

AN UPDATE  
ON DONBAS AND CRIMEA

ANDREW WILSON ON THE WEST  
AND YANUKOVYCH

HOW UKRAINE CAN RECOVER MONEY  
FROM OLIGARCHS

international edition

# The Ukrainian Week

№ 4 (70) MARCH 2014

## A COUNTRY OF FREE RADICALS



The  
Economist

Featuring selected content  
from The Economist

[WWW.UKRAINIANWEEK.COM](http://WWW.UKRAINIANWEEK.COM)

FOR FREE DISTRIBUTION

**DOZENS OF PROTESTERS DEAD**

**FOUR HUNDRED INJURED**

**THE EXACT NUMBER OF VICTIMS OF THE REGIME**

**REMAINS UNKNOWN**

## BRIEFING

**The Mist of Victory:** The revolution is over. A war begins

4

## FOCUS

**The Feast of Defiance:** The surge of separatism would have peacefully died down in Crimea. Then, Russia interfered

6

**Volodymyr Panchenko** explains why the Crimea is not a "native Russian land"



8

**Knockout in the Donbas:** Confusion, shock and urgent need of a wise solution from the new government

Divide and rule?

The Ukrainian Week has highlighted three major issues: administrative, economic and historical/ethnographic. This simple experiment shows that the maps do not match. This leads to the question: What principles are the political stages of federalization going to carry up Ukraine?



**Watch Out – Federalization!** Who, how and when federalized Ukraine – and what consequences this had

10

## NEIGHBOURS

**Ukrainian Revolution:** Western perspective, Western influence and Western contribution

13



**How to Be Good Neighbours:** Ukraine is the biggest test of the EU's policy towards countries on its borderlands

16

**Andrew Wilson:** "The West did not react adequately to the usurpation of power by Yanukovich"

18



**Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea:** Is Britain willing to do more than just condemn the Russian military occupation of Crimea?

20



**Ukraine as the Latest Fashion:** Poles support the Maidan gladly and passionately

22

**Leonidas Donskis:** "Every piece of information about Ukraine on Russian TV was similar to what I had long been listening immediately after 13 January 1991 when the Soviet troops killed fourteen peaceful civilians in Vilnius"

24

**International lawyer Volodymyr Vasylenko:** "There is no statute of limitations for crimes against humanity"

26



## ECONOMICS



**Ihor Losev** on the political side of Ukraine's oligarchy

28

**Oligarch Wars:** Economic transformations should be profound. Otherwise, there will be no economic transformations

30

## CULTURE &amp; ARTS

**Ballet, the voice of Enigma and Ancient Greece: The Ukrainian Week's** choice of events to attend in early spring

33



## HISTORY



**Kyiv:** The streets and squares of revolutions in 1917

34

International edition  
**The Ukrainian Week**

**The Ukrainian Week** № 4 (70) March 2013

**Founder** ECEM Media GmbH

**Publisher** ECEM Media GmbH

**Address** Austria, Am Gestade, 1, 1010 Vienna

State registration certificate KB № 19823-9623ПР 19.03.2013

**Chief Editor** Alla Lazareva

**Editors** Anna Korbut, Natalia Romanec, Shaun Williams

**E-mail** office@tyzhden.ua

**Tel.** (044) 351-13-87

**www.ukrainianweek.com**

**Editors address** 37 Mashynobudivna str., Kyiv, 03067, Ukraine

**Print** Novy Druk LLC, 1 Mahnitohorska str., Kyiv, 03056, Ukraine

Ordering number **14-0626** Sent to print on 28 February 2014

**Print run** 15 000. **Free distribution**

**Our partner**

**Тижень**

## TRENDS &amp; TALK

**Internal troops and riot police leave government district** after bloody clashes with protesters

**Parliament forms a new majority and begins to set up the government of public trust**

**MPs from South-Eastern regions convene in Kharkiv.** Despite fears of separatism, they do not pass any significant decisions. Shortly after, they recognize the new government in Kyiv



**Protesters take administrative buildings under control all over Ukraine.** Officials leave the Party of Regions and resign en masse. Monuments to Lenin are toppled

