

ABN

SPRING
1997

NO. 1; VOL. XLVIII

CORRESPONDENCE

Freedom for Nations! Freedom for Individuals!

IN THIS ISSUE:

<i>Ihor Dlaboha,</i> Once an imperialist...	1
<i>Bertil Haggman,</i> Russian Threat: Nuclear Weapons Closer to Sweden	2
President Kuchma on Ukrainian-Russian Relations	3
<i>Serhij Tolstov,</i> The NATO Enlargement: The Ukrainian Position	11

Ukrainian Canadians Protest Russian Violations of Ukraine's Sovereignty

OTTAWA: The League of Ukrainian Canadians held a rally on Saturday, 12 April, 1997 at 12:30 PM in front of the Russian Embassy (225 Charlotte Street) to demonstrate against Russian political interference against newly-independent Ukraine. Both houses of the Russian Parliament, as well as senior Russian government officials, have openly claimed sovereignty over the Ukrainian city of Sevastopol and the Crimean region of Ukraine. This is in direct violation of international norms and recognition of state borders by the world community.

"Since his election, Ukraine's President Leonid Kuchma has attempted to improve relations with Moscow based on sovereign equality", stated Micheal Sikorsky, President of the Ottawa branch of the League of Ukrainian Canadians. "Actions by Russia are counterproductive to the development of good neighborly relations. They contribute only to apprehension of renewed threats of Russian and Soviet domination, suppression and aggression."

Alarmed by Russia's actions, the international community – including the UN Security Council, NATO, the European Union and the OSCE – have openly and formally declared their support for Ukraine's Independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, including the Ukrainian status of the city of Sevastopol and Crimea. The Ukrainian Canadian community joins the world community in reaffirming its commitment to Ukraine's territorial integrity and independence in support of peace and stability in Europe.

Apologies

The editorial board of *ABN Correspondence* would like to apologise to all its faithful readers for the delay in publishing this issue of our journal. This was due to circumstances beyond our control. During the delay we hope that your interest in our journal has not waned and that you still find the articles of interest and importance.

Once an imperialist . . .

Whoever has been handling public relations for ex-communists, ex-imperialists, ex-stalinists, ex-soviets and other "exes" of the post-communist world is probably the most successful account executive in the history of the profession. Communists, those tyrannical ideologues around the world who contributed to the destruction of human life for more than seven decades, have almost entered the mainstream of civilization. Their sins have been forgotten and their promises are still being looked upon with hopeful eye\$. Indeed, ex-communists have rejected domination, learned their lesson, repented and now want to put on a dark gray business suit and become Wall Street business people.

Wrong.

The February 1 1997 edition of *The New York Times* published an article by Gennadi Zyuganov, boss of the Russian Communist Party and with a 14 percent popularity rating out of a field of five, the No. 1 contender for President Boris Yeltsin's seat. Zyuganov (as do Zhirinovskiy, Lebed and even Yeltsin) again unabashedly quotes from the Russian "*Mein Kampf*" :

" We thus called for evolutionary reform consistent with Russian historical traditions and world trends. Unfortunately, we were not listened to, and the Soviet Union collapsed."

Russian historical traditions have been imperialistic and subjugational while recent world trends demonstrated peoples' desire for decolonization.

" Our foreign policy priority would be to maintain continuity with the foreign policies of pre-revolutionary Russian and the Soviet Union. We would seek to restore our state's unique role as the pivot and fulcrum of a Eurasian continental bloc — and its consequent role as a necessary balance between East and West."

Pre-revolutionary Russian foreign policy was as imperialistic as communist Russia's was. Most of the captive nations of Soviet Russia were already in the tsarist prison of nations. As for the fulcrum of Eurasian balance, Moscow intends to control everything beyond the Ural mountains, up to the Chinese border, the sole force that is capable of stopping it flat in its tracks.

" We see the restoration of the union of the former Soviet peoples — based on voluntary association — as a historical necessity dictated by Russia's needs and those of world's security."

One possible response to an invitation or implied threat to join a club is to acquiesce and the other is to oppose membership or captivity. But Russian needs have priority and a current one is the obliteration of the Chechen nation. And if Russia's needs are not satisfied, world security will suffer.

" This (maintaining state security) rules out being drawn into supranational organizations that claim the right to interfere in others' internal affairs. Thus, we take an extremely negative view of the plans to expand NATO into Eastern Europe, up to Russia's border, and we regard the entry of NATO troops into the former Yugoslavia as the first step toward carrying out those dangerous plans."

Again, the world must revolve around Russia's needs and fears.

Bertil HAGGMAN

Russian Threat: Nuclear Weapons Closer to Sweden

Russia may, as a countermove to NATO expansion, transfer troops with tactical nuclear weapons closer to the Nordic countries and place them in Kaliningrad. That would mean around 250 miles from the Swedish Baltic Sea islands of Oeland and Gotland and somewhat more from the largest Swedish southern naval base of Karlskrona.

Danish military intelligence has in a report revealed in March 1997 that in a crisis "a great risk would exist for an early escalation with possible use of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons".

A possible countermove of NATO could be to stop confidence creating measures if the Russians move westward.

***DESTA – Destabilization, Terrorism & Disinformation
A Northern Newsletter of Threat Analysis
Volume V, No.2, 1997,***

President Leonid Kuchma on Ukrainian-Russian Relations

– Leonid Danylovich, a year ago assuming the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation Yevgeniy Primakov declared, that relations between Russia and Ukraine will be a priority for him. How do you assess these relations in the last year?

– At that time it was with special optimism that I took the words of Yevgeniy Primakov that CIS countries, and first of all Ukraine, will become the priority directions of the foreign policy of Russia. In place of Andrey Kozyrev a new minister, a pragmatist, has come, who possessed a knowledge of the essence of Russian-Ukrainian problems, and we rightfully could expect changes and both in Russian policy and in Russian diplomacy in relation to us. Much to our regret, in the past year nothing has changed. It even seems to me, that the biased attitude towards the Ukraine has aggravated. Absolutely nobody in Russia desires to understand our position, to listen to our arguments. In other words, Russia pretends that Ukraine as a sovereign and independent state does not exist.

– What, in your opinion, are the reasons for the Russian political leadership taking such a position?

– Ukrainian politicians understand that it is necessary to live in friendship with Russia. It is enough to recollect our historical roots. The model to which Ukraine has been striving and continues to strive for in our relations with Russia, is a relationship of two European nations based on equality, mutual benefit, respect, and norms of the international law. How close is this model to reality? We believe that Russia has not yet got rid of a stereotype of Ukraine as its constituent part or, at least, its sphere of dominant influence. It frequently results in disregarding realities and just civilized principles of relations between our two countries. We understand, that overcoming these stereotypes requires time, but we would expect that a more active position should be taken by the Russian political elite in this process, and by the Russian intelligentsia known for her own democratic traditions. As an example, it is possible to recall the evolution of the relations between Russia and Poland after 1918. However, it would not be desired that normalization of Ukrainian-Russian relations would require such a long and thorny road.

So far our good will for dialogue and cooperation constantly encounters preliminary conditions and ambitions which are not compatible with the "technology" of building friendly relations. Examples: the signing of the framework Treaty is conditioned by the solution of the Black Sea Fleet problem. The visits of the President and Prime Minister of the Russian Federation are also effected by this same issue. The attempts to create and duplicate a negative image of Ukraine cannot but disturb us. The search for some kind "of an external enemy" is the method well known in history which can be used to divert the attention of their own people from a number of internal problems during a certain time. But it should be kept in mind that such a policy results in foreign political problems.

There is one more rather negative aspect of cooling our political relations – the halting of development of economic ties. A significant of the mutually advantageous economic projects remains unrealized. The agreement on free trade between the two countries is not fully implemented. I would not like to enumerate further those problems, which require immediate solution and block the development of our relations. In Moscow they are well known.

In your opinion, are there any opponents to establishing friendly, civilized relations between our countries in Moscow, and in Kyiv?

– Yes, naturally.

– Who generates these ideas? Who lobbies for them in governmental structures?

– I am afraid that in today's Moscow the voices of those people, who advocate the development of equal, mutually beneficial relations between our two countries, sound too seldom and too softly. Russia obviously lacks Sakharovs. As for those, who try to play the anti-Ukrainian card, let me point out that a politician, as any person, probably has the right to nonsense, but he should use that right with greater care than other people. Since the Ukrainian phobia of some part of the Russian political elite, certainly, provokes nationalistic reactions in Ukraine. The political forces of the right among us are the opponents of normalization of the relations with Russia, though and they are moving towards the Center, understanding, that economy and not politics determines today's relationship with Russia. Even the most adamant supporters of accelerated integration of Ukraine with the West share the position concerning the necessity of smooth and friendly relations between Ukraine and Russia.

Well, for now there is a number of counter questions. Are they aware in Moscow that the existing situation does not promote the establishment of good neighborly relations between such close countries? Is Russian society aware of the reason we are drifting apart? Personally I would not want to see a future generation growing up in Russia and Ukraine, cautiously perceiving the neighboring country.

– *In Russian political circles the idea is popular, which in essence believes that the West tries “to estrange” two Slavic states – Ukraine and Russia, – strengthening from the outside the existing contradictions between them. What do you think about it?*

– Conversations about “intrigues of the West” are absolutely groundless. Ukraine has declared its aspiration to build a democratic, open society with a market economy, to be integrated in the world economy, but they speak about the same things in Russia. We do not want to see Europe, the whole world through gap sights. We have ceased dividing the world into ours and theirs and have begun to closely study the experience of democratic states in the sphere of integration with neighbors, partners. Why then time and again use the terms of cold war and to look for external enemies?

– *Leonid Danylovich, in your view, has the illness of Boris Nikolayevich stopped the process of positive development of Ukrainian-Russian relations or are there other objective reasons?*

– The political will of the President of the Russian Federation would suffice to have the treaty signed today by both sides. I know perfectly well who stopped Boris Nikolayevich “pulling him by his jacket”. Due to a presidential election campaign, political games, which force one to think more about one's own political future, instead of the future of Russia.

It is not very appropriate for me to say, but I should acknowledge that the President of Russia, Boris Yeltsin, is one of those Russian politicians who continue advocating the normalization of our relations. I understand, that under the influence of those or other groups he is compelled to manoeuvre. If there was no serious pressure on the President (and I know and understand it very well), there would be no contradictions between us, including the Black Sea Fleet. We repeatedly agreed with Boris Nikolayevich. I was compelled to make public those agreements in Kyiv, which we reached during his election campaign. There is nothing secret in this. We have precisely agreed: the main base of the Russian Fleet is in Sevastopol,

and we are doing our best for the normal existence and military preparedness of the Black Sea Fleet.

At the same time it is necessary to take into account that no matter how perfect the document determining the legal basis of the Russian-Ukrainian relations is, it will be subject to the most severe criticism in both countries. Now in his second term Boris Nikolayevich certainly could sign this political treaty.

– In other words, do you as President of Ukraine, have enough political will to sign the treaty determining the relations of Ukraine with Russia?

– Excuse me, but I am not a political gambler, I cannot play with the destiny of my country, the fates of millions of people which have elected me as President. For the sake of the positive solution of such an important problem as the normalization of relations with Russia, I am ready to take many steps though I am possibly risking my political future.

– Mr. President, why has the issue of the limitation and demarcation of the Ukrainian-Russian state borders not been decided?

– It is one of the levers of pressure on Ukraine. I hope, that soon the Russian political elite will come to understand that the absence of precisely defined borders is not a minor traffic accident... The demarcation of border lines is an important political issue, a prerequisite for the existence of any independent, sovereign state. It is important to achieve this as soon as possible, which is in the interests of Russia as well.

– In Russian business circles there are enough supporters of the prompt normalization of the interstate relations of Ukraine and Russia. To what degree can pragmatists in both countries promote the signing of this treaty?

– I want to assure you that I am not idle. I have many meetings with Russian entrepreneurs and business executives. They see the prospects for business between our countries more clearly. While the politicians quarrel, businessmen find mutual understanding. The economy will make politicians abide the laws of common sense. Already I can cite more than enough examples of our cooperation, especially in the military-industrial sphere, in space. Ukraine, USA, Norway, Russia have developed the large project "Sea Launch". It is the project of the century! We also managed to agree upon the use of the SS-18 missile (which is known as "Dnipro") for the satellite launching. But, unfortunately, a large number of joint Ukrainian-Russian projects lay gathering dust, though theoretically

they are essentially completed. Tax, customs obstacles do not make cooperation feasible, and that is the result of politics.

– *In Ukraine there is much talk about the danger of intrusion of Russian capital in the Ukrainian market. How do you personally assess the prospects of Russian investments?*

– For me there is no difference – dollar, rouble, mark. Most important is that there are investments and that we produce competitive goods. Everywhere I say: let's do it, let Russian capital come to us.

– *Does it mean that the assumption that, in time, Russian capital can become a means of political pressure on Ukraine is not constructive?*

– Such ideas could be stated by politicians and not by economists. It is not troubling for them that salaries are not paid on time, that the factories are not working.

– *What is your opinion on who bears responsibility for existing discriminating conditions for trade between our countries?*

– Ukrainian goods are blocked by the Russian side. Certainly, part of the problem is our fault, but the larger share resides with Russia.

– *If the relationship between Ukraine and NATO develops faster than the relationship between Russia and NATO, will this result in deterioration of relations between our countries?*

– We proceed from the policy that Ukraine is a neutral, non-block nation. However, in my view, it is impossible to build the new European order, and simultaneously to create new dividing lines as a result of rigid positions of the parties. In Europe, no state, large or small, has a desire to go to war. It is necessary to sit at a negotiation table and to find mutually acceptable solutions. Normalization of relations is always a bilateral process. But if the movement comes only from one side, the process, certainly, will go slower.

In the case of Ukraine's relations with NATO, there is movement towards each other, and this determines the rate of the development of future cooperation. We are proceeding with the understanding that changes should occur in NATO, too. And we see that North Atlantic Alliance is undergoing transformation. The program "Partnership for Peace", in which Ukraine takes an active part, is evidence of the good will and absence of any aggressive aspirations from the Alliance. In our view, the reason for possible frictions between Ukraine and Russia is not NATO. NATO is only a pretext. If Ukraine and Russia desire to preserve good relations, and from our

side such a desire is constantly demonstrated, nobody will be able to make us quarrel.

We shall speak frankly: in Russia there are forces which are interested in using the deepening of Ukraine's relations with NATO for aggravating tensions in the Russian-Ukrainian relationship. Yes, sometimes Russia frightens the world, and forces some countries, which earlier were in the Warsaw Pact, to seek protection under another umbrella.

– Judging by the recent statements of a number of presidents of the CIS participating nations, many of them have finally arrived at the conclusion that only bilateral relations will determine the policy of cooperation, and the Commonwealth will only remain as an advisory body.

– We are not to blame for the centrifugal processes inside the CIS. This question should be addressed to others. I do not support the idea that the Commonwealth should be dissolved. The Commonwealth of Independent States which we saw as a civilized integrational structure of the EU type, in essence, did not occur. Yes, and it is hardly probable that these plans could come true if all independent states emerging on the territory of the former USSR categorically and rather self-confidently are proclaimed a sphere of vital interests by the largest of them. The existing model of integration in the CIS which is being pushed by a significant number of Russian politicians, can be compared to a person who with all his strengths pulls a plant by the stalk, hoping it will speed up its growth and will bring fruits faster. Perhaps, the most accurate estimation of the 5 years of the CIS was made by the President of Kazakstan Nursultan Nazarbayev, who in an interview with your newspaper, stated that “Russia in the CIS is pursuing such a policy which does not attract potential allies, but rather pushes them away”.

In this context, the experience of the European Union is rather instructive. If we look at this integration space, we see that one of the basic principles of its structure is the principle of equality of all EU members, irrespective of the size of them, be it Germany or Luxembourg. Unfortunately, in the CIS another principle prevailed – the right of the strong. How else is it possible to interpret, for example, the provision of the “Strategic Course of Russia in its Relations with State-Participants of the CIS” that the main task of Russia's policy is the strengthening of her position as a “leading force” in the Commonwealth? Even if it refers to the formation of a new system of interstate political and economic

relations on the territory the post-Soviet area. These statements look as immodest, to say the least. Let's imagine for a minute an appearance of a similar document in, for instance, Germany.

To my mind, the ideology of the CIS should be transformed from "the formulation of integration" to "the formulation of cooperation" and preservation of existing political and economic ties. Even the systematic summits of the heads of states and governments have enormous positive significance. The OCSA does not accept decisions as binding to everyone. We should gather and discuss these or other common problems of our cooperation. Why, thus, should there be this possibility for the actions of others, and binding documents be signed?

