Minsk agreements; President issued new measures against Russia's actions:

We are deeply concerned about the latest break in the cease-fire and the aggression that these separatists -- with Russian backing, Russian equipment, Russian financing, Russian training and Russian troops -- are conducting. And we will continue to take the approach that we've taken in the past, which is to ratchet up the pressure on Russia. (President Barack Obama, January 25, 2015)

The President was speaking trustworthy using emotions to persuade the audience and to make it believe his statement. Credibility was even more enforced by the use of repetition of the word "Russian" – to demonstrate that it was Russia which was responsible for the events happening in Ukraine. What is more, after constant Russia's violations of the agreements U.S. was expanding restrictive measures on the country:

My Administration will continue to work closely with allies and partners in Europe and internationally to respond to developments in Ukraine and will continue to review and calibrate our sanctions to respond to Russia's actions. We again call on Russia to end its occupation and attempted annexation of Crimea, cease support to separatists in eastern Ukraine, and implement the obligations it signed up to under the Minsk agreements. (President Barack Obama, December 18, 2014)

U.S. was trying to fight against Russia using economic measures but it did not give an impetus for a resolution of a crisis. Russia responded with retaliatory measures.

As for retaliatory measures, I would like to remind you what they were all about. First, these were retaliatory measures, not sanctions. Second, in accordance with a presidential executive order, they will remain in force for one year but upon a Government initiative they could be cancelled even sooner. It goes without saying that they could also be extended. But these are retaliatory measures and they should be treated as retaliatory measures and nothing else. These retaliatory

measures will lead to certain consequences. Not all of them will be positive, since we are unable to instantaneously replace the whole segment that was lost following these government decisions. (Prime Minister of Russia Dmitry Medvedev, 13 November, 2014)

However, as Russia suggested these were not sanctions against U.S., it was just a response towards U.S. policy against Russia. Russia treats itself as implementing the Minsk agreements and playing an active role in their implementation:

The Minsk agreements arose only because Russia became actively involved in this effort; we worked with the Donbass militias, that is the fighters from southeast Ukraine, and we convinced them that they should settle for certain agreements. If we had not done that, it would simply not have happened. There are some problems with the implementation of these agreements, it is true. (President Vladimir Putin, November 17, 2014)

Russia acted as if it managed the crisis and claimed that without Russia's intervention Minsk agreements would not have been created. This idea was reinforced by the use of the pronoun "we", there responsibility falls for the whole country, by this showing country's power. While U.S. role regarding the resolution of the crisis during this period did not change much, the methods were sanctions, cooperation with the EU, financial assistance - a diplomatic solution to a conflict:

I've been very clear that it would not be effective for us to engage in a military conflict with Russia on this issue, but what we can do is to continue to support Ukraine's ability to control its own territory. And that involves a combination of the economic pressure that's been brought to bear in sanctions, the diplomatic isolation that has been brought to bear against Russia, and, as important as anything, making sure that we're continuing to provide the support that Ukraine needs to sustain its economy during this transition period, and to help its military with basic supplies and equipment, as well as the continuing training and exercises that have been taking place between NATO and Ukraine for quite some time. (President Barack Obama, January 25, 2015)

The speech was enforced by the use of emotional appeals, President spoke trustworthy and showed responsibility for U.S. actions and that he was sure about U.S. taken decisions.

To sum up, the following period was marked by intensification of military events and constant violations in the ceasefire agreements. However, both parties: Russia and U.S. were transferring blame to one another and no effective solution to a crisis was being proposed. The current events in the crisis were more like a battlefield between these two countries'. After violations of the agreements U.S. enlarges sanctions while Russia puts retaliatory measures.

3.6 De –escalation of crisis in the speeches of politicians

The sixth period, **March, 2015 - April, 2015**, focused on the situation after the Minsk II agreements, how these agreements contributed to the crisis settlement. In March the Western countries' started to push harder for Russia's actions in Ukraine (UK Prime Minister David Cameron creates a fund based on a Cold-War era scheme to help curb Russian influence in eastern Europe. Germany's Chancellor Angela Merkel adds Russia sanctions will stick until Minsk ceasefire is met, and hints sanctions could be extended until end of 2015. (Buchanan, 2015, 5). The expansion of sanctions attained negative attention from Russia.

The topics which were prominent in the speeches of U.S. leaders were similar to the 5th period. While in the speeches of Russian politicians' topics which were most salient were: *Crimea's importance to Russia, Russia's pride of its actions in Ukraine, Russia's input to the settlement of the crisis, response to U.S. deterrence policy, against NATO military actions near Russian border, and other topics from 5th period.*

This period indicated a calming down of a crisis and it had the smallest amount of speeches, therefore we can assume that interest of politicians to the unfolding events was also diminishing. The topic apparent in the statements was situation regarding the implementation of the Minsk agreements which were seen as the basis to the ceasefire. U.S. was threatening Russia with expanding restrictive measures if agreements will not be complied with.