Interbank market closes at UAH

**10.5 per USD**  
**1 on March 3**

Ukrainians withdraw UAH

**30bn**

from deposits during the most violent clashes in Kyiv

The assets of the Yanukovych family are worth USD

**12bn,**

Anders Åslund from the Peterson Institute for International Economics reports

**984 people**

are injured in clashes that started on February 18. 95 people are killed. 341 people are still missing, according to EuroMaidan SOS, a human rights NGO

**285 out of 700-800**

protesters are arrested during a rally against Russia's military intervention in Ukraine in Moscow, OVD Info reports

Ukrainian men crowd to register under the national mobilization campaign in response to Russian military intervention. In the town of Lutsk alone, volunteers apply for registration every

**5-10 minutes**

# The Mist of Victory

**Author:**  
**Roman Malko**

**A**fter Viktor Yanukovych fled and before Ukraine found itself on the brink of a war, it seemed Ukrainians could be celebrating the victory, but somehow there was no euphoria. Only a mist. The only thing that could be clearly seen through it were the bodies of the deceased protesters. Nothing else. No-one knew what would happen next. No-one knows now how long the mist will hang over everyone and what hides behind it. The only thing that is clear now is that the Ukrainian people cannot stop, not even for a second. Because the revolution is continuing.

There is still a lot of work to be done – in fact, so much that it is dangerous to trust politicians with doing it. Because they will fail, as they did last time. They will drown it in words, sell it or hush it up. But people cannot afford to let that happen again. The victory came at much too dear a price; too much blood has been shed. The souls of the deceased heroes will not forgive; the living will not excuse; the future generations will curse.

Ukrainians again have a chance, perhaps, the biggest one in many centuries – they can finally become a people, change, cleanse themselves of servility and rule in their own land. They only need to avoid the mistakes they made after the Orange Revolution, stay alert and not give in to indifference.

Yanukovych has fled, but he can come back at any moment. With a different surname, face and team of “professionals”. Politicians continue to play the same old games. They have quickly bounced back, taken stock of the situation and changed their rhetoric. Not even two weeks after the shocking killing of protesters, they are back to their old ways, lying, scheming, buying loyalty and weaving their poisonous webs.

True, in the three months of protests Ukrainians have changed

like never before. They have learned and grasped a lot and discovered many things in themselves. They can now be truly proud of themselves for they have accomplished something that takes other nations decades to do. And the overthrown president should be given a lot of credit for this. By alienating his own people beyond measure, this unfortunate fool has done the impossible and helped



THIS IS NOT  
VICTORY YET.  
THE STRUGGLE  
CONTINUES





**People get access to the mansions of Viktor Yanukovich, ex-Prosecutor General Viktor Pshonka and other top officials. The latter are put on a wanted list and face criminal charges**

**Parliament schedules presidential and Kyiv mayor election for May 25**

**Acting Interior Minister signs a decree to disband the Berkut riot police**

**A surge of separatist rallies in the Crimea. Pro-Russian forces replace Ukrainian flags with the Russian ones on administrative buildings. A clash takes place between Crimean Tatars and pro-Kremlin activists**

**Russian occupation of the Crimea begins. Reports come of Russian troops being deployed around other Ukrainian frontiers**

resurrect the spirit of freedom, which was dormant for so long, in Ukrainians. But should the people thank the despot? Probably not. Ukrainians need to thank themselves for mustering the strength to rise from their knees and lift up their heads.

We have won a battle. But this was just the first victory, before Ukraine was thrust into a new war. There will be many more battles and frustrations, but the people must win the war. They have no other choice, no room for either a defeat or capitulation, because behind them is an abyss.

First and foremost, Ukrainians must kill the slave in themselves. They must kill the slave in their relatives and friends, neighbours and close ones. They must excise this evil abscess in politicians, those delegated to govern the country. And if they refuse to change, they should be simply thrown out as rubbish.