– *What is the ultimate position of the President of Ukraine on the division of the Black Sea Fleet and the status of Sevastopol?*

– The position of Ukraine is well known. It is a logical consequence of our consecutive and flexible policy, and our readiness for compromise as well. It is necessary to recall that the Constitution of Ukraine reads: "On the territory of Ukraine the deployment of foreign military bases shall not be permitted". As a result of our readiness for compromise a norm has appeared in the Transitional Provisions of the Constitution that legalizes negotiations on temporary deployment of foreign military formations which has created a legal field for the solution of this problem. At the same time, I want to emphasize, that Ukraine has reached the limit on concessions. As a result of attempts by the Russian side to prolong the negotiating process to avoid adoption of a mutually acceptable decision, those who believe in the necessity to withdraw the Black Sea Fleet, from the territory of Ukraine are becoming more vocal. It will be followed by a new round of inter-parliamentary "war" of laws and resolutions. A flow of mutual accusations will flood the pages of the press. Under such circumstances the Presidents of both countries will face a much more difficult task to extinguish new splashes of confrontation: We should not neglect the morale and psychological state of hundreds of thousands of Sevastopol inhabitants, living under the threat of the possibility of a "forceful solution" of their fate proclaimed in Moscow. That is not the kind of "Sevastopol waltz" they wish to hear.

– *Leonid Danylovich, the presidential elections are not so distant. Do you intend to run for a second term?*

– My final decision will depend on how seriously we manage to change the economic situation in Ukraine. I think, any impartial person understands how difficult it is to achieve this in such a short

time. I know of no other country where, after such economic cataclysms, which have taken place in the economy of Ukraine, it was possible to radically change and correct something in five years. Let's recall economic depression in the USA, emergence of "Asian Tigers", the economic progress in Turkey, Spain, Greece, which even within the European Union had lasted for 10-15 years.

The price of progress would be less, if we were wiser. And here Russia should admit partial responsibility for the present disorder of the economy in all the CIS countries. Above all, the policy "to get rid of all dumbbells" is the opinion of those people who know life from books, and in practice are dilettantes. When the whole economy was dismembered, all economic and informations ties were broken, then, probably, they began to arrive at the conclusion that it was impossible to put everything in order, and solve all economic problems in a separate country.

– *If I have correctly understood, your choice – to run for a second term or not – will be determined by economic successes in your country?*

– It will be determined by the internal situation, as well as by the external...

Correction

The editorial board of *ABN Correspondence* recently received a letter from one of our readers in which he refers to the article by Stefan Kostyk in the 3-4/1996 edition entitled *Father "Kadylo" - Military Chaplain of the UPA* (21-29 pp.). In his letter he brings to our attention the fact that Father "Kadylo" was not the only chaplain of the UPA. He cites Volume 24 of the *Litopys UPA* where on page 360 there is a photograph of Father Mykhailo Puzhak who was also a chaplain in the ranks of the UPA. The reader in question had the honor of serving in the UPA and came into contact with Father Mykhailo at the end of 1943 and beginning of 1944 north of Lviv.

NATO Enlargement: The Ukrainian Position

The eastward enlargement of NATO, envisaged to take place in the foreseeable future, is perhaps the only foreign-policy issue to evoke such an ambiguous position on the part of the Ukrainian government.

The European discussions in 1994-96 on the enlargement of NATO brought out very clearly how unique and sensitive is Ukraine's geopolitical position in Europe during the on-going changes in the post-Cold War era.

This is not simply a matter of Ukraine's relative lagging behind the former socialist countries of Central Europe and its comparatively greater difficulties in systematic transformation, but also of the complex problems associate with the regional influence of Russia and the prejudice against Ukraine still apparent in influential political circles in the Western European states. One must also note that in 1992-93 relations between Ukraine on the one hand and the USA and European Union on the other were virtually in a state of hostility due to the delays on the part of the Ukrainian government in getting rid of its nuclear weapons and the reluctance of many Western politicians to accept the new Ukraine as an independent factor in the European political mosaic.

Ultimately, the attitude of the Ukrainian leadership towards the near-inevitable process of NATO enlargement will depend on how fully this process will take into account the interests and specific reservations of Ukraine in the course of establishing a new security system on the European continent.

The official position of Ukraine on the intention to expand NATO eastwards, announced in 1995, was distinguished by its deliberate sagacity and caution. In 1994-96 Ukraine's stance was elaborated and defined more clearly on numerous occasions, in various statements and interviews with senior government officials, until it acquired a relatively clear and detailed form.

The article of Foreign Minister Hennadij Udoenko, 'The architecture of European security', published at the end of 1994, may be regarded as perhaps the first well-substantiated explanation of the Ukrainian standpoint on NATO enlargement.

In this article Udovenko argues that the question 'where should Ukraine be today: in the East or in the West', from the strategic pan-European viewpoint, 'is of an academic nature', since 'Ukraine is situated in the center of Europe', and that the issue of NATO enlargement of the Alliance is an objective process, in as much as it exists 'as an interest of a large group of countries to achieve membership in NATO, and also the readiness of this alliance itself to review in principle the conditions of increasing its numerical composition'.

On the other hand, taking into account, too, the objective principle of the indivisibility of security, Ukraine, in the event of a simultaneous and rapid incorporation into NATO of its Central European neighbors (first and foremost the Visegrad countries – the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia), will face a completely new and 'uncomfortable', if not difficult, situation as regards the external parameters of national security. This, first and foremost, concerns relations between Ukraine and Russia, whose position vis-a-vis the future enlargement of NATO is clearly negative.

In such an event, it would be in Ukraine's interest if the North Atlantic Alliance were to adopt a policy that would avert a new division of Europe into spheres of influence, and take into account the security interests of all interested European states, including Ukraine. In Udovenko's opinion, in its evolutionary process 'NATO should establish its role as one of the fundamental, leading and stabilizing elements of the future pan-European security system. Under these conditions NATO will make a realistic contribution to the development of the future security architecture of a single and indivisible democratic Europe...'¹

Taking into account the particular geopolitical situation of Ukraine and the special historical features of the formation of its economic relations, government circles, in 1995, deliberately avoided any provocative statements and political *démarches*, which would worsen relations with Russia. This concerned the issues of the division of the Black Sea Fleet, the formalization of the status of Ukraine within the CIS, and the regulation of trade with Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan. At the same time several important steps were taken towards the development of relations with NATO, including

¹ Hennadiy Udovenko, '*Arkhitektura evropeyskoyi bezpeky*', *Holos Ukrainy*, 23 December 1994, p. 4.

the acceptance by Udovenko (albeit with much delay) of the 'Individual Partnership Programme' at NATO headquarters on 14 September 1995.

Ukrainian officials give great significance to the release, on 14 September 1995, of a joint press statement of Ukraine and NATO, announcing the 'further strengthening of NATO-Ukraine relations across a broad front, including the development of an enhanced relationship both within and outside the PfP [Partnership for Peace] Programme and NACC [North Atlantic Corporation Council] activities'.²

At the end of the talks at NATO headquarters in September 1995, the two sides stressed that further development of relations between Ukraine and NATO will contribute towards the strengthening of European security. The NATO partners also emphasized their support for the sovereignty and political independence, territorial integrity, internal stability, democratic development, and economic welfare of Ukraine, and its status as a non-nuclear state. They 'stressed, in particular, that an independent, democratic and stable Ukraine was one of the key factors of stability and security in Europe'.³ The signing of the joint statement can be seen as the first step towards the elaboration of separate special arrangement between NATO and Ukraine, which, Ukrainian diplomats believe, should delineate the nature and directions of long-term cooperation in matters of security.

Ukraine's chronic budget deficit and its defence ministry's lack of funds will certainly limit the country's capabilities for extensive participation in the Partnership for Peace programme and other forms of military cooperation of European states for a long time to come. If we take into account that the 'Study on NATO Enlargement' by Alliance experts (published on 28 September 1995) foresees a complex mechanism of invitation, which would first have to be approved by consensus by the North-Atlantic Council (the governing body of NATO) and only then communicated to the government of the prospective member-state by the NATO Secretary-General, even those Ukrainian politicians who are the most ardent supporters of NATO membership should shed any excessive illusions, and instead put their mind to practical measures to improve cooperation between Ukraine and its European partners.

² 'NATO-Ukraine Joint Press Statement', Brussels, 14 September 1995.

³ Ibid, p. 9.

Under these circumstances the warnings of President Kuchma and the foreign ministry concerning the prospect of NATO membership by the Central European states become entirely comprehensible. In particular, in an address to the Diplomatic Institute of the Chinese People's Republic in Beijing on 4 December 1995, Kuchma stated that the 'development of NATO should not lead to the rebirth of dangerous military-political opposition. Our attitude towards the foreign policy strategy of Russia is analogous. Ukraine is a neutral state, and we do not want to transform into a *cordon sanitaire* between new rival blocs'.⁴

In his conclusions concerning the developments of 1995 Udovenko also stressed the importance of Ukraine's preserving its neutrality and endorsed the opinion of the Secretary of the National Security Council, Volodymyr Horbulin, that the priority of the state lies in the development of direct cooperation with NATO, which is more important to Ukraine than participation in the Partnership for Peace programme.⁵

This last remark can more easily be explained by the chronic lack of funds in the Ministry of Defence budget. However, consideration of prevailing new trends and the prospects of Ukrainian policy in Europe affirms that one cannot really say that Ukraine's non-aligned status is equidistant from NATO and Russia, since each of the latter makes different functional demands.

The desired partnership with NATO must ensure for Ukraine the right of a voice during the discussion and resolution of problems of international cooperation, including the question of security. The aspiration to cooperate with NATO outside Partnership for Peace opens prospects of the development of a 'special partnership', specifying the conditions and forms of assistance to Ukraine on the part of NATO in the event of a crisis in Eastern Europe. In that version Ukraine's neutrality will become closer to the present status of Austria, which combines membership in European structures of economic and political integration (European Union) and security (Partnership for Peace) with the preservation of neutrality. Simultaneously, Ukraine's participation in the Partnership for Peace programme should provide a valuable practical experience and consolidate its presence in forms of cooperation which envisage the

⁴ *Interfax-Ukraina*, 6 December 1995.

⁵ *Kiev Post*, 4-10 January 1996, p. 1.

joint development and realization of the mechanisms of collective security, to which the Ukrainian government aspires.

In the first half of 1996 Ukraine's stance on foreign policy underwent significant conceptual changes and was made more precise. The new elements of the Ukrainian approach may be concisely summarized in several fundamental points.

It has been officially recognized at the highest level that the long-term strategic goal of Ukraine is integration in the European Union, on which all other foreign and internal policy measures have to be predicated. However, this process has to be gradual and balanced. During a visit to Switzerland in March 1996 President Kuchma underlined that 'as the largest of the countries of Europe not currently a member of a power-bloc, Ukraine understands that in the present conditions it could destroy the system of international security by its hypothetical joining of existing military-political groupings', although this 'does not mean that the future of Ukraine must necessarily lie outside any bloc'.⁶ The strategic orientation of Ukraine regarding European integrative communities will determine policies of the state concerning cooperation in the system of collective security. This does not rule out, under certain conditions, its possible participation in collective defence structures also.

In his address to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Western European Union in Paris on 5 June 1996 Kuchma declared that Ukraine is prepared to assume at once all the rights and obligations of associated membership in the WEU, which certain other countries of central Europe have already acquired. 'Ukraine has the right to join any military-political structure tending to transform itself into an element of European'.⁷

This statement can be explained as a direct attempt to review the non-aligned status by means of gradual inclusion in institutions of the Euro-Atlantic security system. However, the final decision on the integration of Ukraine in Europe, together with and in the same package as the Visegrad states, remains with the leaders of NATO and the European Union, as well as the governments of the USA and Western Europe. Finally, the uncertainty and lack of clarity in the attitude of West European states towards Ukraine has evoked an unusually harsh criticism on the part of official Kyiv. After his visit

⁶ *Zerkalo nedeli*, 23-29 March 1996, No. 12, pp. 1-2.

⁷ *Interfax-Ukraina*, 5 June 1996, Special edition, No. 1.

to Paris on 5 June 1996 President Kuchma expressed a direct dissatisfaction with the waiting policy of West European governments with regard to Ukraine, pointing out that the West does not want to provoke Russia by support for Ukraine, and hence reserves the option of a division into spheres of influence in the hope of further *rapprochement* with Russia.

In such a case Ukraine, lacking effective international support, could be transformed into an object of even more direct claims and aspirations on the part of Russia, claims that would now be partially legitimized by the West. The widely advertised enlargement of NATO will for the present be limited to the accession of Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary, while, at the same time, Russia focuses its attention on the problems of Ukraine, Crimea and the Black Sea Fleet – at the expense of Ukrainian interests. Benign thinking about a new pan-European system of collective security would be calmly consigned to the theoretical archive. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe would return to its Cold War function of dialogue between two contiguous military-political structures – NATO and the Tashkent Treaty on Collective Security, which would attempt, at least formally, to inherit the role of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The recognition by the West of Russia's peacekeeping role on the territory of the CIS would symbolically complete the redistribution of spheres of influence in Eurasia, endorsing to the full Ukraine's warnings that even a partial restoration of inter-bloc rivalry would result in a negative scenario of further developments.

Repeated reminders to the NATO states of the need to take into account the stability and security of Ukraine, together with a detailed explanation of what this would entail, may be seen as the only correct approach in the functional sense. Any other reaction in the form of unconditional support or rebuff cannot secure the desired acquisitions and concessions in the long-term process of negotiations.

Ukraine's disquiet about NATO enlargement includes fears that it will result in the creation on its western borders of a new East European barrier to Euro-Atlantic cooperation, transforming the East European space outside these schemes for integration into a 'grey zone' of mutual rivalry of great states, with the inevitable prospect of the re-establishment of Russian hegemony.

Thus a hasty enlargement of NATO is clearly undesirable. Firstly, because it will give formal justification to Russia's often repeated intentions to transform the states in the post-Soviet space

into a protectorate in the form of a CIS confederation. Secondly, because this will increase external pressure on Ukraine. Thirdly, because this will increase the distance between Ukraine and the countries of Central Europe and reduce the possibilities for Ukrainian participation in regional integrative processes under the aegis of the European Union.

The Ukrainian leaders also need time to complete their diplomatic bargaining with the West to determine the possibilities and forms of economic and political support for Ukraine, acceptable to the USA and NATO.

Several factors can assist the removal of the negative repercussions of the programme of the NATO enlargement:

1. Efforts directed towards the ultimate removal of the prejudices within the European Union against Ukraine and its integration in the European space will be particularly significant, as will, too, the granting of the status of a European associated member to Ukraine in the near future.

2. Development of cooperation and multifaceted mutual activity between the states of the Central-East European region including the development of sub-regional institutions and organization, such as the Central European Initiative, the Central European Free Trade Association, the Black Sea Economic Cooperation, etc.

3. Regional cooperation and further integration of the border territories of Ukraine, Poland, Hungary and Slovakia.

4. Cooperation with the Western European Union aimed at penetrating the structures of the European Union 'through the back door'.

5. Support for the military and political presence of the USA in Europe and coordination of activity in this direction with the governments of Poland and Greece, which currently show the greatest interest in preserving the American political and military presence on the continent.

Ukrainian Review, Vol. 43, No. 2.

Announcement

It is a great pleasure to announce that on Sunday, 2nd March 1997, Madam Slava Stetsko was elected a member of the Ukrainian Parliament, known as Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy, in a by-election that took place in the electoral district of Nadvirna.

The seat was vacated when Mykhailo Kostetskyj, the previous MP for Nadvirna, was chosen to be a member the Constitutional Courts of Ukraine.

The Nadvirna district has 92,468 registered voters, and from that number, 74,398, equaling 80,5 %, took part in the voting. Slava Stetsko received 64,345 votes, which represents 86,49 % of the voting. Her opponent, Vasyl Kovtsuniak, who was the candidate for the Socialist Party of Ukraine received 5,054 votes, equaling 6.8 % of the voting. The figure for the votes cast against both candidates was 3,773, and 1,126 votes were counted as invalid.

The news of Madam Slava Stetsko's election to the Ukrainian Parliament adds to her numerous responsibilities one more responsibility – as member of the Ukrainian parliament, which is sure to take up a considerable amount of time.

ABN CORRESPONDENCE

Publisher and Owner (Verleger und Inhaber):
American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik
Bloc of Nations (AF ABN), 136 Second
Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003, U.S.A.

Zweigstelle Deutschland: A. Dankiw,
Zeppelinstr. 67, 81669 München.

Editorial Staff: Board of Editors
Editor-in-Chief: Mrs Slava Stetsko, M.A.

Schriftleitung: Redaktionskollegium
Verantw. Redakteur: Frau Slava Stetzko
Zeppelinstr. 67
81669 München, Germany

Tel: 48 25 32 Fax: 48 65 19
e-mail: 100114.335@COMPUSERVE.COM

Articles signed with name or pseudonym do not necessarily reflect the Editor's opinion, but that of the author. Manuscripts sent in unrequested cannot be returned in case of non-publication unless postage is enclosed.

It is not our practice to pay for contributed materials. Reproduction permitted only with indication of source (ABN Corr.).

Annual subscription: 27 US dollars, and the equivalent in all other countries. Remittances to Deutsche Bank, Munich, Neuhauser Str. 6, account no. 3021003, Anna Dankiw.

Druck: Ukrainische Institut für
Bildungs Politik
Zeppelinstr. 67, 81669 München

ABN

SUMMER
1997

NO. 2; VOL. XLVIII

CORRESPONDENCE

Freedom for Nations! Freedom for Individuals!