And I expressed my strong belief that the European Council needs to continue the current sanctions that are in place until we've seen full implementation of the Minsk Agreement. There will be a vote coming up this summer in the European Council. And my expectation is not only Italy, but all countries in Europe will recognize that it would be a wrong message to send to reduce sanctions pressure on Russia when their key implementation steps don't happen until the end of the year (President Barack Obama, April 17, 2015)

This was seen as a hastening of Russia to start actions. The phrases “I expressed”, “my expectation” showed President’s responsibility for the events because the purpose of pronoun “I” is to show responsibility. Russia responded to sanctions by implementing the response measures on the West and it did not admit that it can change the situation regarding the implementation of the agreements:

Russia did not adopt a sanctions policy. It was a choice made by the European Union. Russia was forced to take response measures to protect its agricultural producers from unfair competition. The EU sanctions penalised Russian banks, including those that have been funding Russian agribusiness. Russian farmers were placed in a losing position. This was the reason for our response to the unilateral and illegitimate sanctions imposed by the EU. (Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, April 9, 2015)

Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov stated that Russia’s response measures were for security reasons to save its deteriorating economy.

Despite the expansion of sanctions by the Western parties, Russia seemed to keep on the same stance; it called itself as putting a lot of efforts to come to a crisis resolution while U.S. was waiting for Russia to take actions. Secretary of State John Kerry expressed U.S. position:

So there’s been a kind of cherry picking, a piecemeal selectivity to the application of the Minsk agreements. And as we all know, shooting, shelling has still been going on and people have still been killed over the course of these last days. So there is not yet a full ceasefire, and it’s extremely difficult for the full measure of the Minsk agreement, which includes a political component, to begin to be implemented until you actually have the full measure of security that comes with OSCE monitoring and an actual ceasefire. So our hope is that in the next hours, certainly not more than days, this will be fully implemented. I might add, a convoy that came through from Russia passed across the border into the eastern part of Ukraine without being properly inspected also. (Secretary of State John Kerry, March 2, 2015)

John Kerry used metaphor “cherry picking” which relates to “the idea of picking through a bowl of cherries and seeking the best for oneself”. U.S. referred to Russia as seeking its own goals and was not active in the ceasefire.

Russia itself presented as having active role in the implementation of the ceasefire. This can be seen in the following statement by President of Russia Vladimir Putin:

Russia is making significant efforts to reconcile the parties and normalise the situation. We have already received and continue receiving thousands, even hundreds of thousands of refugees and are doing all we can to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe. However, our position, our independent policy and even attempts to help those in need, including in Ukraine and some other areas, are causing outright irritation on the part of those we traditionally call our colleagues and partners. (President of Russia Vladimir Putin, March 26, 2015)

Russia spoke conversely than U.S. – that it was the U.S. that prevented Russia from implementing its commitments to the agreements. This expression was reinforced by the use of emotional appeals. Russia showed its empathy to Ukrainian people, that they were dealing with the situation of refugees, to reinforce this idea that Russia was a helper in this situation. Russia was waiting till other parties of the agreements will start implementing actions.

As for what Russia can do to ensure the implementation of these agreements, the answer is simple. We have been urging – and will continue to do this even more insistently – the Kiev authorities, as well as France and Germany as the guarantors of the Minsk Agreements, to put pressure on the Ukrainian government and make sure it fulfils the terms signed by its president. (Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, April 9, 2015)

Russian leaders' attitude to U.S. as an enemy was strengthened. The relations of these two countries were deteriorating. Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov suggested the idea that U.S. containment policy towards Russia was the country's will for dominance:

I'd like to remind you about President Obama's interview with CNN late last year, in which he praised his far-sightedness and got personal, comparing himself and Putin. It was clear that he was piqued. He said that Putin had been presented as the chess master who has outmanoeuvred the West, but the West has struck back, and look at where the Russian economy is now! He takes pride in "ruining" the Russian economy and leaving it "in tatters," as he put it. While praising his policy and denying Russia any ability to plan ahead, he acknowledged that the United States had brokered a deal to transition power in Ukraine. He alleged that Putin was caught off balance and had to improvise in Crimea. It was a Freudian slip. In fact, Obama admitted that the Russian President was right and that he told the truth

when explaining what convinced him to take the decision on Crimea.
(Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, April 22, 2015)

In the following quotation Russian Foreign Minister referred to an interview with Barack Obama, where President of Russia Vladimir Putin was compared to a chess master who rethinks his actions in advance. He referred to “a Freudian slip”, which means “a verbal or memory mistake that is believed to be linked to the unconscious mind: “These slips supposedly reveal the real secret thoughts and feelings that people hold” (Chery, 1). Russia’s President Vladimir Putin also treated U.S. actions as deterrence policy:

They are using their entire arsenal of means for the so-called deterrence of Russia: from attempts at political isolation and economic pressure to large-scale information war and special services operations. As it was recently stated quite openly: those who disagree will have their arms twisted periodically. However, this does not work with Russia; it never has and never will. (President of Russia Vladimir Putin, March 26, 2015)

President named actions that U.S. was applying towards Russia. He was assured that this policy will not change country’s stance and Russia will continue its actions. This idea was reinforced by the use of personification: “this does not work with Russia”, the country was presented as personality. Also, the repetition “never” was used to strengthen the idea. By this idea President reinforced the idea of Russia as a strong nation.