Ukrainians must transform the country, from bottom up, here and now. The system of power must be changed keeping in mind that officials are hired servants of the people rather than arbiters of their destinies. The law enforcement system

must also be revamped with an understanding that it has to serve and fear people rather than bandits whose place is in prison. It needs to be hammered home to the police that they cannot raise their hands against the people. Ukrainians must change the education system so that it will produce wise and honest graduates who do not even think about bribing teachers to get good grades. The health care system needs to be transformed to prevent people from dying due to carelessness and greed. The media space has to be cleansed so that people will no longer be zombified and fed filth. The country needs a strong army that will make serving in the military an honour. In fact, everything needs to be upgraded: roads, buildings, bus stops, parks, rivers and even kennels — all to be painted in bright colours. Life in the country must be made comfortable. Ukrainians must feel happy about having been born in this wonderful land and never even think about going to far-off lands in search of a better life.

Right, too much pomp here perhaps, but that is what the Zeitgeist is now. If Ukrainians were not a bit romantic and crazy, they would never have ousted this fake monster. He would still be looming on the horizon as a curse. So pardon the big words. Not everything is as nice or simple as Ukrainians would want. There are countless issues that must be addressed immediately. There are tons of fears that disturb one's sleep, but somehow there is faith that it will all be good in the end. Russia will swallow the defeat, because it is too weak to do anything about it; Ukraine's internal traitors will quiet down given the right approach. Rest assured that Yanukovich will be caught and put in a place where he is most fitting.

Difficulties? There is no running away from them, but Ukrainians know how to overcome them. They have been hardened by the struggle and inoculated in case something untoward happens. ■

PHOTO: UNIAN



There will be many more battles and frustrations, but the people must win the war. They have no other choice, no room for either a defeat or capitulation, because behind them is an abyss



# The Feast of Defiance

The last week, the Crimea, which had been watching the events unfolding in Kyiv with some aloofness, suddenly erupted. People took to squares with radically different slogans. Some openly stated their desire to live in Russia, while others categorically opposed separation. Against this backdrop, other, equally serious processes were taking place, potentially defining what the future authorities in the Crimea will look like

**T**he Crimea has not seen such a surge of separatism since the early 1990s when Yuriy Meshkov, the first and last Crimean president and Russia-leaning politician, came to power. Back then, Kyiv quickly intervened and settled the situation, while this time around the new Ukrainian government, brought to power by the Maidan's victory, has been slow to react.

Various forces in the Crimea and outside hastened to take advantage of the situation. On 23 February, celebrated in Ukraine as Defender of the Fatherland Day, pro-Russian organizations brought their supporters to the streets and demanded a referendum on withdrawal from Ukraine. Separatist rallies were held in Kerch, Simferopol and Feodosiia.

All of them closely followed one scenario. A crowd would

**Author:**  
**Lenur**  
**Yunusov,**  
**Simferopol**

come together, shouting "Russia!", waving the Russian flag and calling for an extraordinary meeting of the local councils (in Simferopol, the Supreme Council of the Crimea). In all places, there were attempts, sometimes successful, to pull down Ukrainian flags and replace them with Russian ones and volunteers were registered to join some self-defence units and vigilante groups.

The organizers were the same in all cases – the Russian Unity, the Russian Bloc and Cossack communities. In the Crimea, it is no secret that each of these entities is financed from Moscow in some fashion under the pretext of supporting "Russian fellow countrymen".

In Sevastopol, where Russia's supporters have always been present in great numbers, the demonstrators did not limit

themselves to replacing flags. The city's biggest rally ever elected its own "mayor", businessman Oleksiy Chaly, who turned out to be a Russian citizen. However, they stopped short of open separatism even there. Chaly indeed started taking over the executive authority in the city but did so with an eye to the Ukrainian legislation. A new office was introduced for the "people's mayor" called, literally, Chairman of the Coordinating Council to Create City Administration to Ensure the Functioning of the City. What hides under this long and convoluted name is essentially an executive body of the city council which, according to the design of local council members, is supposed to assume the functions of the Sevastopol City State Administration. Under the Ukrainian legislation, the mayor of Sevastopol is not



elected but appointed by the president of Ukraine.

