

# Anglo-Americans strike deal with Russia to sacrifice Ukraine

by Irene Beaudry

On Dec. 2, U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher threatened to cut Ukraine off from almost all financial aid, unless Ukraine immediately does the bidding of imperial Russia and dismantles all of its nuclear weapons. Ukraine, however, is steadfastly refusing to budge in face of these threats. Ukraine has repeatedly insisted that it very much wishes to get rid of its weaponry, but that, given the very dramatic events unfolding in Russia, it needs assurances that its borders will be secure.

Ukraine's position was underscored on Dec. 4 by Ivan Plyushch, the head of Ukraine's Parliament, who told Reuters news service that his country's position is non-negotiable. Plyushch said that Ukraine did not fear this would isolate Ukraine internationally, despite the strong international criticism of the conditions which the Parliament imposed when it gave partial approval to the START arms limitation treaty in November. "This issue can only be re-examined if there is a basis for doing so," Plyushch said, and "there can be only one basis: agreement with Ukraine's two basic conditions—providing us with nuclear fuel and a collective security agreement."

But it is precisely this demand to which the West will not agree, because the Anglo-Americans have already forged a deal with imperial Russia allowing it to restore its empire—and that emphatically means retaking Ukraine. As Lenin was wont to note, if Russia loses Ukraine, it loses its head.

## Free at last

Two years ago, almost to the day, on Dec. 1, 1991, the Ukrainian nation overwhelmingly voted for its independence from imperial Russia. For the very first time since 1918, Ukraine was an independent, free country.

But now, the geopolitical machinations of the Clinton administration doom that nation to once again go under the yoke of Russia. British Foreign Minister Douglas Hurd, current chairman of NATO's Council of Ministers, quite willingly spilled the beans that such a deal had been made. He told a press conference in Brussels on Dec. 2 that the highest priority of NATO was to establish closer relations with Russia. "A strong friendship between Russia and NATO is essential to the security of Europe. The process of political and economic reform in Russia continues to move forward and

we note with satisfaction . . . the progress in withdrawing the remaining Russian forces from the Baltic states." Therefore, Hurd added, Ukraine will be removed from the North Atlantic Cooperation Council, and would not be allowed to participate in the new NATO "Partnership for Peace" program (see article, p. 37), if it does not take "swift action" on the demands made by NATO that it denuclearize.

Is the Anglo-Americans' threat real, or is this all just doubletalk to mask the new condominium deal? Russia's new military doctrine makes very plain how utterly duplicitous the Anglo-American geopoliticians are. The doctrine emphasizes Russia's right to first use of nuclear weapons, specifically in the case of "defending" itself or any ally against "aggression" employing conventional weapons, if the country concerned is the ally of a nuclear power (see *EIR*, Nov. 12, p. 36).

In that light, Christopher's statement to the Ukrainian Presidium of the Supreme Council during his trip to Ukraine on Oct. 25, is double-edged: "Some among you believe that Ukraine's security concerns could best be met by renouncing the commitment of this body and the government of Ukraine to a non-nuclear future. I disagree. Retention of nuclear weapons would diminish rather than enhance your security. It would impede, if not imperil, the process of integration into the world community of democratic nations that is the only real guarantee of Ukraine's security."

Behind Christopher's words lies the veiled threat: Ukraine had better get rid of its nuclear weapons because the Anglo-Americans will certainly *not* come to the aid of Ukraine once Russia invades it, and so, better that there be no nuclear weapons on its territory, or indeed, a worse catastrophe than Chernobyl could occur.

Former Ukrainian Defense Minister Gen. K. Morozov, in a recent interview, characterized Kozyrev's threats as "nothing short of barbaric, cruel, and anti-Christian."

On the same day that Hurd announced the new condominium deal in Brussels, Ukraine President Leonid Kravchuk made yet another appeal for help and that Ukraine not be forced to its knees. "Other states must understand, that if we move gradually, taking account of our situation, we shall [disarm]. . . . We should not have to take a decision on our knees," he said.

But on their knees they must go, for Hurd's statement is in direct reaction to the fact that the Ukrainian Parliament did ratify the START I accord on Nov. 18, but only with 13 conditions for implementation.

