



disarmament, binding security guaranties, and recognition of the state's existing borders and territorial integrity.

Most important, the relinquishing of the missiles would be gradual, with an initial 36 per cent of the rockets and 42 per cent of the warheads. Other "states" must pledge not only never to use nuclear weapons against Ukraine, but never to threaten it by force.

Few of these conditions were met at the Clinton-Yeltsin-Kravchuk summit, of the U.S.-Russian monitoring of Ukrainian security, is akin (in Russia's case) to Hitler's Germany agreeing to protect Czechoslovakia in the 1930s. Ukrainians are understandably bewildered about Russia, which has moved rapidly toward an authoritarian presidency and a parliament dominated by extreme nationalists and communists, should be the recipient of such unconditional Western trust.

Some of the responsibility from the summit agreement clearly rests on Mr. Kravchuk, who has given way under pressure before. Yet it also results from the critical economic and political strains under which Ukraine labours. Hyperinflation has crippled its economy. Its currency is nearly worthless. And Ukraine remains dependent on Russia for oil and gas, at prices close to world levels.

Also Ukraine's territorial integrity is being threatened from more than one direction. Like the Crimea, the Donetsk region, which contains a Ukrainian majority but is heavily Russified, seeks autonomy or, as demanded by some striking coal and steel workers last summer, annexation to Russia. In the Transcarpathian region in the west of the country, a strong movement called the "Rusyn Association of Subcarpathia" calls for autonomy. And Romania has laid claim to territory annexed to Ukraine by Stalin in 1940.

One does not have to be a Ukrainian nationalist to see the dangers to Ukrainian independence, which has become fragile at best. The main danger remains Ukraine's historical nemesis: Russia.

To many Ukrainians, Russia today --- whether they listen to Yeltsin, ultranationalist Vladimir Zhirinovskiy or Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev - does not

seem appreciably different from the Russia of the past, a period forever associated with the horrors of collectivization, wartime conflicts in western Ukraine, the persecution of dissidents and the more recent Chernobyl disaster. Ukraine's security and its future independence, are now in the hands of Russian authorities.

*David R. Marples, a history professor at the University of Alberta is the author of Ukraine "Under Perestroika", and a senior research scholar with the university's Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.*

## DESTINATION UNKNOWN

*Excerpts from the OTTAWA CITIZEN, Editorial, February 1, 1994)*

*WHILE RUSSIA AND THE OFFSPRING OF THE SOVIET EMPIRE STRUGGLE TO SURVIVE, IT WOULD HELP IF CANADIANS SHOWED UNDERSTANDING*

The evil offspring of the Soviet Empire continue to prosper in its ruins, feeding off successor states' inability to satisfy expectations for instant economic gratification.

In Serbia on the weekend, Vladimir Zhirinovskiy's right-wing buffoonery continued to make mischief: Serbs cheered a declaration that NATO air strikes should be considered an attack on Russia. In Crimea - formerly the vacation playground of Moscow's elite - a man identified with reunion with Russia clobbered an election candidate more favorable to remaining in Ukraine. And in Moscow, having won their power struggle with reformers, conservatives in the Russian government began trying to convince the West, and possibly themselves, that they are still committed to market economics.

It all smacks of momentum toward a dark but still obscure destination - momentum that we in Canada will never understand, much less stop. It may well be impossible to stop: If Canadians can't dig themselves out of relatively minor social and economic problems, they aren't likely to have much impact turning around catastrophe overseas.

But we could do a lot better job of understanding. Take Crimea, for example. Why would anyone, in the middle of an economic crisis, want to toss a match on the incendiary Russia-Ukraine relationship by voting for a secessionist? Well, from the Russian point of view, this little corner of their south is overwhelmingly Russian in population and was only given to Ukraine in 1954 as a sop when that country was a powerless administrative unit.

In addition, independent Ukraine's economic collapse convinces Crimeans they'd be better off under Moscow.

Ukrainians, in contrast, see Crimea as an integral part of their fragile new country, dredge up their own historical evidence, and argue, with some justification, that Crimea might just be the beginning of Russian efforts to re-absorb their Ukrainian province.

Just imagine what might happen in Canada if hyperinflation, empty stores and a vast, unprecedented crime wave were added to the mean-spirited regionalism that has appeared in the current recession.

## CANADA'S KEY ROLE AS INTERMEDIARY

*Excerpts from the UKRAINIAN NEWS, Editorial, December, 1993*

In the field of international relations, Canada's geographic position and reputation for fairness and objectivity has often placed our country in the role of intermediary - between Washington and the rest of the world. One former External Affairs and later Prime Minister, Lester B. Pearson, even won the 1956 Nobel Peace Prize by serving this role. Current Foreign Affairs Minister André Ouellet's offer to mediate in the nuclear arms dispute between Kyiv on the one hand and Washington and Moscow, on the other, is another example of this fine tradition in action.