IN THIS ISSUE:

Joint Statement of the
United States-Ukraine Binational Commission . . . 1

Opening Statement by Vice-President Al Gore during the
First Plenary Session of the US-Ukraine Binational
Commission in Washington DC 9

Pavel K. Baev,
Russia-Europe: Ambiguity of the "Founding Act" . . . 11

Gabriel Andreescu,
Romania: The Central European Divide 14

Sweden and Finland in NATO

In the neocommunist Sweden of 1997 NATO membership seems further away than Finnish membership. A surprising development in which Finland, during the Cold War pressured by the Soviet Union, has undergone a more radical change than Sweden. Although the present socialist foreign ministers of the two countries, Mrs. Tarja Halonen and Mrs. Lena Hjelm-Wallen, both assure that there is no need for a NATO membership in either country, the Finnish attitude is no doubt less reluctant.

The enlargement eastward is a bold and important step to secure democracy for former Warsaw Pact members. There is no doubt that the Swedish social democrats are not like the New Labour in Great Britain. The Swedish government used, for propagandistic reasons, to place NATO and the Warsaw Pact on the same level to assure a positive Russian attitude.

The indoctrination of the voters and the public seems to have been effective. But public opinion is on the right track. The view of NATO is becoming less negative. A poll taken in January 1997 shows that those opposing NATO membership for Sweden are down from 51 to 36 percent. Those unsure are up from 25 to 39 percent. Twenty five percent of those asked want Swedish NATO membership. In Finland support for NATO is somewhat stronger than in Sweden. 30 percent of the Finns want Finland to join NATO. But 51 percent are still against. But on the other hand 83 percent of Finns asked in a recent poll said they believed the government was preparing for entry into NATO.

DESTA believes it is important that Sweden and Finland work together for a NATO membership. It is imperative that membership is achieved before 2000. The best option would have been membership together with Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. It is risky to wait and remain nonaligned and join in the next wave of membership applications. Finnish and Swedish membership would probably help Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as the two Nordic countries could support the Baltic countries from within better than from the outside. Some leading Swedish foreign policy experts does not seem to understand the new situation - they are still only seeing NATO Russia opposing each other...and forget about the Baltic states and about Central and Eastern European states.

Swedish social democrats seem still to live with the old image of a military NATO not understanding the new permanent NATO presence to create stability in Europe. New members will add to that stability. As *DESTA* has pointed out earlier it is important that Sweden and Finland join to prevent the Baltic Sea area to become a gray zone between NATO and Russia.

Joint Statement of the United States-Ukraine Binational Commission

U.S. Vice President Al Gore and Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma met on May 16, 1997, in Washington to review the progress achieved by the United States-Ukraine Binational Commission in strengthening the strategic partnership between the United States and Ukraine. They note the importance of sustaining a regular dialogue at the highest political level.

The Vice-President and the President agreed that the Binational Commission helps both governments address a broad and expanding range of bilateral and multilateral issues of common interest, promote better understanding and enhanced cooperation and advance the bilateral relationship in the areas of foreign policy, security, sustainable economic development, and trade and investment. The Vice-President and the President noted that the U.S.-Ukraine partnership in based on international law, common goals, approaches and objectives, is not directed against any state or group of states, and reflects the national interests of both states. The U.S. and Ukraine undertook to improve further the organizational and institutional basis for their cooperation. They directed that work toward this goal be carried out through appropriate measures.

The vice-President and the President noted that Ukraine is at a critical juncture in its development as a democratic and market-oriented state, and that the Commission should serve as an effective mechanism for practical work relating to our strategic partnership and for frank dialogue about the challenges that both countries face. They noted the connection between Ukraine's reforms and efforts to create a prosperous and law-based society, and the pace and success of Ukraine's integration with Europe.

The sides underscored the importance of deepening cooperation to ensure the security interests of the United States and Ukraine to promote the integration of Ukraine as a central European state into European and Euro-Atlantic institutions. They affirmed that Ukraine should play a key role in ensuring peace and stability in Central and Eastern Europe and the continent as a whole.

They expressed their strong desire to finalize a document on NATO-Ukraine cooperation at the earliest possible time and expressed the hope that the President of the United States and the President of Ukraine will participate in a signing of the document in

connection with President Clinton's trip to Europe for the NATO summit in July 1997. The Vice-President confirmed the readiness of the United States to recognize and support in that document the security assurances provided to Ukraine in the Budapest Memorandum of 1994.

The two sides underscored the importance of Ukraine's robust participation in IFOR/SFOR peacekeeping operations in Bosnia, the Partnership for Peace (PfP), especially Ukraine's hosting of the full-fledged PfP exercise "Cooperative Neighbor" near L'viv in July 1997, and applauded Ukraine's enhanced cooperation with Poland, best exemplified by the recent formation of the Ukrainian-Polish battalion.

Vice-President Gore and President Kuchma expressed satisfaction with the entry into force yesterday, May 15, of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Flank Document. The Vice-President and President expressed satisfaction with recent statements issued by their respective governments on this issue. The Treaty and its further adaptation are central to the development of a secure and stable Europe and ensure that new dividing lines are not created in Europe.

Vice President Gore and President Kuchma affirmed that the temporary presence of foreign troops on the territory of Ukraine may be based only on a duly concluded agreement with Ukraine according to its constitution and in conformity with international law, and relevant multilateral documents, or otherwise be pursuant to decisions of the United Nations Security Council and be consistent with the United Nations Charter.

The two sides announced their intention to enhance Ukraine's security through support for reform of the Ukrainian military and promotion of a strong bilateral defense and military cooperation program, to include increased U.S./Ukrainian military-technical cooperation. Both sides commended Ukraine's principal action to achieve nuclear weapons-free status and pledged future cooperative threat reduction efforts. They welcomed their signing by Secretary of Defense Cohen and Minister of Defense Kuzmuk of a document to add \$47 million of assistance for strategic dismantlement projects in Ukraine. The U.S. welcomed the announcement by President Kuchma that Ukraine had decided to start eliminating its SS-24 missiles, and Vice-President Gore noted that United States funds would support that effort. Technical experts from both countries will meet in Kyiv as soon as possible to begin necessary preparations for the agreed upon projects.

The two sides noted that the scope and size of the bilateral U.S.-Ukrainian defense and military cooperation program is one of the largest in Europe and its testimony to the strength of the strategic partnership of the two countries. Among the many bilateral programs underway, the two sides highlighted not only a successful series of increasingly complex operational exercises but also export control assistance and new, mutually beneficial cooperation in civil emergency preparedness. The sides looked forward to their planned cooperation to help Ukraine establish a non-commissioned officer corps.

The United States pledged to use its influence to support full implementation of the commitments made in connection with the Trilateral Statement on January 14, 1994, including commitments for compensation to Ukraine for the value of all nuclear weapons withdrawn from the territory of Ukraine.

The United States and Ukraine agreed to promote accession by Ukraine to the Missile Technology Control Regime, and tasked experts to start immediate work toward this end.

Vice President Gore and President Kuchma reaffirmed the commitment of their government to compliance with international arms control and non-proliferation norms. President Kuchma reviewed the steps Ukraine has taken to strengthen its export control system. The sides announced that the work of the commission clears the way for the United States and Ukraine to reach an agreement for Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation and to elaborate other arrangements in this field.

The sides acknowledge ongoing cooperation in science and technology and noted progress made in Science and Technology Center in Ukraine and the U.S. Civilian Research and Development Foundation. They reaffirmed the commitments of their governments to encourage their respective scientific communities to intensify collaboration in basic and applied sciences and technology development and to assist redirection of former weapons scientists' expertise towards the civil sector of Ukraine.

In the field of space cooperation, the U.S. and Ukraine look forward to the historic launch of their first Ukrainian astronaut and scientific experiment aboard the U.S. Space Shuttle in November 1997 and to the future U.S./Ukrainian civil space cooperation in telecommunications and telemedicine, life sciences and earth sciences. They noted that commercial space launch between U.S. and Ukrainian firms has increased since the signing of a bilateral

agreement in 1996 and affirmed continued support for this mutually beneficial cooperation. Both sides noted with satisfaction the participation of both U.S. and Ukrainian commercial enterprises in the Sea Launch project.

The U.S. and Ukraine agreed on the crucial need for Ukraine to implement decisively further macro-economic reforms and economic restructuring to complete Ukraine's transition to a market economy and spur the investment needed to achieve sustainable economic growth. President Kuchma stated that Ukraine is no longer a non-market economy country. Vice President Gore noted that Ukraine is in the process of building market structures, has made significant progress in macro-economic stabilization and has liberalized most prices. They also agreed that the significant progress made over the last two years on reducing inflation has been beneficial for all businesses operating in Ukraine. President Kuchma renewed his government's commitment to seek rapid implementation of their broad reform agenda outlined to donors in September 1996, including approval of the tax reform and budget package before the Ukrainian parliament as well as other equally important measures. In the context of the broad reform agenda, the Vice President welcomed the President's firm intention to secure the measures necessary for initiating Ukraine's IMF Extended Fund Facility as quickly as possible, as well as to move forward this year on a variety of structural sectoral reforms, and the basis for mobilizing the \$3.5 billion pledged by donors last December to help Ukraine meet its balance of payments deficit. The Vice President expressed the readiness of the U.S. to support the launching of a strong IMF program, as soon as the necessary measures are taken. The sides noted that implementation of such a reform program is key to stimulating investment and growth, combating corruption and securing large-scale multilateral and bilateral support for Ukraine. The two sides underscored the necessity of utilizing the potential of the U.S. initiative "Partnership for Freedom" for implementing the second phase of the U.S. assistance program concerning support for trade, investment and economic growth of Ukraine.

The sides reaffirmed their goal of increasing bilateral trade and investment, acknowledging the significant difference between current and potential levels. President Kuchma outlined a tough anti-corruption program that he launched in April 1997 and affirmed his unequivocal commitment to root out corruption at all levels of

government. Vice President Gore affirmed U.S. support for this effort. Further, President Kuchma announced specific and organizational and other steps taken to improve the investment climate in Ukraine and to resolve problems which have emerged, during implementation of specific projects involving American firms regarding trade and investment. Concerning the resolution of outstanding business disputes involving U.S. firms, Ukraine has resolved several of these matters and has undertaken to implement the actions needed for complete resolution of all other outstanding matters as soon as possible in accordance with Ukrainian legislation, representatives of both sides will report back to Vice President Gore and President Kuchma within one month on final resolution of those matters and will make any further recommendations for action that may be required for expeditious resolution of other cases. Vice President Gore and President Kuchma agreed to cooperate on the development of measures to establish transparent and fair procedures for government procurement and granting of business licences in Ukraine. aiming to reduce state intervention and improve the business climate. Specifically, in accordance with the agreed-upon support joint action plan on investment climate issues, the U.S. is prepared to support Ukraine's efforts to:

1. develop and implement key laws and rules concerning ethics and conflicts of interest;
2. establish streamlined and improved procurement and licensing procedures; and
3. facilitate enforcing of court rulings and provide both a forum for facilitating the development of investment projects and a forum for addressing investor disputes.

The two sides agreed to take steps to improve access to each other's markets. The Vice President reaffirmed that Administration would continue to work with Congress to secure renewal of the Generalized System of Preferences program which expires May 31, 1997, and to take the next step toward extending Most Favored nation treatment to Ukraine on a permanent and unconditional basis.

Both sides agreed to deepen cooperation, with broad interagency participation on the Ukrainian side, to accelerate negotiations on completing Ukraine's accession to the World Trade Organization on commercial terms generally applied to newly acceding members, as soon as possible.

Vice President Gore and Kuchma noted the first U.S.-Ukraine civil aviation agreement initiated on Friday, May 16, making another milestone in a deepening bilateral relationship.

Vice President Gore and President Kuchma reviewed Ukraine's efforts to accelerate privatization and to implement structural reforms, in particular in the areas of energy and agriculture. In each sector, they noted that Ukraine has made progress in creating basic market structures such as a program for mass privatization, agricultural commodity markets and a wholesale electricity market. However, the Vice President and President expressed concern that progress has slowed in recent months and affirmed that urgent measures should be taken in these areas to restore competition and strengthen the role of the private sector.

Vice President Gore and President Kuchma agree to work together to enhance Ukraine's energy security by increasing efficiency, strengthening the competitive power market and its independent regulator, strengthening the financial viability of the nuclear power sector to encourage investment, improving nuclear safety, increasing oil and gas production, reforming the gas transit and distribution systems, and upon completion of an Agreement of Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation, in the field of nuclear fuel fabrication. They affirmed their intent to cooperate with G-7 countries in implementing the Memorandum of Understanding on the Closure of Chernobyl. They urged quick action to implement the Shelter Implementation Plan to ensure that the remains of the damaged Chernobyl are put into a safer and more environmentally stable condition. This can facilitate Ukraine's eventual removal of the remaining nuclear fuel and radioactive materials to a permanent disposal site.

The U.S. will work with its G-7 colleagues to announce that the Denver Summit the amount of G-7 contributions to the Shelter Implementation Plan and call for a pledging conference in the fall under the honorary chairmanship of Vice-President Gore and President Kuchma. The Vice President and President invite donors, both public and private, to join the United States and Ukraine in providing resources to the Shelter Implementation Plan projects.

President Kuchma outlined plans to improve the financial position of the power sector through improved collections and tariffs and to begin privatizing the power sector to mobilize foreign investments and technology for modernization. As a critical step to reducing barriers to investment in the oil and gas industries, the Vice President and the President signed a joint initiative to reform

the gas market, and agreed to engage in a dialogue between industry and the two governments to offer solutions to barriers to oil and gas investment. President Kuchma stressed his government's commitment to the passage of legislation on production sharing agreements, which is necessary to attract foreign investment aiming at developing Ukraine's oil and gas resources. The Vice President and President discussed among experts on the economic development of Ukraine's pipelines. They also discussed the construction of a new oil terminal to diversify sources of crude oil imports to Ukraine and to serve the transit system for oil from the surrounding regions to European countries on a cost-effective basis. They further stressed the key role of energy efficiency in achieving energy security, economic competitiveness and a cleaner environment.

Vice President Gore and President Kuchma affirmed that agriculture must serve as an engine of growth for Ukraine and agreed to focus bilateral assistance and trade programs on land privatization and on promoting the private sector's role in input distribution, agricultural services, production, storage, marketing processing and financing. The government of Ukraine announced its decision to move ahead with:

- privatization of most of Ukraine's grain elevators as soon as possible;
- privatization of state organizations for distribution of agricultural inputs and machinery;
- demonopolization privatization of state-owned companies in agriculture; and
- guarantee by government decree the sanctity of private grain contracts and the free movement of grain in domestic and export markets.

Vice President Gore and President Kuchma affirmed that agriculture is a key sector for the economic transformation of Ukraine. In order to strengthen a partnership between Ukraine and the U.S. in that field, they have agreed to discuss in the future, after the reform process has moved forward, establishment of a bilateral working group on cooperation in agriculture. They also agreed to focus bilateral assistance programs on creating Ukrainian instruments to implement market-oriented agricultural policies. They reviewed earlier programs to provide modern agricultural equipment to Ukraine, noting that U.S. equipment to Ukraine, noting that U.S. equipment markedly improved productivity but that such programs were less effective if challenged through the state sector.

Vice President Gore and President Kuchma agreed that every effort must be made to increase the share of future equipment sales from the United States and other countries channeled through the private sector on the basis of internationally accepted commercial practices to assure transparency and the commercial soundness of business transactions.

Vice President Gore and President Kuchma reaffirmed their commitment to safeguarding the cultural heritage of all national religions and ethnic groups of both the United States and Ukraine. They noted the positive and productive efforts of the newly formed Joint Cultural Heritage Commission to protect and preserve cultural sites important to the people of both countries. Vice President Gore noted with pleasure Ukraine's legislation prohibiting construction on or privatization of the site of old cemeteries in Ukraine. They also reviewed recent problems with the delivery of humanitarian, technical and grant assistance and the problems of taxation of such assistance provided in the framework of U.S. government programs. The Ukrainian side stated that there is no legislative barrier to the delivery of this assistance and stressed that these problems will be resolved in accordance with Ukrainian law.

Vice President Gore and President Kuchma underscored the political importance of reinforcing the U.S.-Ukraine strategic partnership both in the political and economic spheres. The sides expressed satisfaction at the work accomplished to date by the four committees and directed the Binational Commission to intensify work on the agenda outlined during their meeting by directing the committees to aim to meet at least twice a year. They reflected on the progress Ukraine has made toward establishing a democratic market-oriented state and underscored that this was a crucial time to redouble cooperative efforts to assure Ukraine's integration with Europe and the rest of international community and to bring prosperity to the Ukrainian people.

Washington, May 16, 1997

The National Tribune, No. 22, Vol. XVI.

Opening Statement by Vice-President Al Gore during the First Plenary Session of the U.S.-Ukraine Binational Commission in Washington D.C on May 16 1997

Welcome, and thank you very much. Mr. President, Ministers, Ambassadors. Ladies and Gentlemen! It is a privilege to welcome you here today, and to formally convene the first session of the U.S.-Ukraine Binational Commission. This is indeed a historic moment for our nations and for our people, for today we begin a brand new turning point in our relationship.