No major changes to the resolution of a conflict appeared during this period. The period showed growing Russia’s response to U.S. actions, response measures were put on Western countries. This period can be treated as informational and economic war between the two parties.

3.7 The continued de-escalation period of crisis as a war of information in the speeches of politicians

The following period from **May, 2015 to July, 2015** denoted the further actions taken by the U.S. and Russia to de-escalate the crisis, how the situation with the Minsk agreements was being fulfilled. During this period the sanctions to Russia were enlarged by the EU (Ukraine: timeline of events, 2015). In the speeches of Western leaders’, the topics did not change much, most of the speeches examined Russia’s constant violations of the Minsk agreements. However, more talks on possibility of providing military assistance and cooperation with NATO

appeared. The U.S. position was more firm, it was affirmed by enlargement of financial assistance to Ukraine, NATO was expanding its military power, as U.S. leaders suggested a help was done for the whole Europe. Whereas, Russian politicians stressed U.S. inactivity in implementing the Minsk agreements, retaliatory measures were prominent in the speeches. Moreover, Russia accused West media of spreading propaganda. Russia argued that the EU leaders for special reasons allow Ukrainian government to disregard the Minsk agreements and that it would be the reason for sanctions to remain on Russia. In general, the period marks economic and informational (propaganda) war of Russia vs. U.S.

From the outset of signing the Minsk II agreements the disagreements between U.S. and Russia over the implementation were prominent. Russia was speaking of its active role in the implementation and lack of actions by the Kiev government:

I think that by now all leading Western countries that have been following the situation and know the facts are perfectly aware that the Ukrainian government is the key obstacle hampering the implementation of the Minsk agreements. The reasons vary. Some fear that if the war comes to an end, if provocations and the shelling of the self-proclaimed DPR [Donetsk People's Republic] and LPR [Lugansk People's Republic] cease, military tensions will abate and they will be called to account for mishandling the economy and social sphere. Others fear that disobedient battalions, no more war for them in southeast Ukraine, will return to other regions and start practicing the skills they acquired during the war. Still others say that the more the military hysteria is whipped up, the easier it will be for the Ukrainian authorities to persuade the West to step up pressure on Russia. (Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 29 May, 2015)

Russia shed the responsibility from itself and put it on Ukraine's government by creating the reasons why it is not implementing actions. The Foreign Minister used ethos, he named his ideas one by one to make his statement memorable and persuasive. There can be made an assumption that by transferring guilt, Russia acted like this to withdraw attention from its actions in Ukraine. The same scenario can be traced in the case of blaming U.S. This idea is presented in the statement by Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov:

I'll say it again: they show commitment to the Minsk Agreements only in speeches, while, in fact, they are trying to twist things. I hope that what we have agreed (which would be, as I said at the news conference following Vladimir Putin's meeting with -John Kerry, on the need to

influence both sides, because Lugansk and Donetsk have to observe the ceasefire more carefully, although most incidents are provoked by the Ukrainian authorities), will be carried out: The United States will use its influence on Kiev to persuade the officials there to abide by the Minsk Agreements. Given what I said about trying to interpret the Minsk Agreements in a perverse manner, the process will not be easy. (Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, May 18, 2015)

It was done for purpose that Russia would not be seen as a cause of events. The idea was strengthened by the use of logos, Foreign Minister used facts to support his position which suggested that Russia's position was not without reason. Minister wanted to demonstrate that West was responsible for not fulfilled commitments. U.S. blamed Russia as not implementing its commitments.

Now, the Russians always raise counter initiatives by the Ukrainians, which they suggest are causing the separatists to shell and to engage in further military activity, and frankly you just sort of get trapped in a rabbit's hole if you start discussing who did what when and how. And so we really tried to focus on how do we move from here forward. And I made it very, very clear, and he accepted the idea, that there needs to be less fighting and more negotiating, and more movement with respect to the Minsk implementation process. [...] Foreign Minister Lavrov indicated to me that they want the Minsk implementation, that they do believe that is the way to resolve this; but obviously, even as we've heard that before, we've also seen Russian activities that further support the separatists in ways that are not productive. (Secretary of State John Kerry, June 16, 2015)

U.S. declared that it was Russia that did not carry out actions to settle the crisis. John Kerry used metaphor "to get trapped in a rabbit's hole", which is allusion to Alice in Wonderland, it "is commonly used as an expression or euphemism for a portal to bizarre world/significantly strange happenings/extremely surreal situations, etc" (Urban Dictionary, 3). Despite Russia's statements its support to separatists was seen.