"Ukraine ratified this START accord without guarantees of national security, without indispensable financial aid from the West, and without compensation for its tactical weapons transferred to Russia," said the chairman of the parliamentary working group and deputy chairman of the Parliament, Vasyl Durdynets.

"But we are not losing hope that the West will take steps to meet us, and will give us monetary aid for the destruction of nuclear weapons," he said.

Ukraine estimates that it will cost over \$2.8 billion to dismantle its entire nuclear arsenal, and about \$1.6 billion to dismantle 36% of the nuclear weapons as specified in the START I treaty Ukraine ratified.

As outlined by Oleh Bilorus, Ukraine's ambassador to the United States, at a Washington, D.C. press conference on Nov. 19, some of the conditions are: that Ukraine considers the nuclear weapons on its soil to be the "state property of Ukraine;" that Ukraine does not consider Article V of the Lisbon Protocol to be binding and, therefore, will not accede to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT); that if dismantling of the weapons occurs outside of Ukraine, Ukraine must directly control the process to ensure that the nuclear material is not used to develop new weapons; and that the reduction of Ukraine's nuclear weapons cannot occur without economic and technical assistance from the international community.

Why would the United States not help financially? Why not offer some deal to aid Ukraine's catastrophic economy in return for dismantling the weapons? Again, Christopher blurted out the truth in his Oct. 25 visit to Ukraine: He suggested that the United States could expand trade and private investments by lowering tariffs on Ukrainian goods and helping Ukraine join the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). According to Ukrainian-based American press reports, Christopher said that if Ukraine is indeed committed to market reforms, the United States could mobilize substantial economic support channeled through international financial institutions. In other words, Ukraine must give itself up to International Monetary Fund (IMF) shock therapy, *à la* Poland, or no aid.

So it is plain: Ukraine's resistance to being looted, as Poland and others have been by shock therapy, has nevertheless resulted in that country's total economic collapse. Ukraine is among the top three economies of the world with the highest rates of inflation—along with Brazil and Zaire. Now, because Ukraine refuses to meekly join the Russian empire, it is to be brought, by western agreement, not to its knees, but to its death. As Ukrainian writer Yuri Pokalchuk put it in a guest commentary in the French daily *Libération* on Dec. 7, "The West is suggesting to Ukraine that it lie down and die before Russia."

# NATO bows to Russia on eastern Europe

by Kathleen Klenetsky

NATO foreign ministers conferring in Brussels, Belgium on Dec. 2 delivered a sharp rebuff to eastern European attempts to obtain security guarantees against the potential for aggression from a Russia increasingly dominated by the imperial "Third Rome" ideology.

Rejecting eastern European membership in NATO for the foreseeable future, the foreign ministers meeting, which was attended by Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev and several of his Russian colleagues, instead gave its informal endorsement to the Partnership for Peace plan promoted by U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher.

Under this scheme, which was first proposed by the Clinton administration earlier this year and is expected to receive formal approval when NATO heads of state meet in January, NATO would extend a security "partnership" to a number of countries, including eastern European countries formerly under the Soviet dictatorship.

According to discussion at the NATO conference, the Partnership for Peace would allow these countries to participate in NATO military exercises and to collaborate with NATO in peacekeeping enterprises; it would also provide assistance to "partner" countries in military budgeting and other areas. But it would deny to them the all-important security protections afforded full-fledged NATO members by Article V of the alliance's charter. In other words, if Russia were to attack Poland, the Czech Republic, or Slovakia, NATO would stay out of it. Instead of getting direct military assistance from other NATO members in the event of a military attack, a "partnership" member would receive only a "pledge of consultation," as Christopher put it.

The booby prize of "consultation" will prove small consolation to the victim of aggression. "That's like having the cops hold your hand while you're getting mugged, instead of stopping the mugging," commented one Washington observer.

Rubbing salt into the wounds, Christopher gave an interview to the Dec. 3 London *Independent*, in which he stated that it was just too bad if Poland, Hungary, and other countries of East and Central Europe were dismayed by NATO's actions. "There may be a momentary disappointment if they had high expectations of imminent [NATO] expansion," he said. But these countries should realize that "membership of NATO is a very serious business. It's not a social club."

The NATO decision represents craven kowtowing to Russian hard-liners, who have publicly insisted that the West