We have much to celebrate. From Donetsk to Lviv, Ukraine citizens have chosen to look towards a future nurtured by free minds and free markets. They have said yes to reform and democracy. And they have said no to tyranny. No to rule by fiat. No to corruption. No to the stranglehold of planned economies and planned lives. But we also have much hard work ahead of us to lock-in these gains. Though the bulk of this work must be accomplished by citizens of Ukraine themselves, we continue to be ready to help where possible, but there are many things we cannot do for you. In the end economic development, trade and investment can only proceed in Ukraine if the objective conditions for such progress exist and if investors, Ukrainian and foreign, conclude that they have reasonable conditions in which to operate.

We know reform is not easy. And we applaud your achievements to date, and recognize that many decisions on reform required vision and courage. It is the same vision and courage Ukraine showed in its historic decision to eliminate its nuclear arsenal, to accede to the NPT, to make possible full implementation of START 1, and to approve the CFE Flank agreement. The world is grateful for Ukraine's leadership.

We also have good reason to take pride in what has been accomplished in establishing independent Ukraine's proper place on the European and world scene. From UNPROFOR to IFOR, to the Partner for Peace, Ukraine has shown readiness to actively contribute to building a new Europe, and the United States is committed to working with you to keep your further integration into Europe's structures and institutions on a dynamic track.

So let us begin. There is much to do as we build and nurture our strategic partnership based on shared ideals, mutual respect, and a commitment to work in good faith towards the resolution of issues even at times when our interests may naturally diverge. And as we proceed, let us remain flexible to meet changing needs and situations, and let us speak frankly to each other as mature partners and friends do. I am optimistic about the future, Mr. President. But I am also realistic about the challenges ahead. A more prosperous – and democratic – future will only take hold with the active commitment of all those who truly believe in freedom and the right of all people to have a voice in their political and economic destinies. President Clinton and I – and each of us here today, – are not neutral bystanders. We know which forces we want to prevail, and they are the forces of reform.

This is what brings us here today to convene this important session. The stakes are high. Failure is not an option. Our day will be busy as our future will be bright. Thank you very much.

The National Tribune, No. 22, Vol. XVI.

United States Vice President Al Gore describes Ukrainian-American Intergovernmental Commission's Meeting as 'A Historic Mission'

As Dinau's Washington correspondent reported on May 16, the United States Vice President Al Gore has described the meeting of the Ukrainian-American intergovernmental commission took place in Washington on May 16 as part of Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma's program of visit to the United States.

In his opening speech at the meeting, Mr. Gore welcomed the political and economic reforms being implemented in Ukraine. he said that the two sides need to work together to make the changes irreversible. He added that implementation of the necessary measures will be enhanced by the creation of a favorable investment climate in Ukraine.

Mr. Gore particularly mentioned the removal of nuclear weapons from Ukraine's territory and Ukraine's important role in maintaining peace and stability in Europe. He stressed the need for the United States to do everything possible to enhance Ukraine's integration into European institutions.

In response, Mr Kuchma called for the creation of a legal basis for Ukrainian-American cooperation. According to him, the two countries must decide what they intend to gain from their strategic partnership. Considering that the Commission's activities also focused on relations between Ukraine and NATO, the Ukrainian leader emphasized that the text of the future NATO-Ukrainian agreement needs to be drafted. He also emphasized that the proposed agreement between NATO and Russia must not result in the creation of new spheres of influence in Europe. Mr. Kuchma said that the two countries must reach agreement to the effect that "without Ukraine's consent, no nation has the right to deploy its forces and military equipment on Ukraine's territory."

Mr. Kuchma called for fulfillment of all obligations on the trilateral declarations of the presidents of Ukraine, Russia and the United States regarding the removal of tactical nuclear weapons from Ukrainian territory.

Participants in the Commission's plenary meeting discussed foreign policy aspects of partnerships between the two countries, the current investment climate in Ukraine, the Chornobyl issue, the Ukrainian energy sector, and conversion in the Ukrainian defense industry. A joint statement was signed at the end of the meeting.

The National Tribune, No. 22, Vol. XVI.

Russia-Europe: Ambiguity of the "Founding Act"

The drama of Russia's struggle against NATO's eastward expansion was formally resolved not in the Madrid Conference, but in Paris on May 27. There, Yeltsin and the heads of the 16 Atlantic Alliance member-states signed the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation, and Security. The document promised to elevate the partnership between NATO and Russia to a new level and specified areas - including peacekeeping, nuclear and conventional arms control, and counter-terrorism - where this partnership will be realized.

It also established a Permanent Joint Council between NATO and Russia that will handle all the practicalities of partnership. The doubts about future relations in the "16 versus 1" format nevertheless persist. Russia has received relatively little in return for abandoning most of its previous demands. The Founding Act is not a legally binding document and did not give Russia anything like a veto on Madrid's deliberations.

Russia received no guarantees, only reassurances, that NATO has "no intention, no plan, and no reason" to deploy nuclear weapons or to station "substantial combat forces" permanently on the territories of new members. Russia repeated its categorical objections to the inclusion in NATO of any of the former Soviet states, such as the Baltics. The Alliance, however, refused to exclude such an option. Many influential experts and politicians in Russia warned against rushing the deal with NATO, arguing that a better agreement could be negotiated after the Madrid summit. Foreign minister Yegevny Primakov showed little enthusiasm for the final compromise.

It was Yeltsin who insisted on striking the deal, seeking to make a big show in Paris. Yet there is no guarantee that Yeltsin will make an effort to implement the Founding Act. It provides an opportunity to forge cooperation, but Russia does not seem very interested in it, while the Alliance itself is likely to be too busy with its new members. Moscow's experience with the Partnership for Peace agreement - signed in May 1995 after long debate and producing meager results - is illuminating.

The Russian military is skeptical about working together with NATO, despite NATO's good record in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Meanwhile Russian politicians love to blame the alliance for every problem in European security. But no amount of political rhetoric and diplomatic activity can compensate for Moscow's lack of basic foreign policy resources. That is why Russia's relations with European security organizations remain so ambivalent. On the one hand, Moscow is trying to exploit its residual international profile and attract attention to its needs.

On the other, policy-makers in the Kremlin are afraid that the increasing involvement of international organizations in conflict management in Russia's "near abroad" might reduce and marginalize its role in its own backyard. In 1994, Russia proposed giving the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) a role in the disputed enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh in Armenia as part of a plan to strengthen the OSCE at the expense of efforts to expand NATO. But at the OSCE Budapest summit that year, Yeltsin discovered that though the proposal to strengthen the OSCE lacked support, Russia still had to allow the OSCE into Nagorno-Karabakh. Moscow had expected to keep its central role in handling this conflict, consolidating its success in negotiating a May 1994 cease-fire. Instead it hoped that financial constraints and bureaucratic muddle would halt the first all-European peacekeeping operation.

Indeed, that proved to be the case, particularly since the OSCE in late 1995 had to divert its attention to Bosnia-Herzegovina. The deadlock in Nagorno-Karabakh allows Moscow to keep some 9,000 troops in Armenia as a major lever in the region. Only two weeks after the Budapest meeting, Russia went into Chechnya with disastrous results. The European Union blocked the ratification of its framework agreement with Russia.

The Council of Europe put Russia's membership application on ice and NATO went ahead with developing its enlargement plans. By summer 1995 however, the West had apparently decided that Yeltsin's re-election was more important than human rights violations and abuses of military force in a far-away rebellious province. Russia was admitted to the Council of Europe in early 1996, and payments of cash aid started to arrive, which implied that the International Monetary Fund was financing the war. The only organization that was able to penetrate the conflict zone was the OSCE, but its mission in the Chechen capital of Grozny was unable to influence the course and character of hostilities. The main conclusion that Moscow drew was the irrelevance and ineptitude of European organizations.

This disillusionment with "security architecture" has brought a noticeable change in Russia's European policies. Moscow's

occasional statements about strengthening the OSCE owe more to tradition than sincerity. The Council of Europe is seen as merely a public forum for settling scores between factions in the Russian parliament.

As for NATO, in the heat of the enlargement debate in Moscow, such different personalities as ultra-nationalist Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, ex-Army leader and presidential challenger Alexander Lebed and reformist Grigory Yavlinsky all pointed out that the controversy had diverted attention from Russia's real security problems in the Caucasus, where Russia is directly involved in several violent conflicts, and in Chechnya, where its territorial integrity is threatened.

Moscow is not seriously concerned about NATO expansion into the Caucasus. Secretary General Javier Solana's visit to Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia in February generated some protests from the Kremlin, but that was more a reflection of the hysteria about NATO in the capital.

Moscow thinks that international organizations cannot introduce any security structure for the Caucasus or even provide a framework for conflict resolution. Instead it sees them as vehicles for penetration of the region by players such as the United States, France or Turkey. Thus Russian foreign policy efforts are really concentrated on bi-lateral relations with the United States, Germany, France, and all the way through the list to Ukraine and Belarus.

It assumes that meaningful deals are only possible with a real partner, in a bilateral dialogue, where Russia can feel itself to be at least an equal. Russia's corner in such a game should be secured by its military preponderance. The only power that could challenge Russia militarily in the Caucasus is Turkey; hence the degree of political effort focused on pushing it out of the arena. Dominance - still the paramount goal - must be secured by a more sophisticated policy which involves, for instance, playing the international oil consortium against Azerbaijan, or Iran against the United States.

In fact, it is reassuring for Russia that the U.S. National Guard exercises in Georgia, scheduled for this autumn, are about repairing hospitals and building orphanages, which Tbilisi finds a bit disappointing.

For Russia, the good thing about NATO enlargement is that it will keep the Alliance busy and away from where the real problems are.

Pavel K. Baev is senior researcher at the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO), and the editor of Security Dialogue.

Romania: The Central European Divide

The exclusion of Romania from the first wave of new admissions to NATO could bring destabilizing effects both within the country and the immediate region. Significant recent strides in both domestic politics and foreign relations could be undermined, opening the way for political backlash as well as renewed tensions among Romania's neighbors. From 1989 the government of then-president Ion Iliescu expressed openness towards the West, joining the Council of Europe in 1990 and signing an association agreement with the European Community in 1993. In 1994, Romania became the first country to join NATO's Partnership for Peace program, taking part in training exercises with NATO troops and serving in peacekeeping forces in the former Yugoslavia and Albania. Proponents of NATO expansion say integration with Western institutions must be accompanied by a commitment to their shared values and principles.

As Germany's President Roman Herzog stated in March 1996: "It is essential that new member states be consolidated democracies that have left behind the nationalist heritage and have rediscovered the principles of an open society, free economy and humanist culture." Yet up to 1996, Romania's commitment to democratization and openness to Europe was more formal than real. As members of the ruling coalition in the mid-1990s, extremist nationalist parties forged by old elites seeking new political legitimacy, pursued policies contrary to the kind of values the government had formally pledged to uphold as members of the Council of Europe. Human and minority rights standards were degraded, even after new laws had been passed. Groups representing Romania's Hungarian minority were denigrated as "extremist and separatist," and the Roma (Gypsies) seeking to exercise their rights were accused of trying to spoil the country's international reputation.

This nationalism, particularly over the issue of a 1961 treaty with the Soviet Union that set the border between Romania and Ukraine, also damaged relations with Moscow and Kiev. After the elections of November 1996 a new government, led by president Emil Constantinescu, restated Romania's desire for integration with

the West. But unlike previous governments, it seriously seeks to implement such a policy. Defining a western orientation as an absolute priority of Romanian foreign policy, it stresses that this objective must "never be designed as a apology for internal failure, as a method for beautifying the image of those holding power." The program emphasizes the need for new relationships with the major regional states. On June 2, Constantinescu and Kuchma signed a treaty confirming the frontier between the two countries, but stressing that "the protection of the identity and interests of the Romanian minority in Ukraine should have prominence over territorial disputes."

At the same time a new Poland-Romania-Ukraine accord seeks to bring stability to the border with the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), there are new efforts to build mutual trust with Russia and there is new communication with Moldova and a cooperation treaty with Italy.

Following last autumn's reconciliation accord with Hungary, politicians now speak of a strategic partnership. The Hungarian and Romanian foreign and defense ministers have met several times, establishing an Intergovernmental Commission to review border and other issues. New Hungarian consulates have been opened. And in May, Hungarian President Arpad Goncz visited Romania and met with Constantinescu.

At home, signalling the first concrete steps towards integrating the Hungarian minority, the Democratic Alliance of Hungarians in Romania joined the government. Local administrative and educational laws have been amended to protect the rights and ethnic identity of the Hungarian minority. Central to this drive for a more cooperative and democratic style of politics has been the desire to join NATO. Government officials argue that Romania, with its coalition government - including a broad array of reform-minded and minority parties and its openness to dialogue with unions, civic, non-governmental organizations and others - can serve as a regional pillar of stability for the Alliance.

The Romanian government also stresses its ability to play an important strategic role in a tense region, to provide important energy and other resources, key alternative transportation links, and even an untapped market for arms and other material. The decision by Washington to exclude Romania from NATO, at least for the time being, is a significant political disappointment to Bucharest's energetic western strategy, placing some of these positive recent steps at risk. In the first place, as an analysis by the Foreign

Ministry asserted before the decision was made, failure to admit Romania will "break the coherence of the Central European space," in the first place by placing a new division between Budapest and Bucharest.

Hungary's accession without its eastern neighbor will hand the Romanian nationalist parties an unexpected tool with which to exploit lingering tensions between the two.

This new divide between member and non-member could cause relations among the Romania-Poland-Ukraine triangle to deteriorate. With alliances straining and in the absence of NATO, ultimately, a security grey zone so close to Russia could come to be regarded as an open invitation to fill the vacuum. On the international stage, Romania's exclusion could make its participation in future multinational actions less likely, placing at risk Bucharest's cooperation in such initiatives as the economic sanctions against Iraq (which cost Romania around \$3 billion), the embargo against Serbia and Montenegro, or peace-keeping missions, as in Africa and Albania. Domestically, exclusion may result in substantial public frustration. Public opinion polls have constantly shown Romanians' strongly favoring integration into NATO and the European Union, by margins of 80 percent and higher. These results do not mean that Romanians know much about European institutions or about what integration would mean to domestic, political, and economic life.

But the population's sensitivity to the symbolic act of Romania's non-admission could have a great impact on public opinion. Romania is arguably passing through the most important moment in its post-1989 history. For the first time, it has a real chance to make a democratic break. If the economy fails and democracy does not stabilize, the country could slide into a terrible internal imbalance.

Admission to NATO would have represented extraordinary support for the country's political and economic stability. A vital opportunity has been lost.

Gabriel Andreescu is president of the Center for Human Rights in Bucharest.

Mushroom Cloud Over Denmark

Swedish born Professor Carl-Axel Gemzell at Copenhagen University in Denmark has spent considerable time in the archives of the former East German army. It has for some time been well known that the Soviets regarded Denmark as one of the primary targets in Europe. In that way it would be possible to control the exit and entry into the Baltic Sea. Professor Gemzell's new material shows the ruthless planning of Moscow.

During "Exercise Waffenbruderschaft" in 1980 the Warsaw Pact forces had control over 840 nuclear weapons. Of those 320 were "used" already in the first wave attack. In the first salvo 60 missiles were fired with 200 kiloton nuclear warheads, many at targets in the Copenhagen capital city area. Every missile had the destructive power of ten Hiroshima bombs.

During an exercise in 1983 the Warsaw Pact concluded that Germany could be "united" in three days. After a fortnight Denmark and the Benelux countries would be under Soviet control. In 30-35 days the Warsaw Pact forces would halt at the Bay of Biscay and in southern France.

Denmark was in the planning targeted with 25,000 soldiers from the Soviet Union, East Germany and Poland. The Exercise Wal-77 demonstrated the technique to be used against Denmark. Both landings via sea and air were to come as a total surprise. Southern Norway was also included as target. Sweden was not to be occupied in this stage. Conquest of Denmark would send a Soviet message to Stockholm: remain neutral or else...

The Soviet Navy admired Nazi Admirals like Erich Raeder and Karl Doenitz. Admiral Raeder was taken to Moscow after the capitulation of Nazi Germany in 1945 and questioned in detail on the planning of the Nazi invasions of Denmark and Norway in 1940.

Danish leading officers are shocked to hear about the new material from former GDR. Lt. General K.G.H. Hillingsoe says: "Had they attacked with nuclear weapons we would have had no chance. Already in the 1960s we started lowering our readiness, but had we known of the Soviet plans we would have fought for more money to the the defense budget."

The Gemzell revelations indicate what was known in the West. That the Warsaw Pact did not regard nuclear weapons as deterrent. They were to be used along with conventional weapons at an early stage, in the first wave to knock out Western resolve to fight back. The strategy of the Warsaw Pact was offensive. At the same time Moscow assured public opinion in the West that the Soviet Union would never be first to strike with nuclear weapons. A quick Blitzkrieg to reach the Atlantic was in reality the plan. Occupation currency and medals were ready and stored in East Germany.