Russia on its side despite the violations which were confirmed by evidences still did not acknowledge its participation in the war and military actions:

Naturally, Ukraine occupied a special place. The discussion was open. There was no ambiguity or attempts to conceal what should be done and what each side thinks. Let me repeat that we felt the sincere striving of Secretary of State John Kerry to facilitate the implementation of the

Minsk agreements. Yes, they think Russia can do more. There were some accusations that they repeated in public later on about the alleged presence of Russian troops and arms in south-eastern Ukraine. We were handed very poor Xerox copies of what they described as satellite pictures. We are studying them. It is unclear what has been photographed there. No specific facts were quoted. As for the evidence of the presence of Russian troops, the Americans gave us a reference to Russian media, notably the newspaper *Novaya Gazeta* and the *Dozhd* television channel. There was a half-a-page report about some army serviceman who wrote some letters from there and about something that was found in his diary. (Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 29 May, 2015)

Russia mocked U.S. politicians' statements, and supposedly, Russia's military presence inside of Ukraine. Sergey Lavrov used logical appeals to reinforce the idea that Russia treats U.S. arguments as inappropriate to claim such facts. On the contrary, Russia treated itself as solving the crisis:

This dialogue is becoming a reality despite all the obstacles and complications. At Russia's initiative, working subgroups on the various aspects of a settlement were formed and began their work. The economic subgroup met on May 14. Another two meetings, on security and humanitarian issues, gathered yesterday, and the subgroup on political issues is due to meet on May 22. (Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, May 20, 2015)

Politician used personification to emphasize Russia's as a whole nation's responsibility as it was the initiator of the crisis settlement. The connection between the audience and the speaker was stronger. Moreover, this picture of Russia as the initiator of crisis settlement was reinforced in the situation of the withdrawal of heavy weapons:

We made this initiative almost a month ago with the support of Donetsk and Lugansk. The Ukrainian side seems to show understanding, at least as represented by the joint Russian-Ukrainian Centre for Control and Coordination that was set up upon Mr Poroshenko's request. Now the sides are dovetailing the details of this document. If supported by the self-defence fighters, it may become a very important result of the work by the subgroup on military issues. We are also suggesting that the sides should pull out heavy weapons not only with a calibre over 100 mm, but also with a calibre under 100 mm, including tanks and mortars. (Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 29 May, 2015)

Russia was trying to come across to a settlement to attract public attention that it could be seen as a helper, not as a cause of the events.

Another topic was sanctions and how they were treated by politicians of both countries. Russia violated Minsk agreements therefore sanctions will not be lifted. U.S. President Barack Obama expressed irony towards Russia's actions and declared that the future of Russia's economy and the further imposition of sanctions will depend on the country's decisions:

Ultimately, this is going to be an issue for Mr. Putin. He's got to make a decision: Does he continue to wreck his country's economy and continue Russia's isolation in pursuit of a wrong-headed desire to re-create the glories of the Soviet empire? Or does he recognize that Russia's greatness does not depend on violating the territorial integrity and sovereignty of other countries? (President Barack Obama, June 08, 2015)

President used historical reference to the Russia's past, to the Soviet Union's Empire and related present events in Ukraine with the common goals which were sought in the past. President now referred not to Russia but to President Putin and related it with his seeks, not Russia's. Moreover, the additional sanctions on Russia's economy were placed in contact with G-7: "In June 2015, the G7 collectively extended sanctions already in place for an additional six months" (Rollie, 2015, 2).

Here at the G7, we agreed that even as we will continue to seek a diplomatic solution, sanctions against Russia will remain in place so long as Russia continues to violate its obligations under the Minsk agreements. Our European partners reaffirmed that they will maintain sanctions on Russia until the Minsk agreements are fully implemented, which means extending the EU's existing sectoral sanctions beyond July. And the G7 is making it clear that, if necessary, we stand ready to impose additional, significant sanctions against Russia. (President Barack Obama, June 08, 2015)

U.S. unity with other international partners was strengthened. The pronouns "we" and "our" suggest that the responsibility falls to the whole nation and even to other Western partners. The partnership had an important role in this aspect, in changing of Russia's position. Moreover, U.S. besides economic sanctions applied energy restrictions. The idea of energy used as a weapon against Russia appears:

In spite of all that Russia has done, Ukraine has been able to move. And we've already made significant progress in the face of Russian

cut-off of gas supplies to Ukraine last year, we supported the EU's effort to mediate a gas deal and work through Ukraine's neighbours to increase reverse flows of gas, shipments to Ukraine. We supported Lithuania as it inaugurated its first LNG terminal, ending the Baltic region's complete dependence on European imports. (Vice President Joe Biden, June 26, 2015)

Energy dependence of Ukraine and other Eastern European countries could be used as a tool of Russia to spread its influence; therefore U.S. imposed restrictions protected these countries because of less dependence on Russia. The personification "Ukraine has been able to move", when the country was given human traits reinforces countries' vulnerabilities and strength that it has to resist its enemy.