Remarkably, Chaly did not make any statements, at least not in public, about Sevastopol's separation. The leaders of the Russian Unity, who orchestrated the rallies in Crimean cities, also tried to stay away from rabid separatism. "No-one can accuse us of violating the law or order," Serhiy Aksenov, leader of the party, kept repeating. By this he evidently meant the laws of the Ukrainian state.

Nevertheless, on 26 February, thousands of Crimean Tatars gathered in front of the Supreme Council in Simferopol to declare that separation of the Crimea from Ukraine is unacceptable. Pro-Russian organizations staged their rally in the same place at the same time. A total of 10,000 to 20,000 people were gathered.

The spark that ignited the passions in Simferopol was information that an extraordinary session of the Crimea's Supreme Council was to be held that day to possibly vote on the Crimea's withdrawal from Ukraine. Adding fuel to the fire was a rumour that Russia was relocating some of its troops to the peninsula and was going to generously hand out Russian passports to the locals.

As the two rallies tried to outshout each other, pushing back and forth and even exchanging some punches, tense consultations were held inside the parliament's building. The Crimean politicians indeed discussed independence of the peninsula – not from Ukraine but from the "Makedonians", a nickname the Crimeans have given the forces representing Donetsk and Makiyivka (Makeevka in Russia, hence the sobriquet – **Ed.**) which have held complete control over the autonomy in the past years.

This state of affairs ran against the grain of several political forces in the peninsula which have been denied access to the decision-making process dominated by the Donbas natives. The dismissal of Anatoliy Mohyliov, who also represents Makiyivka, was a dream cherished by various and sometimes even opposing camps – pro-Russian organizations, the Mejlis of the Crimean Tatars and some Party of Re-

gions members in the Crimea who found themselves playing second fiddle to the outsiders from Donetsk. The position of this latter group was communicated to the press by Volodymyr Klychnikov, member of the Crimea's Supreme Council, who said: "Time has come to say what has been on everyone's lips but has not been stated publicly: the branch of 'Makedonia' in the Crimea is closed."

The "common enemy" brought together political opponents. Dmitry Polonsky, one of the leaders of the Russian Unity, said in a TV interview that the responsibility for what is happening in the Crimea has been assumed in Simferopol by "two men, two political forces and two peoples". "On the part of the Russian people in the Crimea, it is Serhiy Aksenov and the Russian Unity party," he said. "On the part of the Crimean Tatars, a very significant and third-largest population group in the Crimea, it is Refat Chubarov and the Mejlis. There is no other authority in the Crimea today!"

Eventually, the extraordinary session of the Supreme Council, which had agitated the Crimeans so much, never took place as it lacked a quorum.

So what about separatism? Chairman of the Supreme Council Volodymyr Konstantynov, who had earlier publicly suggested that the Crimea might pursue an independent course, made an official statement on 26 February saying that the issue of withdrawal from Ukraine is not on the agenda in parliament. He called such talk a provocation aimed at "discrediting the Supreme Council of the autonomy and making it illegitimate".

"Unfortunately, this provocation has been organized and supported by the Makiyivka team in the Crimean government. In order to stay in power, they are willing to sacrifice the social and political stability on the peninsula. To them, it is foreign land!" Konstantynov said.

On February 28, the confrontation was fueled one again. There were no official talks of Crimea's separation. However, according to what experts called a long-developed plan, it was

#### Facts About Crimea

# 266,000

Crimean Tatars live in Crimea. Stalin deported them in 1944, many died of diseases and hunger on the road. They returned in 1989. Crimean Tatars are Sunni Muslims. Crimea gets all its water and gas from the mainland Ukraine. Big offshore oil and gas deposits have been discovered around the Crimean coast.