Conclusion to be drawn are that it is only natural that countries like Hungary, Czechia and Poland are seeking NATO protection.

Apologies

The editorial board of *ABN Correspondence* would like to apologise to all its faithful readers for the delay in publishing this issue of our journal. This was due to circumstances beyond our control.

During the delay we hope that your interest in our journal has not waned and that you still find the articles of interest and importance.

ABN CORRESPONDENCE

Publisher and Owner (Verleger und Inhaber):
American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik
Bloc of Nations (AF ABN), 136 Second
Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003, U.S.A.

Zweigstelle Deutschland: A. Dankiw,
Zeppelinstr. 67, 81669 München.

Editorial Staff: Board of Editors
Editor-in-Chief: Mrs Slava Stetsko, M.A.

Schriftleitung: Redaktionskollegium
Verantw. Redakteur: Frau Slava Stetzko
Zeppelinstr. 67
81669 München, Germany

Tel: 48 25 32 Fax: 48 65 19
e-mail: 100114.335@COMPUSERVE.COM

Articles signed with name or pseudonym do not necessarily reflect the Editor's opinion, but that of the author. Manuscripts sent in unrequested cannot be returned in case of non-publication unless postage is enclosed.

It is not our practice to pay for contributed materials. Reproduction permitted only with indication of source (ABN Corr.).

Annual subscription: 27 US dollars, and the equivalent in all other countries. Remittances to Deutsche Bank, Munich, Neuhauser Str. 6, account no. 3021003, Anna Dankiw.

Druck: Ukrainische Institut für
Bildungs Politik
Zeppelinstr. 67, 81669 München

ABN

AUTUMN
1997

NO. 3; VOL. XLVIII

CORRESPONDENCE

Freedom for Nations! Freedom for Individuals!

IN THIS ISSUE:

Charter on a distinctive partnership between NATO and Ukraine	1
Kazakhstan: despite progress, continued reform needed	8
<i>Dr. Tze-Chi Chao,</i> Freedom and Democracy, shared ideals East and West	11
Foreign Minister Hennadij Udovenko elected President of the 52nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly	14
ABN on the Internet	16

Bertil HAGGMAN

KGB Infiltrates Swedish Industry

Anders Ericsson, head of Sweden's Counter Espionage Service (SAEPO) in March warned that KGB-agents have managed to infiltrate Swedish businesses. Also the Russian mafia operating in Sweden is infiltrated according to Ericsson. A large number of "former" KGB-agents are active as businessmen in Sweden. One of the, Andrei Pannikov, was in 1988 deported from Sweden suspected of industrial espionage. Now he is back in Sweden and is on the board of a Swedish company.

In the 1980s Pannikov operated from the Soviet Trade Delegation in Stockholm and police claimed he had collected information on Swedish economy and businesses. The main focus of his attention was the oil business. After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 Pannikov established himself as Russia's first independent oil dealer. Now he has interests all over the world. One of his companies is active at the oilfields of Chanty-Manchisk in western Siberia.

Pannikov is living in the Mediterranean region and is on the board of the Swedish company Navitank involved in the freight of oil from harbors in the Baltic countries and on the Black Sea. The offices of Navitank is in Stockholm. The Swedish company is owned by Navitank Ltd on the British Virgin Islands. The number of employees is around 18.

At present there are around 500 registered companies in Sweden which have connections to Eastern Europe.

D E S T A

*Destabilization, Terrorism & Disinformation
A Northern Newsletter of Threat Analysis
Volume V, No.3, 1997.*

Charter on a distinctive partnership between NATO and Ukraine

July 10, 1997

I. Building an Enhanced NATO-Ukraine Relationship

1. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and its member States and Ukraine, hereinafter referred to as NATO and Ukraine,

- **building on a political commitment at the highest level**
- **recognizing the fundamental changes in the security environment in Europe which have inseparably linked the security of every state to that of all the others**
- **determined to strengthen mutual trust and cooperation in order to enhance security and stability, and to cooperate in building a stable, peaceful and undivided Europe;**
- **stressing the profound transformation undertaken by NATO since the end of the Cold War and its continued adaptation to meet the changing circumstances of Euro-Atlantic security, including its support, on a case-by-case basis, of new missions of peacekeeping operations carried out under the authority of the United Nations Security Council or the responsibility of the OSCE**
- **welcoming the progress achieved by Ukraine and looking forward to further steps to develop its democratic institutions, to implement radical economic reforms, and to deepen the process of integration with the full range of European and Euro-Atlantic structures**
- **noting NATO's positive role in maintaining peace and stability in Europe and in promoting greater confidence and transparency in the Euro-Atlantic area, and its openness for cooperation with the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe, an inseparable part of which is Ukraine**
- **convinced that an independent, democratic and stable Ukraine is one of the key factors for ensuring stability in Central and Eastern Europe, and the continent as a whole**
- **mindful of the importance of a strong and enduring relationship between NATO and Ukraine and recognizing the solid progress made, across a broad range of activities, to develop an enhanced and strengthened relationship between NATO and Ukraine on the foundations created by the Joint Press Statement of 14 September 1995**

- determined to further expand and intensify their cooperation in the framework of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, including the enhanced Partnership for Peace programme

- welcoming their practical cooperation within IFOR/SFOR and other peacekeeping operations on the territory of the former Yugoslavia

- sharing the view that the opening of the Alliance to new members, in accordance with Article 10 of the Washington Treaty, is directed at enhancing the stability of Europe, and the security of all countries in Europe without recreating dividing lines are committed, on the basis of this Charter, to further broaden and strengthen their cooperation and to develop a distinctive and effective partnership, which will promote further stability and common democratic values in Central and Eastern Europe.

II. Principles for the Development of NATO-Ukraine Relations

2. NATO and Ukraine will base their relationship on the principles, obligations and commitments under international law and international instruments, including the United Nations Charter, the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent OSCE documents.

Accordingly, NATO and Ukraine reaffirm their commitment to:

- the recognition that security of all states in the OSCE area is indivisible, that no state should pursue its security at the expense of that of another state, and that no state can regard any part of the OSCE region as its sphere of influence

- refrain from the threat or use of force against any state in any manner inconsistent with the United Nations Charter or Helsinki Final Act principles guiding participating States

- the inherent right of all states to choose and to implement freely their own security arrangements, and to be free to choose or change their security arrangements, including treaties of alliance, as they evolve

- respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all other states, for the inviolability of frontiers, and the development of good-neighbourly relations

- the rule of law, the fostering of democracy, political pluralism and a market economy

- human rights and the rights of persons belonging to national minorities

- the prevention of conflicts and settlement of disputes by peaceful means in accordance with UN and OSCE principles.

3. Ukraine reaffirms its determination to carry forward its defence reforms, to strengthen democratic and civilian control of the armed forces, and to increase their interoperability with the forces of NATO and Partner countries. NATO reaffirms its support for Ukraine's efforts in these areas.

4. Ukraine welcomes NATO's continuing and active adaptation to meet the changing circumstances of Euro-Atlantic security, and its role, in cooperation with other international organizations such as the OSCE, the European Union, the Council of Europe and the Western European Union in promoting Euro-Atlantic security and fostering a general climate of trust and confidence in Europe.

III. Areas for Consultation and/or Cooperation between NATO and Ukraine

5. Reaffirming the common goal of implementation of a broad range of issues for consultation and cooperation, NATO and Ukraine commit themselves to develop and strengthen their consultation and/or cooperation in the areas described below.

In this regard, NATO and Ukraine reaffirm their commitment to the full development of the EAPC and the enhanced PfP.

This includes Ukrainian participation in operations, including peacekeeping operations, on a case-by-case basis, under the authority of the UN Security Council, or the responsibility of the OSCE, and, if CJTF are used in such cases, Ukrainian participation in them at an early stage on a case-by-case basis, subject to decisions by the North Atlantic Council on specific operations.

6. Consultations between NATO and Ukraine will cover issues of common concern, such as:

- political and security related subjects, in particular the development of Euro-Atlantic security and stability, including the security of Ukraine

- conflict prevention, crisis management, peace support, conflict resolution and humanitarian operations, taking into account the roles of the United Nations and the OSCE in this field

- the political and defence aspects of nuclear, biological and chemical non-proliferation
- disarmament and arms control issues, including those related to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE Treaty), the Open Skies Treaty and confidence and security building measures in the 1994 Vienna Document
- arms exports and related technology transfers
- combatting drug-trafficking and terrorism.

7. Areas for consultation and cooperation, in particular through joint seminars, joint working groups, and other cooperative programmes, will cover a broad range of topics, such as:

- civil emergency planning, and disaster preparedness
- civil-military relations, democratic control of the armed forces, and Ukrainian defence reform
- defence planning, budgeting, policy, strategy and national security concepts
- defence conversion
- NATO-Ukraine military cooperation and interoperability
- economic aspects of security
- science and technology issues
- environmental security issues, including nuclear safety
- aerospace research and development, through AGARD
- civil-military coordination of air traffic management and control.

8. In addition, NATO and Ukraine will explore to the broadest possible degree the following areas for cooperation:

- armaments cooperation (beyond the existing CNAD dialogue)
- military training, including PfP exercises on Ukrainian territory and NATO support for the Polish-Ukrainian peacekeeping battalion
- promotion of defence cooperation between Ukraine and its neighbours.

9. Other areas for consultation and cooperation may be added, by mutual agreement, on the basis of experience gained.

10. Given the importance of information activities to improve reciprocal knowledge and understanding, NATO has established an Information and Documentation Centre in Kyiv. The Ukrainian side will provide its full support to the operation of the Centre in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between NATO and the Government of Ukraine signed at Kyiv on 7 May 1997.

IV. Practical Arrangements for Consultation and Cooperation between NATO and Ukraine

11. Consultation and cooperation as set out in this Charter will be implemented through:

- NATO-Ukraine meetings at the level of the North Atlantic Council at intervals to be mutually agreed

- NATO-Ukraine meetings with appropriate NATO Committees as mutually agreed

- reciprocal high level visits

- mechanisms for military cooperation, including periodic meetings with NATO Chiefs of Defence and activities within the framework of the enhanced Partnership for Peace programme

- a military liaison mission of Ukraine will be established as part of a Ukrainian mission to NATO in Brussels. NATO retains the right reciprocally to establish a NATO military liaison mission in Kyiv. Meetings will normally take place at NATO Headquarters in Brussels. Under exceptional circumstances, they may be convened elsewhere, including in Ukraine, as mutually agreed. Meetings, as a rule, will take place on the basis of an agreed calendar.

12. NATO and Ukraine consider their relationship as an evolving, dynamic process. To ensure that they are developing their relationship and implementing the provisions of this Charter to the fullest extent possible, the North Atlantic Council will periodically meet with Ukraine as the NATO-Ukraine Commission, as a rule not less than twice a year. The NATO-Ukraine Commission will not duplicate the functions of other mechanisms described in this Charter, but instead would meet to assess broadly the implementation of the relationship, survey planning for the future, and suggest ways to improve or further develop cooperation between NATO and Ukraine.

13. NATO and Ukraine will encourage expanded dialogue and cooperation between the North Atlantic Assembly and the Verkhovna Rada.

V. Cooperation for a More Secure Europe

14. NATO Allies will continue to support Ukrainian sovereignty and independence, territorial integrity, democratic development, economic prosperity and its status as a non-nuclear weapon state, and the principle of inviolability of frontiers, as key factors of stability and security in Central and Eastern Europe and in the continent as a whole.

15. NATO and Ukraine will develop a crisis consultative mechanism to consult together whenever Ukraine perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence, or security.

16. NATO welcomes and supports the fact that Ukraine received security assurances from all five nuclear-weapon states parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear weapon state party to the NPT, and recalls the commitments undertaken by the United States and the United Kingdom, together with Russia, and by France unilaterally, which took the historic decision in Budapest in 1994 to provide Ukraine with security assurances as a non-nuclear weapon state party to the NPT.

Ukraine's landmark decision to renounce nuclear weapons and to accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear weapon state greatly contributed to the strengthening of security and stability in Europe and has earned Ukraine special stature in the world community.

NATO welcomes Ukraine's decision to support the indefinite extension of the NPT and its contribution to the withdrawal and dismantlement of nuclear weapons which were based on its territory.

Ukraine's strengthened cooperation with NATO will enhance and deepen the political dialogue between Ukraine and the members of the Alliance on a broad range of security matters, including on nuclear issues.

This will contribute to the improvement of the overall security environment in Europe.

17. NATO and Ukraine note the entry into force of the CFE Flank Document on 15 May 1997. NATO and Ukraine will continue to cooperate on issues of mutual interest such as CFE adaptation.

NATO and Ukraine intend to improve the operation of the CFE treaty in a changing environment and, through that, the security of each state party, irrespective of whether it belongs to a political-military alliance.

They share the view that the presence of foreign troops on the territory of a participating state must be in conformity with international law, the freely expressed consent of the host state or a relevant decision of the United Nations Security Council.

18. Ukraine welcomes the statement by NATO members that "enlarging the Alliance will not require a change in NATO's current nuclear posture and, therefore, NATO countries have no intention, no plan and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members nor any need to change any aspect of NATO's nuclear posture or nuclear policy - and do not foresee any future need to do so."

19. NATO member States and Ukraine will continue fully to implement all agreements on disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control and confidence-building measures they are part of.

The present Charter takes effect upon its signature.

The following text is an excerpt of the declaration issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Madrid on 8th July 1997

We attach great importance to tomorrow's signing of the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine. The NATO-Ukraine Charter will move NATO-Ukraine cooperation onto a more substantive level, offer new potential for strengthening our relationship, and enhance security in the region more widely. We are convinced that Ukraine's independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty are a key factor for ensuring stability in Europe. We continue to support the reform process in Ukraine as it develops as a democratic nation with a market economy. We want to build on steps taken to date in developing a strong and enduring relationship between NATO and Ukraine. We welcome the practical cooperation achieved with the Alliance through Ukraine's participation within IFOR and SFOR, as well as the recent opening of the NATO Information Office in Kyiv, as important contributions in this regard. We look forward to the early and active implementation of the Charter.

KAZAKHSTAN: DESPITE PROGRESS, CONTINUED REFORM NEEDED

ALMATY, (July 25 1997) IPS – The former Soviet republic of Kazakhstan has come a long way in five years since it started comprehensive reforms after the collapse of communism, but more needs to be done in the political, economic, social, and cultural spheres, say western diplomats.

Under the new Kazakhstan constitution, adopted in 1995 after a referendum marred by irregularities, parliament's powers are limited as power is concentrated in the presidency. The judiciary remains under the control of the president and the executive branch, and corruption is "deeply rooted," according to the foreign diplomats.

Presidential elections, originally scheduled last year did not take place, after the 1995 referendum extended the term of President Nursultan Nazarbayev to the year 2000. Nevertheless, say U.N. and European Union officials Nazarbayev is "not a dictator, more an authoritarian" and they believe Kazakhstan is one of the most politically stable countries in the post-Soviet region.

The Central Asian republic, with a population of close to 17 million, has managed to avoid ethnic conflicts despite the diversity of its people, 52% of whom are ethnic Kazakhs, 34% Russians, 5% Ukrainians, some 300,000 Germans, and others from more than 100 nationalities. This alone deserves commendation, says Klaus-Juergen Hedrich, parliamentary state secretary (deputy minister) in the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). He led a German delegation here this week for five days of talks on development cooperation aimed at "helping the Kazakh people to help themselves."

Since 1993, Germany has allocated some \$55 million for financial and technical cooperation with Kazakhstan. The focus is on assisting small and medium enterprises, civic administration, integrated agricultural projects, vocational training and health projects. Despite its persistent human rights deficit, Kazakhstan has recognized the importance of the civil society, Hedrich said in an interview with IPS.

Presently about 3,000 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are registered in the Ministry of Justice, according to Kazakh official figures. But there are mechanisms for non-

governmental organizations (NGOs) to participate in decision-making through their deputies in representative agencies as well as measures of "street democracy" - meetings, demonstrations, processions and strikes.

Within this legal framework, Kazakhstan - which is roughly the size of Western Europe - has witnessed demonstrations by people laying claim to their pensions and demanding the payment of salary arrears. Workers in Kazakhstan were owed some \$75 million up until April, according to official figures. This compared favorably to the situation in Russia where wage arrears last month totaled \$.36 In the Ukraine, the April figure for salary arrears amounted to \$.37 billion. The payment of outstanding wages needs the urgent attention of the Kazakh government, western officials say.

A U.N.-sponsored study in the capital, Almaty, says that the transition from communist to market economy structures since the Central Asian state became independent in December 1991, has hit the unemployed, youth, women, and the disabled. Between 10-12% of the workforce was unemployed at the end of 1996 and 41% of those without a job were in the 16-29 age bracket, says the "Kazakhstan Human Development Report 1997." The U.N. report points out that the share of people "unable to afford the minimum consumption basket" last year in Kazakhstan was 30.9%. This figure included some 30 percent of the urban and nearly 40% of the rural people.

According to official figures, the number of reported crimes was 184,000 in 1996. Independent estimates, however, place the number of unreported crimes up to one-third higher. The average life expectancy in the Central Asian republic declined from 68.2 years in 1991 to 64.9 years in 1995.