Whereas Russia viewed sanctions as a tool by which Western countries' wanted to isolate it:

They must have wanted to aggravate the situation as much as possible before it started, as they no doubt remember that the G7 said that the anti-Russia sanctions would remain in effect until Russia implemented the Minsk agreements. It's like an ace in the hole for the Ukrainian authorities: We, Ukrainians, will sabotage the Minsk agreements, but Russia will be the one to suffer, because no one will lift the sanctions. (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, June 8, 2015)

Minister refers to the metaphor originating from the card game "an ace in the hole" which means "something that can supply a sure victory when revealed" (The meaning and origin of the expression: Ace in the hole, p. 1). Russia looked at the imposed sanctions as if it was done for specific purposes of Ukraine and without special reason, as Russia sees it. Response measures by Russia were imposed on Western countries:

One of these matters is our response to our European colleagues' decision on the sanctions. The Prime Minister sent me a letter, proposing that we extend the measures that we took in response to the actions of our partners in some countries. In accordance with this letter, I signed today an executive order extending special economic measures taken to ensure our country's security, and I ask the Government to promptly draft and issue the corresponding Government resolution. (President of Russia Vladimir Putin, June 24, 2015)

Russia took retaliatory measures because of country's security, as Foreign Minister suggested. The statement portrayed Western countries' as a threat to Russia's security, not vice a versa. This suggested Russia portraying itself as a peacekeeper, by doing this it is aimed to make the speech more persuasive.

NATO assistance to Europe as a topic prominent in this period appeared. NATO was expanding its military power and member states were invited to contribute:

NATO's Readiness Action Plan is an important start -- allowing us to step up our military presence in the air, at sea, and on land, from the Baltics to Poland, Romania and Bulgaria. And we're pleased that some of our NATO allies have made similar contributions. (Vice President Joe Biden, June 26, 2015)

NATO was used as a tool by U.S. to resist Russia's aggression. This Western expansion closer to Russia's borders attained negative reaction of Russia's President:

If somebody threatens any of our territories, that means we will need to aim our Armed Forces, our modern weaponry towards the territories from which that threat originates. How could it be otherwise? NATO is advancing towards our borders; it is not Russia that is moving towards them. Nevertheless, I would not escalate anything here. [...] These are most likely just political messages aimed at Russia or its allies. (President of Russia Vladimir Putin, June 16, 2015)

Another statement by Foreign Minister of Russia also suggested the same idea:

The infrastructure of the global system of US missile defence is actively established around Russia on the territory of the Baltic states, Poland and Romania. Many other actions based on decisions made at the Wales summits are also being taken, whereby political instructions depict Russia as an opponent. This hasn't happened since the Cold War. We used to develop a partnership with NATO. (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, May 20, 2015)

The allusion to the historical event – the Cold War was made, suggesting the idea that these NATO actions were important to Russia and that they reminded the biggest confrontation between U.S. and Russia seen in the past. Therefore, Russia itself presented as an opponent of U.S.

The period signified a war of information and media – propaganda war. Not military actions were intensified but propaganda means used by Russia to tackle U.S. As American President Barack Obama in his speech stated, Russia's intervention in Ukraine was based on propaganda:

And as I mentioned earlier, the costs that the Russian people are bearing are severe. That's being felt. It may not always be understood why they're suffering, because of state media inside of Russia and propaganda coming out of state media in Russia and to Russian speakers. But the truth of the matter is, is that the Russian people would greatly benefit. And, ironically, one of the rationales that Mr. Putin provided for his incursions into Ukraine was to protect Russian speakers there. Well, Russian speakers inside of Ukraine are precisely the ones who are bearing the brunt of the fighting. Their economy has collapsed. Their lives are disordered. Many of them are displaced. Their homes may have been destroyed. They're suffering. And the best way for them to stop suffering is if the Minsk agreement is fully implemented. (President Barack Obama, June 08, 2015)

Pathos was prominent in President's speech; he expresses sympathy towards Russian people who had to suffer because of current Russia's actions. While Russia, on the other side, accused West media of spreading propaganda:

We note that the "carelessness" and passivity of the Ukrainian authorities is encouraged by their patrons in the West and a wide range of "free" international media. Thus, according to our observations, the May 2014 tragedy in Odessa has been given a paltry amount of attention in Europe and North America. This is yet another element of the information war and media manipulation. (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, May 1, 2015)

Russia accused West media of spreading propaganda related to the events in Ukraine. Foreign Minister supported his argument using facts; this showed usage of phrases "according to our observations", also a reference to the revolution in Ukraine was made – logos appeal was used to depict U.S. as a party which spreads propaganda. Russia aimed to shed the guilty from its side. Furthermore, the idea that Russia's media showed true events and U.S. media changed them appears:

As for Ukraine, our journalists are the only ones who have been working continuously in southeastern Ukraine and showing live images of the enormous destruction inflicted by the Ukrainian army, and battalions

of the National Guard, the Right Sector and other formations that are not subordinate to the government in Kiev. By the way, in Ukrainian-controlled territory, there is nothing even close to the destruction we see in southeastern Ukraine. I don't remember any mention of civilian casualties in the reports from the front on Ukrainian army losses. (Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, May 20, 2015)

Russia viewed its journalists as showing true events despite the fact that real events were concealed therefore it was safe for Russia to claim that propaganda was coming from U.S. side.

