

Ukraine opposes Maastricht Treaty, seeks economic, political help

by Mark Burdman

Opposition to the European Community's Maastricht Treaty is not only manifest in Denmark, France, and other countries of western Europe. Maastricht, which would place the EC member-states under supranational financial control and grotesque bureaucratic centralization from Brussels, is also perceived as a clear and present strategic danger by leading political figures in the nation of Ukraine.

This point was forcefully made during an Aug. 28 interview with *EIR* granted by Dmytro Pavlychko, chairman of the parliamentary commission of the Ukrainian Parliament, in the town of Alpbach in the Tyrol region of Austria. Pavlychko was one of the leaders of a delegation of prominent parliamentarians, economists, and professionals who had come from Ukraine to attend the "Dialogue Congress—Ukraine" sponsored by Austria's renowned "European Forum Alpbach" from Aug. 26-28.

The gist of Pavlychko's comments was that Ukraine is firmly opposed to Maastricht, and would be happy to see the entire project buried, and replaced by a firm commitment on the part of Germany, Austria, and other western or central European nations to help develop the economies and political institutions of the post-totalitarian nations of eastern Europe and the Balkans. This would be necessary, in his view, to create an effective strategic buffer against the probable emergence of a post-Soviet Russian imperial thrust in the coming months or years.

Germany and Austria must destroy Maastricht

Pavlychko came to this point when asked his view about the proposal, authored by *EIR* Founding Editor Lyndon LaRouche, for a "Productive Triangle" of infrastructural and agro-industrial development, based on the area encompassed by the three great cities of Paris-Berlin-Vienna. He responded by focusing on Vienna, the capital of Austria, noting the irony that the Austrians seem more eager at this point to become part of the "European Union" that is supposed to emerge out of the Maastricht agreement, than to play a leading role in a development project in Europe.

Specifically, he referred to the speech made one day earlier in Alpbach by Dr. Andreas Khol, a senior figure in the ruling Austrian People's Party and head of the foreign policy

commission of the Austrian Parliament. In a long speech, billed as a presentation of Austria's evaluation of the situation in Europe, Khol insisted repeatedly on the importance of European Community (EC) member-states' ratification of the Maastricht Treaty, inclusively because that would, in his view, expedite Austria's entry into the EC in the near future. He portrayed Maastricht as necessary to reinforce "European crisis-management" capabilities to deal with future Yugoslavia-like crises, and arrogantly dismissed the opposition to Maastricht in France and other countries as misguided, confused, and "emotional." Asserted Khol: "From the Austrian perspective, it would be very sad indeed if the French, on Sept. 20, rejected Maastricht."

Danish vote a 'good experience'

Ukraine's Pavlychko said he was "disappointed" with what Khol had to say. He explained why:

"The main thing for Europe, is how we build the new Europe. Europe must see that, after what has been happening in recent years, Europe is bigger and wider than some years ago. Ukraine, Belarus, the Baltic republics, the other post-totalitarian states—they are Europe also. We must unite Europe, in a political sense. We may not be like France or Germany economically, but politically we must unite all Europe. So, when Denmark said, 'We don't want this Maastricht, this single currency and so on,' it was a good experience for Ukraine." He said the Ukrainians would be equally happy, were France to reject Maastricht in the Sept. 20 national referendum on the treaty.

He continued: "I was a little disappointed when I heard that Austria wants to go into western Europe, since it is my view that the mission of Austria and Germany should be to take the lead to help develop eastern Europe. In this Maastricht scheme, where are Hungary, Ukraine, and so on? Ukraine wants to go to Europe; we are a European nation, and only in a common Europe would we receive security and cooperation. This is in our interest. We must unite the eastern European nations, but this is only possible if Austria and Germany open the doors. In my view, the mission of Austria and Germany is to unite the eastern European countries, to include the world of eastern Europe in the West. In such a situation, Germany and Austria must be

interested in destroying this Maastricht proposal to create an immediate 'Europe.' Without Ukraine and the others, it is not possible to build a normal, democratic Europe. . . . It will be a great mistake of western Europe if western Europe were to go to Maastricht."

Pavlychko expressed astonishment that sovereign nations of western Europe would be so eager to have their fate, including the direction of their economic and fiscal policies, decided by a supranational bureaucracy in Brussels. He did not miss the irony, that these western European nations are acting to strengthen a European bureaucratic *nomenklatura*, while nations like Ukraine are so passionately trying to solidify and preserve their independence from a centralized *nomenklatura*, this one in Moscow, that ruled the fate of Ukrainians for so many decades.