At the same time, natural population growth dropped from 13 per 1,000 people in 1991 to 5.2 in 1996. This, says Herbert Behrstock, resident representative of the U.N. Development Program, was a clear sign that "human development and social indicators" are continuing to decline. "The fall is steep and the near-term projection is very distressing," he adds. "Fortunately, these facts are of serious concern to national leaders, (Kazakh) government officials and the affected population."

Behrstock, co-author of the Kazakh Human Development Report, said the feasibility of proposals made by the study must be explored and priorities established. In fact most of the suggested action does not call for "the simplistic infusion of more money," although the benefits of growth are likely to come to the people only

after several years. "Even then, the challenge will be to achieve equity, to eradicate this 'new poverty' and to return to the high standards of living to which this nation aspires," Behstock says.

The report takes a close look at the economic transformation under way here and notes that the basis of an open economy is in place and the privatization of state property practically completed, along with the decentralization of economic authority. The report adds, however, that the results achieved in economic reform are "not all positive." Accomplishments vary in different sectors of industries, and are considerably out of balance with social indicators. "Significant improvement of human development indicators is possible only if the social sphere is reformed in parallel with the economy, taking into account inherent delay in achieving the first positive results," the U.N. report says. While the U.N. system with its development activities is assisting in achieving that objective, the European Union, under its Technical Assistance to the Commonwealth of Independent States (TACIS) program, is contributing its share in different areas.

According to the TACIS regional coordinator for Central Asia, Robert Kremer, who is based in Almaty, TACIS made available to Kazakhstan some 71.3 million ECU (about \$71 million) for its national programs between 1991 and 1995. These include public administration reform, social services, and education.

Kremer says Kazakhstan is having to overhaul its public administration and social service structures. To complement these changes, education had a vital role in ensuring the availability of personnel who could take the responsibilities and opportunities created by the new system. Kazakhstan has a valuable asset in its skilled work force and it would be short-sighted to attempt to save on education and vocational training, Hedrich says. A skilled work force is part of an optimum environment required to attract foreign investors interested in Kazakhstan's rich natural resources, mainly petroleum and minerals, he notes.

However Nazarbayev's bid for some \$80 billion foreign investments by the year 2000 - mainly in the oil and gas industry - and its hopes of becoming one of the 21st century's world oil leaders, appear likely to remain a distant goal.

Investments in the oil and gas sector amount to a sparse \$3 billion, one-third of which was invested last year, according to the official figures.

Freedom and Democracy Shared Ideals East and West

The following text is a statement delivered by Dr. Tze-Chi Chao on "Freedom and Democracy – Shared Ideals East and West" on the 5th September 1997 during "Conference Forum 2000" in Prague.

This international gathering, which is taking place in the heart of Europe at the onset of a new millennium, holds profound significance for the advancement of human well-being and world peace, as together we will discuss the important moral, ideological and spiritual issues facing mankind as we prepare to enter the 21st century.

The World League for Freedom and Democracy is an international civic organization established for the purpose of:

- 1) Advancing the concepts of freedom and democracy and promoting these ideals throughout the world;
- 2) Upholding and respecting the human rights and fundamental liberties of all people;
- 3) Promoting international cooperation and development as well as educational, cultural and religious exchanges in order to advance social progress and raise standards of living; and,
- 4) Uniting the forces of freedom and democracy to put an end to dictatorship and totalitarianism.

Clearly, these goals are closely related to our discussions at this Forum.

Since its founding more than 40 years ago, the WLFD has steadfastly relied on the correctness of these ideals in expanding its activities around the globe. Moreover, the WLFD is now a charter member of the non-governmental organizations community of the United Nations (UN/NGO/DPI). It has six regional groupings: Asian Pacific, Middle East, Africa, Europe, North America, its member nations including the United States, England, France, Germany, Russia, Japan and the Czech Republic. With chapters in more than 140 countries around the world, the WLFD has achieved universal recognition and affirmation in the international community. I deeply hope that participants at this Forum will lend their guidance to help us to further advance the ideals of freedom and democracy.

As we prepare to pass into a new millennium, we must also look back upon the human tragedies and suffering which occurred over the course of the 20th century as the results of two world wars and the long period of the cold war. Within the past 50 years, however, the international situation has witnessed a gradual shift to greater regional cooperation, the termination of bipolar ideological conflict and a steady increase in living standards. Such developments are truly a cause for joy, and we intend to continue our common struggle in pursuit of further gains.

We understand very well that the essence of both Eastern and Western cultures embraces the ideals of freedom, democracy, human rights, equality and fraternal love as central themes. The traditional Chinese moral concepts of Confucianism, with its emphasis on the path of benevolence and universal love, thus present a universal model for mankind in establishing a peaceful and harmonious society. Politically, this means a responsible government on the basis of the people's will. In the Book of History, it is written: "Heaven observes what the people see; Heaven listens to what people say." This aptly explains the Way of Heaven, or benevolent rule within a harmonious society has no concrete definition. Rather, it is founded upon the spirit of respect for the popular will. And in the Four Books, a formula for good governance has been succinctly stated: "*What is good for the people is good; what is bad for the people is bad.*" Thus, the Eastern political ideal of "social stability and fair government" is also a common political aspiration of Western societies. This is sufficient proof that East and West can join together in a joint contribution to human well-being.

The great thinker and revolutionary Dr. Sun Yat-sen drew upon both traditional Chinese culture and aspects of Western culture to formulate his well-known "Three principles of the People," in which he put forth three fundamental conditions for achieving world peace. First, there must be equality for all peoples of the world, minorities must be protected and the spirit of brotherhood must be enhanced. Second, all citizens must be treated equally under the law. Power must rest under the people and their rights and interests must be safeguarded within a fully democratic system. Third, there must be economic equality within a free-market system, people and nations must work together for mutual benefit. Excessive concentration of wealth must be avoided and people must have security in their material lives. Dr. Sun recognized that all human disputes originate from inequality and ignorance, and that the world will not know peace until these factors are eliminated.

Dr. Sun also introduced a theory on the fundamental nature of peace and morality. He emphasized that: *"Only with morality can the nation survive, only with morality can there be peace."* This not only corresponds with the traditional Eastern culture, it can also provide inspiration and serve as a contribution to the advancement of peace throughout the world.

Thousands of years ago, Eastern culture had already developed deep respect for values of morality, peace and human well-being, as reflected in the lofty ideal of "Universal Brotherhood." The ancient Book of Rites contains the following passage:

When the Great Principle prevails, the world is a commonwealth in which rulers are selected according to their wisdom and ability. Mutual confidence is promoted and good neighborliness is cultivated. Hence, men do not regard as parents only their own parents, nor do they treat as children only their own children. Provision is secured for the aged till death, employment for the able-bodied, and the means of growing up for the young. Helpless widows and widowers, orphans and the lonely, as well as the sick and the disabled, are all well cared for. They do not like to see wealth lying idle, yet they do not keep it for their own gratification. They despise indolence, yet they do not use their energies for their own benefit. In this way, selfish scheming is repressed, and robbers, thieves and other lawless men no longer exist, and there is no need for people to shut their doors. This is called the Great Harmony.

This offers a comprehensive summation of the essence of human aspirations and it is entirely consistent with the modern day spirit of the Global Village.

Of all human necessities, none are more important than the need for spiritual enrichment, material comfort and freedom from fear. As we face the advent of a new century, it is our firm hope that the enlightened people of the world can join together in pursuit of the ultimate ideals of Eastern morality, a world which is the domain of all in a spirit of universal brotherhood. Let East and West seek harmony through the continuous advancement of science and technology, the upholding of human freedom and political democracy, and the consolidation of forces to create a better, more prosperous future for all mankind.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have come all the way from Taiwan, a place where, after 40 years of hard work, is well on the way to economic prosperity and political democracy. It is another proof that these values work regardless of time or space, East or West. President Lee Teng-Hui, the person who has been credited for most of

his efforts in our country's achievements, believes that there is no difference in essence in this regard, be it East or West. The only difference is the degree of achievement. Before I conclude my remarks, I wish to extend to you my most sincere invitation to you all to come to Taiwan as my honored guests so that you will be able to see for yourselves what we have done and what are the true characteristics of Eastern culture. It will undoubtedly help to enhance the mutual understanding and future cooperation between East and West.

Foreign Minister Hennadij Udovenko Elected President of the 52nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly

Ukraine's Minister Hennadij Udovenko has been elected President of the 52nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly which opened on Tuesday, September 16.

According to DINAU's Kyiv correspondent, political analysts regard Mr. Udovenko's election as a recognition of Ukraine's successes on the international arena ranking it with such unique post-era events as the signing of the Ukrainian-NATO special Partnership Charter and the first Ukrainian European Union Summit. According to information provided by the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry, Mr. Udovenko met with United Nations Secretary-General Koffi Annan on the eve of the opening of the session. Mr. Annan expressed satisfaction with the Eastern European regional group's decision to nominate Udovenko for the post. According to him, Ukraine has gained high international recognition through its important contributions to achievement of the goals and the principles of the United Nations Statutes.

Mr. Udovenko also held various consultations and meetings in New York on the eve of the 52nd session. Among others, he met with United States Ambassador to the United Nations, the European Union's *Trojka*, representatives of Russia, Tanzania, and Columbia. The meetings focused on the approaches of various countries to various items on the session's agenda. Particular attention was paid to the main item on the agenda, namely, reformation of the United Nations Organization. Mr. Udovenko pledged to do everything within his power to advance the reforms which are aimed at making the United Nations more effective.

Mr. Udoenko also met with the World Bank's United Nations representatives to discuss the World Bank's cooperation with Ukraine and the United Nations.

The Ukrainian Foreign Minister also attended a special church service dedicated to the 52nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Personal Data

Born on June 22, 1931, in Ukraine, Mr. Hennadij Udoenko obtained a degree in the History of International Relations, from the University of Kyiv, in 1954. He also undertook postgraduate studies in economics. He has authored numerous publications on international affairs.

Hennadij Udoenko entered the Ukrainian diplomatic service in 1959 and held a number of positions with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, including head of the division of Personnel and head of the division of International Economic Organizations. He was also a member of the Board of the Ministry. As a representative of his country Hennadij Udoenko has participated in many sessions of the General Assembly and in international conferences, including the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the Conference of the Law of the Sea. From 1981 to 1985 he was Ukraine's representative on the Governing Body of the International Labour Organization (ILO).

In 1985 he represented Ukraine in the Security Council and in July of that year he served as President of the Council.

He was also elected to other important and prestigious positions in the United Nations. In 1987 he was elected Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee of the 42nd session of the United Nations General Assembly. He was elected Vice-President of the Economic and Social Council in 1990-91. He served till 1992 in a representative capacity to the UN. In September 1992 he was appointed to Ambassador of Ukraine to Poland. In September 1994 Udoenko was appointed by President L. Kuchma as Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine. On September 16 1997 Udoenko was elected by acclamation President of the 52nd session of the United Nations General Assembly.

The National Tribune, Vol. XVI, No. 38.

ABN on the Internet

ABNPress is a new information agency providing the latest analysis and commentary about political, economic and social change in Ukraine today.

To subscribe:

1. Send an email message to: majordomo@list.abnnet.com
2. Include the following text in the body of your message:
subscribe ABNPress <your email address>
ex.: subscribe ABNPress ivan@ukraine.com
3. Send your message!

Many thanks, and we hope you find our information useful.
ABNPress Director <http://www.ABNnet.com>

The Fifth Columnists

With less than 280 days left to Ukraine's Parliamentary elections, the nature of this state has come under journalistic scrutiny. Knowing full well that the Ministry of Information (or as journalists call it "*the Ministry of Censorship*") is well funded and more than willing to invoke retribution for an "*non-sanctioned*" article, some journalists have nonetheless decided to test Ukrainian democracy – or more accurately, to test the resolve of the Fifth Columnists.

"The first and foremost obstacle facing Ukraine's future development is the absence of a national idea," said Ihor Behey, "*For a Free Ukraine*" columnist. [*"For a Free Ukraine*" was one of the first non-state newspapers to appear on the journalistic scene in Ukraine at the end of the 1980s.] *"Ukraine has no sense of identity. Ukraine needs to develop its own Manifest Destiny, like the United States did during the 19th century. The pro-Russian interests, the so-called Fifth Columnists have since 1994, have managed to denationalize Ukraine."*

Five out of six years of Ukrainian Independence, Mr. Leonid Kuchma has held real state power in his hands – first as Prime Minister under President Kravchuk, and now as President. During this time, Mr. Kuchma has iterated patriotic slogans promising to be an All-Ukrainian President – a President willing serve the entire

Ukrainian electorate from Lviv to Luhansk, including those that voted against him. In reality, Mr. Kuchma spoke patriotically for patriots yet acted on behalf of, and in the interest of Russian "internationalists." During Mr. Kuchma's tenure, Ukrainian national rebirth was promptly halted. *"The status of the Ukrainian language, its development and use, hasn't changed in real terms since 1989,"* said Maria Bazeluk, Editor-in-Chief of *"Shlyakh Peremohy."* The problem is not that Mr. Kuchma's staff are not Ukrainian speakers, but rather that, they are indifferent to Ukrainian interests, including those of a Ukrainian Nation-state. For this reason, out of all post-soviet states, Ukraine now assumes second from last place in economic development, just ahead of war ridden Tadjikistan. Recall that Ukraine was fingered by Western agencies to have the most potential for economic growth and prosperity following the Great Collapse.

With the help of the Communist Party, Russia controlled Ukraine during the soviet era. Today, with the help of the so-called "new" Ukrainians, Russia continues to dominate and influence events in Ukraine. Under the Kuchma Administration, the same "new" Ukrainians have assumed key governmental positions and pursue openly anti-Ukrainian policies.

Some examples of key Fifth Columnists include:

1. Mr. Anatoliy Kinakh: Former Vice-Premiere of Ukraine; Currently he heads the Ukrainian Association of Entrepreneurs and Businessmen; Consultant to the President regarding Economic affairs; The best way for Mr. Kinakh to learn Ukrainian is to become President, just as his patron did three years ago.

2. Mr. Yuriy Rybchynskij: Bi-lingual poet-lyricist and an active Russian propagandist; Consultant to the President on Cultural Affairs; With his assistance, Ukrainian state-owned radio and television promotes Russian pop music at the expense of Ukrainian rock-n-roll. Even in Canada for example, mandates that radio programs air a certain percentage of their time to Canadian artists.

3. Mr. Yevhen Kushnarov: President Kuchma's Chief of Staff; former mayor of Kharkiv; did nothing to develop Ukrainian culture in Kharkiv; instead of developing Ukrainian culture, he established an international festival of Russian songs; allowed the placement of a statue in honor of General Zhukov. Zhukov was the leading Soviet General during W.W.II who also signed a decree along with Lavrenti Beria deporting Ukrainians to Siberian slave-labour camps.

4. Mr. Serhij Tyhypko: Former President of "Privatbank", currently Vice-Premiere of Ukraine; As President of "Privatbank", he invested Ukrainian money to produce films promoting Krym as Russian territory, to support Russian scientists, Russian language newspapers, in particular "Kievskiye Vedomosti" and "Komanda". Ironically, he assumed a Ministerial post in Ukraine, and not in Russia.

The "new" Ukrainians have had the most success in controlling Ukrainian mass media – the fourth branch of government. Control over the fourth branch provides the "new" Ukrainians the opportunity to further Russify Ukraine and facilitates what many have called "The Quiet Belarussization."

ABNPress, Kyiv, June 21 1997.
<http://www.ABNnet.com>

ABN CORRESPONDENCE

Publisher and Owner (Verleger und Inhaber):
American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik
Bloc of Nations (AF ABN), 136 Second
Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003, U.S.A.

Zweigstelle Deutschland: A. Dankiw,
Zeppelinstr. 67, 81669 München.

Editorial Staff: Board of Editors
Editor-in-Chief: Mrs Slava Stetsko, M.A.

Schriftleitung: Redaktionskollegium
Verantw. Redakteur: Frau Slava Stetzko
Zeppelinstr. 67
81669 München, Germany

Tel: 48 25 32 Fax: 48 65 19
e-mail: 100114.335@COMPUSERVE.COM

Articles signed with name or pseudonym do not necessarily reflect the Editor's opinion, but that of the author. Manuscripts sent in unrequested cannot be returned in case of non-publication unless postage is enclosed.

It is not our practice to pay for contributed materials. Reproduction permitted only with indication of source (ABN Corr.).

Annual subscription: 27 US dollars, and the equivalent in all other countries. Remittances to Deutsche Bank, Munich, Neuhauser Str. 6, account no. 3021003, Anna Dankiw.

Druck: Ukrainische Institut für
Bildungs Politik
Zeppelinstr. 67, 81669 München

ABN

WINTER
1997

NO. 4; VOL. XLVIII

CORRESPONDENCE

Freedom for Nations! Freedom for Individuals!