CONCLUSIONS

Analysis reveals that at the first part of the crisis period the interest of U.S. and Russian political leaders in Ukraine was rather high. There appear ceasefire agreements, various tools, such as sanctions to settle the crisis. While the second part of the analysed crisis period signifies calming down of the crisis and diminishing interest of politicians in Ukraine crisis as well.

Major topics which appeared throughout all the crisis periods were as follows: refusal of signing the association agreement with EU (which was the main cause of the crisis); Russia's military intervention has started in the Eastern part of Ukraine and annexation of Crimea; Malaysian Airlines Flight Disaster; the Minsk agreements and their implementation and parliamentary elections in Ukraine.

The main changes of the rhetoric from the beginning of the crisis were changing Russia's and U.S. attitudes to one another, also the rhetoric of the leaders' with each period was becoming stricter. At the onset of the crisis U.S. and Russia viewed one another as partners and U.S. was not hastening to blame Russia for the events in Ukraine, they acted more as partners not enemies. This shows that states tried act rationally having not enough information on the intentions of one another. Later on U.S. in the speeches expressed constant discontent with the actions of Russia and the attitude to Russia as an enemy was strengthened by the use of sanctions on Russia. Whereas, Russia acted silently as a peacekeeper from the beginning and through the whole time span did not acknowledged its actions in Ukraine. At the end of these periods Russia started to use response measures based on propaganda. Therefore, both states have changed the rhetoric under the influence of assessment of relative power and each other states' intentions.

The relations of the two countries through the whole period can be described as an economic war, a war of propaganda and a policy of isolation coming from

the U.S. Both parties were blaming one another for propaganda. U.S. claimed that Russia's intentions which it officially claims, such as the better situation for Russians living in Crimea, is a propaganda based intention. While Russia accused Western media of spreading distorted picture of the events, regarding the separatists and their actions in the Eastern part of Ukraine. Logical and emotional appeals were prominent in the speeches which aimed to persuade the audience.

U.S. and Russia attitude to the crisis started to be like a battlefield of these two countries' wishing to demonstrate their powers in international arena. After the Malaysian Airlines Flight disaster, the relations of these countries' achieved similar state as in the Cold War period. Military actions by Russia intensified in each following period and constant violations of the ceasefire agreements appeared. During further periods in the rhetoric of Russia's leaders appeared constant accusations of West's intervention into the crisis and their tools, based on propaganda to weaken Russia, seeking its own interest – domination in international arena. It seems that Russia again used national interests as instruments to legitimize the country's actions and consolidate its public in support of its actions on the international arena. In U.S. speeches more talks on military assistance appeared but no real actions were taken, except for NATO operations in Eastern Europe, to strengthen security of this region.

Taking all things into consideration, the analysed periods signify the settlement of the crisis by the means of rhetoric and diplomacy. Both sides tried to affect one another by certain statements willing that it will have certain weight in international arena. Their strategies were changing constantly from proactive to reactive. The position of U.S. remained "safe", it has no intention to strengthen Russia's aggression and tried to act safely. Russia acted as a peacekeeper and interpreted its role as solving the crisis. These ideas were enforced by the use of metaphors, personifications, pronouns, allusions and historical references – which denoted an attempt of West to seek for dominance and Russia's will to re-establish the Soviet Empire.

REFERENCES

- BELKIN, PAUL, D. E. MIX, S. WOEHREL. (2014). *NATO: Response to the Crisis in Ukraine and Security Concerns in Central and Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R43478.pdf>. p. 1-20.
- BRECHER, M. (1993). *Crises in World Politics: Theory and Reality*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- BUCHANAN, ELSA. (2015). Ukraine crisis timeline: From the highs of independence to a full-blown war. Available at: <http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/>

