

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

Ukraine a trigger point

In a radio interview on Dec. 8, Lyndon LaRouche commented on NATO's decision to exclude eastern European countries from joining the alliance. Excerpts follow:

A new generation is now leading the United States, which has inherited the terrible features of policy-shaping left over from the wreckage of the Bush administration, which is still all over the Clinton administration. They have a very specific, easily recognized problem, easily recognized to anyone who has studied the history, for example, of the 18th century in Europe or the early 20th century. This problem, in technical language, is called a *cabinet warfare mentality*. But they are people who have . . . never been educated in history. . . . They don't understand what cabinet warfare is. . . .

In the Ukraine case, the administration is operating . . . together with London . . . to establish Bush's policy of a new global-imperial condominium, with Russia.

This is also a delusion, one should be reminded, like the delusions of the early part of this century, before World War I, and the greater delusions which took over much of U.S. policy among the more credulous people in

the 1930s that we were not going to world war when we were; we're in that same kind of delusion now.

[Yet] before World War I, the British and leading Americans around Wilson and Roosevelt in this country, for example, knew we were going to war. . . . In the 1930s, all the leading establishment, from at least 1936 on in the United States, knew the United States was going to war against Germany. . . . *Today*, the difference is, the *highest* level of policy-shaping in London and in Washington, those in power around the Clinton administration, around Major, *don't know*. . . .

Bush made a speech in Kiev. . . and told the Ukrainians to submit to Gorbachov and not to seek independence. . . . You had two key people in the Bush administration, apart from Baker. . . . Now, who are Brent Scowcroft and Larry Eagleburger? They were formerly employees of Kissinger Associates. . . . Now, the Eagleburger/Thatcher/Scowcroft/Bush policy—is still the policy of the Clinton/Christopher State Department, in modified terms: It's different theorems, but the same axioms.

Ukraine is a trigger point for general world war. If the United States backs down on this issue of Ukraine, then they set the forces in motion for a Russian Third Rome dictatorship with very confidently aggressive foreign aims, beyond the so-called Near Abroad, for a present-day Russia.

not extend security guarantees to Moscow's former eastern European colonies.

Russian armtwisting

Russian pressure on NATO on this issue has been intense. A week before the Brussels meeting, Russian foreign intelligence head Yevgeny Primakov issued a statement warning NATO not to oppose Russia's wishes, ominously asserting that an expansion of NATO would force Moscow into "fundamental" countermeasures. In effect, western Europe and the United States have given Russia a veto over NATO affairs, and, in the process, have de facto conceded that the old Soviet sphere of influence in eastern Europe remains—no matter what talk of "peace and democracy" Boris Yeltsin and his entourage may indulge in.

Foreign Minister Kozyrev made no bones about the fact that Russia was pleased with NATO's capitulation. After meeting with Christopher in Brussels following the NATO conference, Kozyrev gloated to reporters that the Partnership for Peace is "a good idea. Partnership is the key word." And Clinton Defense Secretary Les Aspin, speaking at a conference in Washington on Dec. 3, commented (with no irony apparent) that NATO's adoption of the Christopher plan "gives Russia less heartburn. This is a proposal they find

very comforting and they have been very supportive of it."

Not surprisingly, the NATO decision elicited strong responses from those who see it as yet another indication that the West, and the United States and Britain in particular, are seeking to establish a New Yalta deal with Moscow, at the expense of smaller powers.

Polish officials were among those said to be "deeply disappointed" with the outcome of the Brussels meeting. The Polish deputy defense minister gave a press conference on Dec. 7 in which he asserted that NATO membership remains one of Poland's chief strategic goals, and asserted that Russian fears on this score were groundless.

Jan Nowak, national director of the Polish American Congress, believes that the Clinton administration's Partnership for Peace plan "may be perceived in Moscow as a 'green light' for ambitions to restore the Russian empire and to regain its sphere of influence in East Central Europe."

"What looked like prompt acceptance by the United States and its allies of Moscow's 'veto' against the NATO membership of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech and Slovak republics will have an encouraging impact on those politicians around Boris Yeltsin who are seeking recognition of Russia as the sole 'peacemaker' for the entire area of the former Soviet Union," Nowak warned.