IN THIS ISSUE:

Scientific Research Center of teh Soviet Era in Estonia	1
<i>Tiit Noormets,</i> The Estonian Summer War in 1941	2
<i>Bertil Haggman,</i> Reduced Swedish Military Preparedness – Can NATO Help?	6
North Korean Crisis and Paece on the Korean Peninsular	7
Resolution of teh 8th WLFD Conference	11
Report on the WLFD Kachaninland Chapter	12
Islamic Republic of Chechnya	16

Remembering the Death of a Great Leader

38 years ago Stepan Bandera was Assassinated on Moscow's Orders.

"The lively activity of the OUN amongst the emigrants after World War II and the name of Stepan Bandera, who became the symbol of the fight for freedom, eventually came to be regarded by Moscow as a danger and a threat. In addition to the ruthless extermination of the Ukrainian people, Moscow, for fifteen years, endeavored to exterminate the spokesman and champion of the Ukrainian independence aspirations, Stepan Bandera, since his name had become the symbol of freedom in every region of the Russian "people's prison" from the San to the Sakhalin and Kamchatka amongst all classes of the population, in the Red Army and amongst the millions of prisoners in the Russian concentration camps. At the instructions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the KGB (Committee for State Security) tried by every possible means to discredit and destroy the moral greatness of Stepan Bandera, state enemy no.1, amongst the population, by every means available. The NKVD, later the MVD, that is to say the KGB, for years endeavored to liquidate Stepan Bandera, who lived in Munich under the name of Popel, physically, until finally on October 15, 1959, it succeeded in doing so."

Danylo Chajkovskyj

Stepan Bandera dreamed all his life of an independent Ukraine. He instructed Yaroslav Stetsko at the incipience of World War II to proclaim an Independent Ukraine which became realized on June 30, 1941 against the wish of German invaders, therefore Bandera and Stetsko were arrested by the Nazis and spent four years in German concentration camps. Hunted all his life by Moscow's emissaries, Stepan Bandera, a legendary undaunted freedom fighter, was killed on direct orders from Shelepin (Head of the KGB) on October 15, 1959. The killer (Bohdan Stashinskyj) confessed, and the German High Court sentenced him to 8 years of prison, since he was only an obedient instrument of a larger conspiracy. The Karlsruhe Court revealed also the real killer: the KGB.

The National Tribune, Vol. XVI, No. 40.

Scientific Research Center of the Soviet Era in Estonia

Until now the recent history from 1944-1991 i.e. the period of Soviet power has not been well studied in Estonia or the other Baltic States. In fact this field of study should become one of priority for our historical research in the near future. Our objectives should be a survey of the organization of Soviet society as well as the development and developing of "homo soveticus." Naturally, it would be of the utmost necessity for Estonian society but would evoke an even larger interest in the countries that have been in the similar situation as well as in the West. The frail East European democratic and political state systems are quite defenceless towards the possibilities of the reoccurrences of already experienced extreme totalitarian misdevelopments in the 20th century. The example of Estonia could be considered very proper against a larger background because before the Soviet occupation our society was European in its mentality and structure. For us the studies of the Soviet period have a future value – liberation from the Soviet terror calls for a precise diagnosis of the previous situation.

The analysis of the Soviet time on a scientifically acceptable level is extremely voluminous. First the documents should be published, then the scientific monographs on different themes should be written. Only after covering the main themes with monograph studies the general depiction could be created. Only after the re-establishment of the state, the studies of the Soviet era have been disco-ordinated and largely superficial. Considering the importance of the theme and interest towards it far beyond the borders of Estonia, the necessity of the institution activating, deepening and coordinating the studies of the Soviet era should be obvious.

As the basis for fundamental research of the Soviet era documents are preserved in archives and the research is only beginning, it is natural that the initiators of the creation of the S-Center are the archivists. In October 1997 the Open Estonia Foundation was presented an application to finance the project "Operation of the Soviet power institutions in Estonia." The aim of the project is to archive historically the records of the Soviet power institutional archives. It is planned to set representative selection and to prepare and publish a five volume series of documents with wide commentaries and an analytical introduction. For that purpose a

special work group from the workers of the main archives of Estonia has been organized.

The S-Center seminary with the participation of all related research took place on the 14 December 1997. The objective of the seminary was to lay down the present situation in the research of the Soviet era and to estimate further necessities.

There is also a KGB conference planned with the inclusion of Estonian and foreign research. Estonian, Lithuanian and Latvian archives have already organized a joint seminary of KGB documentation and the practical and scientific use of it, also the future development of the cooperation needs more solid institutional bases.

The S-Center is not trying to monopolize the research of the Soviet era but to offer help and knowledge to the scientists engaged in this field.

Address: Maneezi 4
 Tallinn
 Estonia
 EE0100

* * *

Tiit NOORMETS

The Estonian Summer War in 1941

General theoretical background of the project

Estonia's recent history has not been thoroughly researched and the favorable conditions that have been created due to the disappearance of censorship and non-scientific pressure after the Soviet Union stopped existing and Estonia gained its independence again, have mostly been used to study the Soviet repressive politics and its consequences. The problems connected to the Estonian resistance movement from the year 1940 when Estonia was occupied and annexed until the year 1941 when German occupation started and especially its most important part – the armed resistance movement in the summer of 1941 or the Summer War have drawn considerably smaller scientific attention and have not been researched yet.

The data collected during the German occupation was interpreted as Estonian help to the victorious German Reich to destroy Bolshevism ("Eesti rahva kannatuste aasta" I-II, Tallinn 1943). During the Soviet period historical research was carried out as part of the ideological-political pressure and the national resistance movement was a touchy subject. The topic was only treated in some publications that were mostly meant for foreign propaganda and were the non-scientific use of single facts and documents of optional choice which enabled to show the resistance movement as foreign espionage and to consider it "nationalistic banditism", which was brought along by the class struggle which collaborated with the German fascist occupational regime and which was considered a war crime in the Soviet Union. While dealing with the events of World War II or the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union in Estonia, the resistance movement and the actions of the Soviet repressive system and Red Army against it only received very little attention.

The detailed treatments of the resistance movement have been published by the Estonian emigrants in the West (first and foremost the collection "Eesti riik ja rahvas Teises Maailmasõjas" IV-VI, Stockholm 1957-1958), but those works are mainly based on memories and therefore the scientific analysis is weak (or there is no scientific analysis at all) and the drawbacks due to subjectivity of any memories can be traced there. At the same time a new conception was expressed there – the so-called "forest brotherhood" movement was considered to be a resistance movement with a view to re-establishing the independence of the Estonian Republic. After making classified documents in Estonian archives available for researchers at the end of 1980s only articles in periodicals and some shallow surveys in popular publications were published about the resistance movement of 1941. The only exception is the local-historical work of Prof. H. Lindmäe about one country ("1941. aasta sõjasuvi Tartumaal", Tartu 1992). It can be mentioned in conclusion that up to now the research of the subject has given more questions than answers.

Main purposes of the project

The purpose of the project is the scientific research of source materials from the resistance movement of 1941 or the so-called Summer War. The most important source materials are the surveys

of the history of an organization called Omakaitse/Self-Defence in countries which were drawn up in 1942-1943 and which are situated in the Estonian State Archives now and contain a lot of factual material and figures about the resistance to Soviet aggression, the foundation, scope and practice of the "forest brotherhood" movement. In addition to the above sources, data about the resistance movement can be found in the Estonian State Archives in 21 funds that date back to the period of the German occupation. The analysis enables scientific treatment of the sequence of events of the resistance movement and looks for answers to political, legal, military and other questions concerning the subject and to find the aims, opportunities, means and results of the resistance.

The primary goal of the project is to find the most important texts, to make a representative choice of them in order to prepare and publish a collection of documents. At the same time the aim also is to arrange the source material according to thematic and systematic order, foremost analyzing various figures and writing articles about the results. The research also needs to study Soviet documents in the Estonian State Archives (The Archives of the Communist Party), also working in the Baltic Archives in Sweden and in the Finnish Military Archives.

Carrying out the above project helps to fill in a gap that is to be regretted especially because throughout history Estonians have had only three wars of their own which were held in their own interests – the conquest against German invaders in the 13th century, the War of Liberation in 1918-1920 and the Summer War in 1941 – and all of them need equal attention. At the same time, research concerning the Summer War gives an opportunity to study the chances and means of resistance to a totalitarian regime. The need to study the history of resistance is also stronger because of the fact that in the 1st few years the most recent history of Estonia has unilaterally been concentrated on Soviet repressive policy and the picture of a nation as a passive victim of history is stronger than a picture of a nation creating its own fate.

According to the working hypothesis the Summer War in 1941 was a spontaneous movement of self defence in Estonian society which quickly changed into an organized resistance movement. Its goal was to re-establish the independence of the Estonian Republic. A detailed study of the events of the Summer War and their analysis enables clarification of the aims, chances and means of resistance to a totalitarian system.

Methodology

According to the primary goal of the project which is the publication of a set of documents, the methodology is mainly based on the principles of archeography. Scientific research is needed for drawing up an extended introduction and commentary. The analysis of the abundant numerical data requires statistical analysis. As far as the armed resistance movement was foremost a military process, the analysis of the documents will be based on the methodology of military sciences and military history, primarily the theory of guerrilla warfare. In the introduction, the events in Estonia will be compared to similar processes in Latvia, Lithuania and West Ukraine (which were in the same political and military situation) on the basis of the works of historians of those countries.

Publishing and using the results of the project

The results of the work will be published as a set of documents, the main part of the which consists of extracts of the surveys of Omakaitse (Self-Defence). It will be a collection of detailed data which lacks analytical dimension, therefore a more thorough introduction than that of a traditional publication of source material will be added to the set of documents. The set will include a register of personal names and place names and photo documents from the Estonian Film Archives as illustrations. As a rule a guerrilla war consists of a great number of single events which are not closely connected to each other and which are carried out without central planning and leading, so the material needs to be represented as completely as possible. Only in this way will the material be analyzed and conclusions drawn, a collection of "exemplary documents" would be useless. Therefore it is only possible to make and publish the collection "The Estonian Summer War in 1941" as a separate edition and not as a part of a publication of wider scope.

Presumably the publication will be used in three different ways. The set of documents will be of great scientific importance as a source material for historians, amateur historians researching their native place, students etc. It can be used as teaching material and as a source for scientific research for studying the organization and tactics of the guerrilla war in the Estonian military education system. Finally we may assume that the publication will be

interesting for a wider scope of readers and will encourage their interest in history. The set of documents will fill in a gap in highlighting one of the most dramatic periods in Estonian history, being also the basis for further research in the field of local history or for writing a monograph/monographs. The methodology of military science enables clarification of the events and processes, their reasons, courses and results. The scientific results can also be applied to the processes of the Estonian state defence, especially at the present stage of the founding of its basic principles.

Bertil HAGGMAN

Reduced Swedish Military Preparedness Can NATO Help ?

In December a budget deficit of one and a half billion dollars was discovered in the Swedish Army and Navy. Supreme Commander, General Ove Victorin, was called before Defense Minister Bjoern von Sydow to explain the budgetary problems. Miscalculations now force reduced preparedness, refresher courses for conscripts have to be cancelled. Also the Air Force is reporting deficits which might affect the Saab 39 Griffin fighter program.

The question of Swedish NATO membership should therefore once more be on the agenda, but the socialist government does not seem to change its antiquated line. With the Soviet threat gone there is really no reason why Sweden cannot join NATO. Once Sweden is a member of NATO, it could actively support membership for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. As a non-member Sweden has no influence in the alliance. The knowledge that help is close at hand in a crisis in Norway, Denmark, Germany (and soon Poland) ought to be psychologically helpful and also a solution to the lack of funds. With NATO membership Sweden would not have to lower its military guard.

*D E S T A Destabilization, Terrorism & Disinformation
A Northern Newsletter of Threat Analysis
Volume V, No.5 November - December 1997*

North Korean Crisis and Peace on the Korean Peninsula

A speech delivered by Ahn, Eung-Mo, President of the Korean Freedom League at the WLF D General Conference, Washington, D.C., September 16-19, 1997.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished delegates, it is my great honor to speak as a delegate of the Korean Freedom League and share my views with you at the 1997 WLF D General Conference in Washington, D.C., which symbolizes freedom and democracy for all mankind. I firmly believe the holding of the Conference is very timely and significant.

Dear fellow delegates, the goal of the World League is to uphold and defend the high value of democracy, such as the integrity of the human being, freedom, the principle of democracy, as well as peace, and to ensure that all men are equal in pursuit of happiness.

In the past, these rights have been threatened by the communist ideology, but since the end of the Cold War era this threat has been reduced in substance worldwide. However, there are some regions of the world at present where the remnants of the Cold War era still remain causing instability.

Accordingly, I would like to reassure you, all the distinguished delegates, there is no change in our responsibility to counter the evil forces which threaten to undermine the universal value of humanity.

My fellow delegates, today the Korean Peninsula still remains as a sole island of the Cold War. It is because North Korean Communist regime is yet to wake up from the hallucination of Communism and shows no sign of respect for fundamental human rights.

Therefore, I would like to make it perfectly clear that our mission in Korea has not been accomplished.

Ladies and Gentlemen, today North Korea has fallen into a chaotic situation.

Due to food shortages, most of the North Korean people are suffering malnutrition and the children are the worst victims of the food shortage, as reported in the media. The factories are estimated to operate in something like less than 30 percent of their production

capacity. North Korean government agencies are directly involved with drug trafficking and counterfeiting.

Thus, there are an increasing number of North Korean citizens defecting recently. As we all know, former Labour Party Secretary, Hwang, Jang-Yop, has defected to South Korea, and former North Korean Ambassador to Egypt, Jang, Sung-Gil, and his brother sought political asylum in the United States a few weeks ago. It is now a common phenomenon to have North Korean family groups defecting to the outside world.

The so-called supreme ruler of North Korea, Kim, Jong-II, is not as yet elected as Party General Secretary nor as Head of State in the North. They could not convene the meeting of the Supreme People's Council nor that of the Party Central Committee. Kim, Jong-II is simply Chairman of the Military Affairs Council and is the chief commander of the North Korean People's Army. North Korea is in a state of bankruptcy under martial law.

However, it is certainly strange to witness that there are huge efforts by the free world to support the North Korean government in bankruptcy and to make sure that it would not fall. The rationale for this is that when a rat is cornered at a dead end, it can counter-attack the cat, as an old Korean proverb goes, and if Kim, Jong-II considers the situation to be hopeless and the system sure to fall, he might want to commit suicidal war in desperation taking along the lives of innocent people.

This policy of appeasement has been named as a policy of soft landing. I would like to recall the fact that President Ronald Reagan of the United States had once called Communists devils. I believe that this policy of soft landing means to compromise with the devil in order to maintain peace and stability.

Distinguished delegates, if and when we become successful in compromising with the devil in North Korea for her survival, national division of Korea will be perpetuated with the tension between the two Koreas.

Kim, Jong-II has inherited the power of his father to make the regime of feudalistic dynasty in modern times. Kim, Jong-II firmly believes that it is a crime against Communist revolution to have a multi-party system, market economy, privatization of means of production, private farming and plurality of ideology, etc., and any discussion for change in system is condemned. Those who promote these ideas are purged necessarily.

Therefore, he stubbornly refuses to uphold universal principles of democracy. As long as North Korea is governed by this type of leadership, there will never be a day of post-Cold War era on the Korean Peninsula, and the population of 23 million people currently living in the North will never be able to enjoy fundamental human rights.

Therefore, Kim, Jong-Il's regime must be ousted in order to defend and uphold fundamental human rights, for which the World League was organized and has pursued.

My fellow delegates, the fact that North Korea has food shortages and that people are starving to death is not a news item any more these days.

But, North Koreans are not doing anything to help themselves. Instead of importing foods to feed starving North Koreans, they are preoccupied with idolization of their leaders and are busy wasting resources for political propaganda. They are spending more than 320 million US dollars in building the Kum Soo San Memorial Palace in order to preserve the remains of Kim, Il-Sung in a show case. To participate in the World Youth Students Festival, which was held in Cuba from the end of last July to the beginning of August, North Korea chartered two commercial airline planes to transport a large delegation of more than 500 members. To celebrate the birthdays of Kim, Jong-Il and Kim, Il-Sung, they had invited huge numbers of guests from more than 80 countries around the world to the luxurious birthday parties. We can hardly imagine this could be a picture of a starving nation. Kim, Jong-Il has forsaken his duty and responsibility as the ruler of North Korea.

Distinguished delegates, the North Korean food shortage is not simply the result of continued floods ever since 1995, but it is the natural outcome of structural failure and contradiction, stemming from the collective farming system. All the farmers are losing their enthusiasm and will to work under the collective farm system. The new corn seeds at the experimental station of the North Korean Academy of Agricultural Science have produced ten tons of corn per hectare, while they could produce only two to three tons at the collective farms. Besides, North Korea has made all the hills and mountains completely bare in order to cultivate terrace farm fields. as a result, when it rains a little, the soil of the terraced fields is washed away to fill the rivers, making the riverbeds higher than the farm land. Thus, with very little rainfall the rivers become flooded, and to the contrary, a short period of dry weather brings about severe

drought causing damages to the crops. So, there is a double catastrophe of drought and flood every year. There are no fertilizers or pesticides for farming as factories in the North are at the lowest in their capacity of production.