The dangers of a new Russian empire

Pavlychko advised greater patience from western and central European policymakers, to allow for a strategic timetable that would help the formerly communist countries to develop effective democratic institutions over the next years, while enabling European leaders to assimilate and understand the lessons of the current unrest in the Balkans. What must be done, Pavlychko stressed, is to find ways to bring countries like Ukraine together with Croatia, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Romania, Moldova, Poland, Hungary, and others, so that "the eastern European and Balkans countries, which have similar problems, would unite on an economic and a cultural basis. But at the head of these countries, would be Austria and Germany."

The main strategic consideration motivating such proposals, is to create a buffer, to defend both Ukraine and Europe as a whole from the dangers posed by the likely reassertion of Russian imperialist ambitions in the coming period. "Only by uniting Europe in this way, can we create a real border between Europe and Asia. What I mean by Asia, is the dangers from Russia. The main danger for us, is the danger of the renovation of the Russian Empire. Russia is in the situation, where we do not know what will happen tomorrow. The renovation of the empire is possible. We must support and help Russian democracy. But the fact is, the empire is still alive in the minds of many Russian leaders and simple people. There is a 'Great Russian' idea to retain these republics that used to belong to the Soviet Union."

According to Pavlychko, "it is the great problem for Europe, to build its border with Asia. Ukraine must be like the banner of European civilization, democracy, and independence."

He warned that the situation in Russia is becoming "dangerous," with the growth of "half-Nazi, half-red, that is, red-brown opposition to [Russian President Boris] Yeltsin. This could become very, very dangerous for the whole of Europe." The threat was embodied in the person of Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, the leader of the so-called Liberal Democratic

Party, who supports a rapid restoration of the borders of the old Soviet Union, and who received no less than 6 million votes in the Russian presidential race against Yeltsin last year. "Next time, he will get more," Pavlychko warned. "I predict Zhirinovskiy may get 12 million" votes.

"The situation in Russia is very sharp," he went on. In Pavlychko's view, the situation will get dramatically worse, if and when Yeltsin is removed from power. As long as he stays in power, Yeltsin, a master politician, may make concessions to his nationalist-imperialist opposition, "but deeply, he is a man of understanding, and he understands that Russia must be Russia, without the Baltics or Ukraine."

Yeltsin or no Yeltsin, Ukraine must be emphatic in rejecting the idea that it can exist for long within institutions in which Russia is the dominant partner. During his public presentation to the congress one day earlier, Pavlychko had stated emphatically, "The whole world should realize that the Community of Independent States is an unstable, cumbersome alliance, with a tendency toward self-destruction. Membership of Ukraine in the CIS is a temporary measure." Instead, he told the assembly, Ukraine wanted to establish closer relations with a wide range of institutions or organizations, including NATO, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the North Atlantic Assembly. But the main focus would be striving to bring such nations as Austria together with a "new alliance of all eastern European and such Balkan countries as Croatia and Slovenia." He welcomed Ukraine having been granted observer status in the "Pentagonale," a five-nation European initiative, with its present headquarters in Austria, which also includes Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Italy. (Formerly, Yugoslavia was also a member of this grouping.)

During the Alpbach "Dialogue Congress—Ukraine," other Ukrainian participants were less sanguine about Yeltsin than was Pavlychko, with some claiming that the only difference between the Russian President and types like Zhirinovskiy is timing, not a difference in ultimate goals. They asserted that whereas Zhirinovskiy wants immediate restoration of the Soviet borders, Yeltsin is willing to wait 10-15 years, or even some decades, to accomplish that goal, these Ukrainians said. But whatever differences there may have been on this particular point, there was a strong consensus among Ukrainian attendees—most of whom were members of one or another tendency of the opposition nationalist movement Rukh—that Russia is not destined to become an effective part of, or partner for, Europe, and that the tendency of Russia to seek to reestablish its imperial domain represents the single greatest threat to Ukraine and Europe. From this standpoint, the matter of Ukraine strengthening its relations with Europe in general, and with Austria in particular, was a commonly expressed objective.

But the question posed by Pavlychko is the essential one: Will western Europe live up to the challenges and expectations that nations like Ukraine are expressing?