- ukraine-crisis-timeline-highs-independence-full-blown-war-1497629. Last accessed 02/11/2015.
- CHERY, KENDRA. What Is a Freudian Slip? Available at: <http://psychology.about.com/od/sigmundfreud/f/freudian-slip.htm>. Last accessed 10/11/2015.
- Chess Metaphors. Available at: <https://sites.google.com/site/sportingmetaphors/chess-metaphors>. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- DAMEROW, H. (2009). Global actors. Available at: http://faculty.ucc.edu/egh-damerow/global_actors.htm. Last accessed 17/10/2014.
- DAVID T. JONES (2016). *The Ukraine: A Forgotten Foreign Affairs 'Pin Up'*. Available at: <http://www.theepochtimes.com/n3/2210882-the-ukraine-a-forgotten-foreign-affairs-pin-up/>. Last accessed 02/02/2017.
- FISHER, M. Everything You Need to Know About the Ukraine Crisis. (2014). Available at: <http://www.vox.com/cards/ukraine-everything-you-need-to-know/what-is-the-ukraine-crisis>. Last accessed 17/10/2014.
- ISYAR, OMER G. (2008). Definition and Management of International Crises. *Perceptions. Journal of International Affairs*. p. 1-49.
- KITCHEN, NICHOLAS (2010). Systemic pressures and domestic ideas: a neoclassical realist model of grand strategy formation. *Review of international studies*, 36 (1). p. 117-143. ISSN 0260-2105 DOI: 10.1017/S0260210509990532
- LEHMANN, CAROLIN. (2012). A Rhetorical Analysis of President Barack Obama's Speech Delivered in Prague, April 5 2009. In *The Power of Speech*. p. 1-6.
- MOTYL, ALEXANDER J. (2014). War Comes to Ukraine. Available at: <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/141645/alexander-j-motyl/war-comes-to-ukraine>. Last accessed 22/04/2015.
- Report on Preliminary Examination Activities, 2016. Available at: https://www.icc-cpi.int/iccdocs/otp/161114-otp-rep-PE_ENG.pdf . Last accessed 02/02/2017.
- ROLLIE, STEPHEN. (2015). Forex - USD/RUB: Oil Prices and Sanctions Continue to Leave Ruble in Trough. Available at: <http://wbponline.com/articles/view/54603/usd-rub-oil-prices-and-sanctions-continue-to-leave-ruble-in-trough>. Last accessed 12/11/2015
- The Situation in Ukraine and Crimea. (2014). *Canisius College. Model United Nations. 36th Annual Conference*. Available at: http://www3.canisius.edu/~diciccoj/MUN_2014_CSC_Ukraine.pdf. p. 1-20
- TALIAFERRO, JEFFREY, STEVEN E. LOBELL, AND NORRIN M RIPSAN (2009). *Neoclassical Realism, the State and Foreign Policy* . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- The Ukraine Crisis Timeline. (2014). Available at: <http://csis.org/ukraine/index.htm#128>. Last accessed 01/12/2014.
- Ukraine ceasefire agreement signed in Minsk. (2014). Available at: <http://www.cctv-america.com/2014/09/05/ukraine-ceasefire-agreement-signed-in-minsk>. Last accessed 04/11/2015.
- VASQUEZ, JOHN A. (2000). *What Do We Know about War?* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield. Found in Google Books.

Speeches cited in the text:

- Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 20 February, 2014: Answer by the Russian Foreign Minister, Sergey Lavrov, to the question from the mass media about the situation in Ukraine, during the press conference summarising the results of the negotiations with the Iraqi Foreign Minister, Hoshyar Zebari, Baghdad, 20 February 2014.// http://archive.mid.ru/bdomp/brp_4.nsf/e78a48070f128a7b-43256999005bcbb3/9a57c89aa391da6444257c8900547b4b!OpenDocument. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- President Barack Obama, February 28, 2014: Statement by the President on Ukraine.// <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/02/28/statement-president-ukraine>. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- Secretary of State John Kerry, March 1, 2014: Remarks at a Press Availability.// <http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2015/03/238077.htm>. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- President Vladimir Putin, March 4, 2014: Vladimir Putin answered journalists' questions on the situation in Ukraine.// <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/20366>. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- President Barack Obama, March 17, 2014: Statement by the President on Ukraine.// <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/03/17/statement-president-ukraine>. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- President Barack Obama, March 20, 2014: Statement by the President on Ukraine.// <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/03/20/statement-president-ukraine> Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, April 7, 2014: *Article of the Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov "It's not Russia that is destabilising Ukraine"* published in The Guardian on April 7, 2014.// http://archive.mid.ru/bdomp//brp_4.nsf/english/01101476BF4BD20C44257CB4001B48AE. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- Vice President Joe Biden, April 22, 2014: Remarks to the Press by Vice President Joe Biden and Ukrainian Prime Minister Arseniy Yatsenyuk.// <https://www>.

- whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/04/22/remarks-press-vice-president-joe-biden-and-ukrainian-prime-minister-arse
- Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 14 May, 2014: Interview of the Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov to “Bloomberg TV”, Moscow, 14th of May 2014.//http://archive.mid.ru//brp_4.nsf/0/FC216870BE040E3C44257CD900491440. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- Prime Minister of Russia Dmitry Medvedev, 24 May 2014: Dmitry Medvedev’s interview with the Rossiya-1 TV channel.// <http://government.ru/en/news/12590/>. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- Secretary of State John Kerry, May 26, 2014: 2014 Presidential Elections in Ukraine.// <http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2014/05/226543.htm>. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 28 May, 2014: Speech by the Russian Foreign Minister, Sergey Lavrov, at the protocol event on the occasion of Orthodox Easter, Moscow, 28 May 2014.// http://archive.mid.ru//bdomp/brp_4.nsf/e78a48070f128a7b43256999005bcbb3/579bb15378650a7d-44257ce7005db10e!OpenDocument. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- President Vladimir Putin, June 4, 2014: Vladimir Putin’s interview with Radio Europe 1 and TF1 TV channel June 4, 2014.// <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/45832>. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev, 17 July, 2014: On sanctions against Russia and Russian companies.// <http://government.ru/en/news/13800/>. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- President Barack Obama, July 18, 2014: Statement by the President on Ukraine.// <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/07/18/statement-president-ukraine>. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- President Barack Obama, July 29, 2014: Statement by the President on Ukraine.// <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/07/29/statement-president-ukraine>. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- President Vladimir Putin, August 14, 2014: Meeting with members of political parties represented in the State Duma.// <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/46451>. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, September 27, 2014: Interview by Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov To Bloomberg TV, September 27, 2014.//http://archive.mid.ru//brp_4.nsf/0/E8469404DAB7C97C44257D6200258404. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 27 October, 2014: Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov’s interview with Life News television and Izvestia daily, Moscow, 27 October 2014.// http://archive.mid.ru//brp_4.nsf/0/

- EF40A589BC597EE9C3257D7F00386A2C. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- Vice President Joe Biden, December 02, 2014: Statement by the Vice President on the Formation of a New Ukrainian Government.//<https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/12/02/statement-vice-president-formation-new-ukrainian-government>. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- President Barack Obama, January 25, 2015: Statements by President Obama and Prime Minister Modi of the Republic of India.// <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/01/25/statements-president-obama-and-prime-minister-modi-republic-india>. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- President of Russia Vladimir Putin, March 26, 2015: *Address by President of the Russian Federation*.// <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/20603>. Last accessed 11/04/2016.
- President Barack Obama, April 17, 2015: Remarks by President Obama and Prime Minister Renzi of Italy in Joint Press Conference.//<https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/04/17/remarks-president-obama-and-prime-minister-renzi-italy-joint-press-confe>. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, April 22, 2015: Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov's live radio interview with Sputnik, Ekho Moskvyy and Govorit Moskva, Moscow, April 22, 2015.// http://archive.mid.ru/bdomp/brp_4.nsf/e78a48070f128a7b43256999005bcbb3/0bca9a90832725fc43257e3000210820!OpenDocument. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, May 1, 2015: Foreign Ministry statement on the anniversary of the May 2, 2014, events in Odessa.//http://archive.mid.ru/bdomp/brp_4.nsf/e78a48070f128a7b43256999005bcbb3/0b0785c76d3b8e1443257e39002818d1!OpenDocument. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, May 20, 2015: Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov's remarks and answers to questions during Government Hour at the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly, Moscow, May 20, 2015.// http://archive.mid.ru/bdomp/brp_4.nsf/e78a48070f128a7b43256999005bcbb3/88ff7ad1c2f54dc643257e4c0022d5e8!OpenDocument. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, 29 May, 2015: Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov's interview to Mezhdunarodnoye Obozreniye programme on Rossiya 24 TV channel, Moscow, 29 May 2015.// http://archive.mid.ru/bdomp/brp_4.nsf/e78a48070f128a7b43256999005bcbb3/9a0879a31dd73a4943257e57004d3b4b!OpenDocument. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- President Barack Obama, June 08, 2015: Remarks by President Obama in Press Conference after G7 Summit.// <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/06/08/remarks-president-obama-press-conference-after-g7-sum>

- mit. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, June 08, 2015: Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov's statement and answers to media questions at a joint news conference following talks with Belarusian Foreign Minister Vladimir Makei, Moscow, June 8, 2015.// http://archive.mid.ru/bdomp/brp_4.nsf/e78a48070f128a7b-43256999005bcbb3/48fb1ea6ebdbfc1643257e5f003aa2d2!OpenDocument. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- Secretary of State John Kerry, June 16, 2015: Secretary Kerry's Press Availability.// <http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2015/06/243892.htm>. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- President of Russia Vladimir Putin, June 16, 2015: Joint news conference with President of Finland Sauli Niinistö.// <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/49714>. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- President of Russia Vladimir Putin, June 24, 2015: Meeting with Government members.// <http://en.special.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/49757>. Last accessed 15/11/2015.
- Vice President Joe Biden, June 26, 2015: Remarks by the Vice President to the Truman National Security Project and Center for National Policy.// <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/06/26/remarks-vice-president-truman-national-security-project-and-center>. Last accessed 15/11/2015.