Unfortunately, however, North Korea has now given up its efforts to revive its farming structure, and it is making a political campaign only to claim that it should be resolved through ways of outdated and anachronistic socialism.

Distinguished delegates, therefore, we strongly urge that North Korea has to take the measures of reform and open-door policy in order to overcome self-contradictions within the North Korean system, and we firmly believe that our policies and strategies toward North Korea are to induce them to reform and open them to the outside world. The worst choice that we can make is to assure and guarantee the safety of Kim, Jong-Il's regime, and not help North Korea reform and open up.

Distinguished delegates, there are more than one million armed soldiers on active duty in North Korea, while the people are starving to death. They maintain more than twice the number of military armaments and hardware in North Korea as compared with those of the South Korean Army. The North Koreans would often declare openly for retaliation, and would threaten the South by using such words as "sea of fire". Former North Korean Secretary of the Party, Hwang, Jang-Yop, testified at a press interview recently that Kim, Jong-Il truly believed that South Korea would be brought under their control only through an eventual war. With these perceptions and attitudes, North Korea is currently demanding the withdrawal of the U.S. forces from the South. They claim that the agenda of the Four party Meeting must include the issue of the U.S. forces' withdrawal from Korea along with entering a peace agreement with the United States. This precisely indicates that they have hidden intentions and goals, that is, as soon as the U.S. forces in Korea are withdrawn, they can have another Korean War immediately, even the next day.

The real reason for North Korea to negotiate a peace agreement with the United States is to assure the withdrawal of the U.S. forces from Korea. Even though they explain openly, that time has come to replace the armistice agreement with a peace agreement, as it has been more than half a century since the end of the Korean War, it is only their political propaganda. They believe that, once the United States and North Korea could agree on a peace treaty, there is no excuse for the U.S. armed forces to continue to stay in the South. It

means the second Korean War at any moment once again. This would be the exact same situation as when the U.S. troops withdrew from Vietnam, North Vietnam immediately started a massive military advance toward Saigon.

The key issue on the Korean Peninsula is that North Korea continues to hold onto its evil ambition to communize the South by force, even at the expense of the North Korean people starving to death. It is not just simple political propaganda alone. In fact, they continue to build up their military power and to make a strong demand for the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Korea within the international community. Therefore, we strongly demand that Kim, Jong-Il should be ousted from power in order to assure peace and security on the Korean Peninsula, as he is pursuing the anachronistic policy which is irrational and immoral.

Distinguished delegates, it is evident that Kim, Jong-Il in the North is paying attention to the pressures of international society, even though he can ignore the demands of his own people.

Distinguished delegates, and ladies and gentlemen, once again I would like to appeal for your support. Please accept this message as that of the people of the Korean Peninsula.

RESOLUTION

Recalling previous resolutions of the 8th WLFD Conference held in 1975 in Brazil and the 9th WLFD Conference held in 1976 in Seoul, Republic of Korea, concerning Cambodia.

Noting the turbulent situation in Cambodian politics which causes grave concern to all freedom-loving peoples.

Be it so resolved,

That this conference call on the United Nations to take urgent measures to provide a climate for peace and justice in Cambodia.

Submitted by the Khmer League for Freedom (closed since 1976), WLFD Cambodian Unit Chapter

Report on the WFLD Kachinland Chapter

*The 29th World League for Freedom and Democracy Conference
Washington D.C., September 26-29, 1997*

On this auspicious day of the 29th World League for Freedom and Democracy Conference, I, as a representative of the ethnic Kachin people of the Union of Myanmar (Burma), greatly appreciate and honor to present the situation in the Union of Myanmar to the world leaders who are striving for world peace.

For almost half a century, Myanmar has been ravaged by a civil war that continues unabated. An armed solution "if successful", would have by this time resulted in one or the other side succeeding militarily against the other during this civil war. This no-win situation between the warring parties and factions, has only devastated the nation, while the people remain the ultimate losers in this endless armed conflict. For this reason, Kachin Independence Organization (KIO) perceives that to achieve justice, human rights, peace, democracy, and equal opportunities for the whole nation, now is the time for everyone to have a conscience and for all concerned people of Myanmar to join hands and to focus, in spiritual and intellectual reconciliation on one common direction for the betterment of all peoples as a nation.

The KIO has previously attempted to jointly achieve the above objectives with the other warring ethnic races. But, due to preconditions placed by various organizations and alliances on such negotiations, the KIO was unable to secure a joint consensus or agreement to participate together in such negotiations. For this reason and from our own convictions, the KIO decided to negotiate separately. Commencing in 1993, we conducted negotiations with the SLORC on numerous occasions. These negotiations resulted in a cease-fire agreement being entered into on the 24th February with SLORC. Following the cease-fire agreement, close cooperation and friendship has achieved the resettling of refugees, and the beginning of the development process in Kachin State, along with other matters as well. Similarly, most of the other ethnic nationality insurgent organizations have entered cease-fire with the SLORC. Naturally, where there is civil war, there can be no human rights, peace and democracy. Only a nationwide cease-fire will lead to peace conditions necessary to allow the nation to develop further.

As a matter of fact, the 1991 Nobel Peace Prize laureate, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, whose release on July 10, 1995, topped news headlines around the world, has announced her intention to continue political dialogue with the SLORC. She said, "the aim of the SLORC is to return the power to the people. This is exactly our aim as well and that SLORC Chairman Gen. Than Shwe stated that he would like me to help achieve peace and stability in the nation. I intended to help SLORC in every way so that we can return power to the people. this is not only my intention. It is the intention of all who want democracy, and it is obviously the intention of the SLORC. There is no hostility between me and SLORC".

However, for some reason, her original vision was altered to accelerate the process of democratization thereby confronting the SLORC since then.

This era marks the beginning of peace in several countries in the South-East Asia region. Some countries in this region including Myanmar are just beginning to learn the self-responsibilities inherent in the foundations of democracy. If we look at the democracy system in the West, we will see that most Western countries have enjoyed independence for hundreds of years and have established democratic systems of government for centuries. In such systems, the people are taught since they are children the essence of self-responsibility, democracy and human rights. Consequently they appreciate and value the principles of democracy and human rights, which now most regard as sacrosanct. For this reason, and arising from different realities, Western and Southeast Asian people view these concepts differently.

Today, the situation in Myanmar and Cambodia are quite similar in terms of the political struggle among different groups. Under such circumstances, it is extremely important that only appropriate advice and support from the outside world will restore peace to these warring neighboring countries rather than introducing a new high-tech democratic process.

Recently, ASEAN, the grouping of neighboring Southeast Asian countries granted Myanmar membership. It was because all the neighboring countries have good intentions for harmony and peaceful co-existence. They also want to bring about the same level of economic development in the region. ASEAN leaders deserve recognition for providing constructive assistance and adopting a broad minded attitude.

Ladies and Gentlemen; in attendance at this conference today, are various leaders from all over the world who desire world peace,

and who are prepared to personally work towards the achievement of peace and security in the world. In the sense of world peace, Myanmar forms an integral part of such global strategy. We call upon you to support and advise us in achieving peace in Myanmar as well as the whole region. Firstly, we will need your support on the establishment of talks leading to a nationwide cease-fire in Myanmar. The final step in this process will be nationwide peace talks, which will include leaders of all political parties and revolutionary forces in good faith.

If the international community will be willing to collectively assist us in this regard, we believe that Myanmar will, within a certain period of time achieve a secure peace for all future generations of Myanmar. At the same time, a secure peace in this region will take us one step closer to achieving the goal of world peace.

Joint Communiqué

The 29th General Conference of the World League for Freedom and Democracy was held between 17-19 in Washington D.C., capital of the United States of America under the theme "Toward a better and more secure world" with delegates and observers from over 80 nations in attendance.

The President of the WLF, Dr. Tze-Chi Chao opened the Conference and handed the ceremonial transfer of Chairmanship to Mr. Bruce Potter, secretary-general of the U.S. League for Freedom and Democracy on behalf of its chairman, the Hon. Mike Huckabee, Governor of Arkansas.

In his opening address, Dr. Chao observed that standing on the threshold of the 21st century, the WLF had the full potential to create a better environment for human prosperity and happiness. Governments can no longer formulate policies or pursue national goals without regard for the impact on others. International dialogue and cooperation for mutual benefit will assist in obtaining freedom and equality for all.

The fight against totalitarianism and dictatorship, terrorism, oppression of ethnic minorities, disease, poverty, environmental erosion, drug trafficking, crime and rapid global population

expansion must be addressed to create a new millennium of freedom, democracy, prosperity, progress and peace for all mankind.

Distinguished speakers addressing the opening included the Hon. Ivan M. Korotchenya, Executive Secretary of the Commonwealth of Independent States (C.I.S.), Dr. Rodolpho Pastor Fasquelle, Minister of Culture of Honduras, and the Hon. Maxime Carlot Korman, former Prime Minister of Vanuatu.

Congratulatory messages were received from President Bill Clinton of the United States of America, President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China, the Hon. Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Governor Mike Huckabee of Arkansas, U.S. Senator Robert G. Torricelli of New Jersey and the Mayor of the District of Columbia, Marion Barry, Jnr.

The WLFD have worked diligently as participants in the United Nations NGO Conferences this year. All members of the WLFD should strongly support the League's efforts within NGO organizations.

Important initiatives in peace accords have been forged by President Vaclav Havel, President of the Czech Republic. The Conference noted with pleasure that the WLFD was represented by Dr. Chao at the Forum 2000 in Prague on September 5, where the accent was on peace and humanity in the interests of mankind. The WLFD will pursue new horizons to meet the many international fundamental changes evolving globally.

While the dangers of global warfare have receded, conflict continues on a restricted scale in parts of the world. The new challenges are of an economic, educational and environmental dimension. The emphasis now is on achieving mutual understanding between regions and countries through free market economies so peaceful co-existence can provide a framework for greater humanitarian initiatives.

For these principles to succeed tensions must be eliminated on the Korean Peninsula, Cambodia, the Middle East, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and in parts of the African continent and South East Asia.

WLFD applauds the strong commitment to peace-keeping initiatives of the United Nations and the humanitarian and environmental objectives of its specialized agencies. The Conference recognizes the strong thrust for greater cohesion between the nations of Central and Latin America and notes the harmony achieved at the 23rd WLFD Conference in Costa Rica.

It is to be hoped that all the countries will play a part in the work of global organizations and that the Republic of China on Taiwan

will be enabled to participate and offer its economic support and technological expertise to strengthen this vital work.

Respect for the preservation of sensible environment standards of our world is essential, the attack on poverty, starvation and disease must be stepped up and discrimination against people on the grounds of race, sex or disability must be eliminated and the expansion of food and energy sources must be increased.

The world looks with confidence to the United States of America to continue its positive role towards the peace and prosperity of the world. The result can be a new world cooperative for the new millennium, marking the transition of WLF objectives in the interests of mankind.

The Conference expresses its gratitude to the United States League for Freedom and democracy and to the people of the United States for their generous and friendly hosting of the 29th World Conference of the WLF.

Islamic Republic of Chechnya

Chechen President Aslan Maskhadov has declared the war-devastated Russian region an Islamic republic.

"We have won our independence and now we will announce a new system of administration for our country. It will be the Islamic Republic of Chechnya."

"I announce to the whole world from Antalya: From now, Chechnya as an Islamic republic," he said.

The status of the mainly Muslim region remains unresolved after it waged a 21-month-long war for independence from Russia. Tens of thousands of people were killed before a peace deal was signed in August 1996.

He said the Chechen forces were ready for war again if Russia stood in the way of full independence for the region.

Russian authorities have already criticized some of Chechnya's actions carried out in the name of Islamic law.

Maskhadov also said Chechnya, which faces major economic problems, would pursue a liberal economic policy.

Archbishop was considered a Saint and a Hero

Archbishop Volodymyr Sterniuk died in his quarters at the Metropolitan's Residence at 5 St. George's Square, Lviv, Ukraine on Monday 29 September, 1997. Bishop Lubomyr Husar (Plenipotentiary-Auxiliary of the Head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church) and the Patriarchal Curia in Lviv was in charge of the Archbishop's funeral attended by a huge crowd of faithful. The body of Archbishop Volodymyr Sterniuk was transferred on September 29 from the residence to the Cathedral by bishop Lubomyr Husar, Julian Voronovsky, Julian Gbur and with numerous assistance of the clergy (about 50 priests). Requiem services (parastas), Holy Scripture reading round the clock and continued viewing lasted until the funeral on Thursday, October 2. The body of the Archbishop, after a funeral with massive participation in through the streets and the center of Lviv, with many tributes and condolences offered at key strategic places of the city by church leaders and politicians, was interned in the crypt of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Cathedral of St. George, Lviv.

Archbishop Sterniuk was born 12 February 1907 in the town of Pustomy near the city of Lviv. His parents were Fr. Volodymyr and Stefania (née Konovalets). Two of his uncles were also priests as well as his brother, Eustache. His initial schooling was completed in Lviv and then he undertook studies at the Minor Seminary of the Redemptorist Fathers in Eschen, Belgium, where he obtained his high school diploma.

He entered the Redemptorist Monastery in St. Truiden (Flemish speaking part of Belgium in the province of Limburg) in July 1927. He made his temporary vows in 1928 and his perpetual religious vows in 1931.

He completed his philosophic and theological studies in Belgium at Beauplateau and Louvain. In July 1931 he was ordained to the priesthood by the Ukrainian Catholic Bishop of Winnipeg, Canada, Basil Ladyka at Louvain. At first he was appointed Provincial Consultor for the Order of the Holy Redeemer (Redemptorists). His ministry saw him working in Galicia, Volynia, Ternopil, Ivano-Frankivsk, and Lviv regions of Ukraine.

By concealing himself in the choir of the St. George Cathedral, Volodymyr Sterniuk witnessed the liquidation of his church during the pseudo synods of bishops (held without the participation of Ukrainian Bishops) in 1946. Naturally, he was arrested the following year during the open persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church which started with the arrest of the Ukrainian Catholic Hierarchy. He was sentenced and spent many years of imprisonment in the Archangel province near the town of Yertsovo (former USSR). Released in 1952, he returned to Lviv, and worked in different capacities as park gatekeeper, assistant book keeper, janitor and male nurse.

In July 1967 he was secretly consecrated as bishop in Lviv by bishop Vsevolod Velychkovsky. (The latter was released from concentration camps and allowed to leave for Winnipeg, Canada, where he died). At the time of his consecration he received instructions from the exiled Head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church Metropolitan Josyf Slipyj to take over the leadership of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine. From 1972 to the return from exile in the West of the Major Archbishop of Lviv, Cardinal Myroslav Ivan Lubachivsky in 1991, Archbishop Sterniuk performed his duties as the locumtenens and senior bishop of the Kyivan-Halych Metropoly.

Archbishop Sterniuk was very instrumental in the movement for the legalization of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church at the close of the 1980's. On 17 September 1989, he gave his blessing and encouragement for the irreversible act of solidarity for the legalization of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in which 250,000 people participated. He also led the fight for the restitution of the illegally confiscated property of the Ukrainian Catholic Church that was handed over to the Russian Orthodox Church.

On 19 August 1990, Archbishop Sterniuk celebrated the first Divine Liturgy by a Greco-Catholic priest in the Church in St. George's Cathedral since the Soviet liquidation of the Church in 1946. In 1991, when the Kyivan-Halych Archbishop and Patriarch Myroslav Ivan Cardinal Lubachivsky returned to Kyiv, Metropolitan Sterniuk was relieved of his duties. From this time the Metropolitan served as a good will ambassador making trips to the West, (U.S. and Canada) supporting several religious causes, and was met everywhere with respect and enthusiasm.

He remained a resident of the Metropolitan's Residence in Lviv and up to his last days accepted guests and admirers. Towards the end of his days the Ukrainian Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, Studite Monks and the clergy from St. George's Cathedral saw to his needs.

The National Tribune, Vol. XVI No. 40.

ABN CORRESPONDENCE

Publisher and Owner (Verleger und Inhaber):
American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik
Bloc of Nations (AF ABN), 136 Second
Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003, U.S.A.

Zweigstelle Deutschland: A. Dankiw,
Zeppelinstr. 67, 81669 München.

Editorial Staff: Board of Editors
Editor-in-Chief: Mrs Slava Stetsko, M.A.

Schriftleitung: Redaktionskollegium
Verantw. Redakteur: Frau Slava Stetzko
Zeppelinstr. 67
81669 München, Germany

Tel: 48 25 32 Fax: 48 65 19
e-mail: 100114.335@COMPUSERVE.COM

Articles signed with name or pseudonym do not necessarily reflect the Editor's opinion, but that of the author. Manuscripts sent in unrequested cannot be returned in case of non-publication unless postage is enclosed.

It is not our practice to pay for contributed materials. Reproduction permitted only with indication of source (ABN Corr.).

Annual subscription: 27 US dollars, and the equivalent in all other countries. Remittances to Deutsche Bank, Munich, Neuhauser Str. 6, account no. 3021003, Anna Dankiw.

Druck: Ukrainische Institut für
Bildungs Politik
Zeppelinstr. 67, 81669 München