## IF THE RESIDENTS OF THE CRIMEA HAD TO CHOOSE BETWEEN UKRAINE AND SEPARATION WITH ALL THE CHANGES IT ENTAILS, THEY WOULD MOST LIKELY PREFER THE FIRST OPTION

By March 3, the Russian Parliament voted for a law to annex the Crimea to Russia, the Russian Federation Council supported the President's appeal to bring Russian troops to the Crimea, and Ukrainian troops in the Crimea are on alert, facing huge psychological pressure, expecting provocations and storming of military units all over the peninsula. Meanwhile, reports come of military mobilization around other frontiers of Ukraine, as well as Russian military training in Kaliningrad Oblast, close to the Polish and Lithuanian borders.

supposed to turn into a Ukrainian Transnistria under Moscow's jurisdiction. The majority of the population did not want this. However, a group implementing this scenario in the Crimea was quick and tough while Kyiv's indecisiveness boosted its chances for success. The people behind that scenario used the period of political instability in Ukraine to take over power.

Initially, the people occupying administrative buildings and military units did not identify themselves, pretending to be Ukrainians that want to join Russia. Meanwhile, Russia did not intervene openly while presenting its military mobilization as exercise.

The new government tried to deal with the situation by appointing Serhiy Kunitsyn, an of-

ficial with extensive experience in the Crimea, as the new representative of the President in the Crimea. However, tension continued to escalate as numerous attempts were taken to provoke clashes that would allow Russia to justify military intervention presented as protection of its citizens or Russian-speakers in the Crimea. For some reason, the new government did not do much to prevent those provocations.

As to the residents of the Crimea, they are conservative and do not like changes. If they had to choose between Ukraine ruled by the Maidan government and separation from Ukraine with all the changes it entails, they would most likely prefer the first option.

On February 28, when the Ukrainian media world buzzed about Russian military intervention, people in Simferopol were doing their routine shopping, without panic or any specific and passionate sentiments. ■

# Aleksander Griboyedov on the Crimea: "And then came we, the universal heirs, and with us the spirit of destruction"



**Author:**  
**Volodymyr**  
**Panchenko**

**F**ierce propagandists have been trying to hammer the slogan "The Crimea is Russia!" into their own heads and those of others, insisting that Russia lost the lovely peninsula because of "a drunk Khrushchev". Curiously, why necessarily drunk? Is it a reference to the fact that the Crimea was handed over to the Ukrainian SSR in 1954 when the official Soviet apparatus was boisterously celebrating the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the "union of Ukraine and Russia"? Still, a political diversion of giving peninsulas as "gifts", even for a landmark jubilee, would be way too bizarre.

In February 1954, Nikita Khrushchev was in no way a magician revelling in his own tricks. He became Secretary of the CC CPSU in September 1953, only several months before the event. Khrushchev's "personality cult" was years off; after saying goodbye to Stalin in the Kremlin was, for the time being, cautiously declaring the principle of "collective governance".

As far as the legal aspects of the situation are concerned, we must acknowledge that the Soviet bureaucracy did a good job here. The Crimea was incorporated into Ukraine not by the decision of "a drunk Khrushchev" but by the Presidium of the Soviet Supreme Council which adopted, on 19 February 1954, the Edict "On Transferring Crimea Oblast from the RSFSR to the Ukrainian SSR". Naturally, the transfer was previously discussed by the Presidium of the CC CPSU, as was the custom in the Soviet Union.

This is how Crimea Oblast appeared on the map of Soviet Ukraine. Bona fide historians admit that the transfer occurred for purely economic reasons. After all, this is what the 1954 document actually emphasizes where it says: "considering the common economy, territorial proximity and close economic and cultural ties between Crimean Oblast and the Ukrainian SSR".

The Soviet government decided to save the peninsula, ravaged by the war and the deportations of the Crimean Tatars, by putting the burden of its revival on Ukraine, while keeping the military (military industrial sector, the navy and the air force) under Moscow's direct control. The labour force was also replenished by the Ukrainian SSR: in 40 years, from 1944 to the mid-1980s, over a million people were moved to the Crimea from other oblasts of the republic.

The train of history is long gone, and it is in vain that various "Russian blocs" are now nostalgically shaking their fists. Moreover, the Crimea is not a "native Russian land", as some Russians would like us to believe. Russia took possession of this "wart on the nose", to quote from Grigory Potemkin, in the course of long wars against Turkey. On 8 April 1783, the Russian empress issued a manifesto

adding the territory of this former khanate to Russia. Even though Catherine II promised to the Tatars that Russia would "sacredly and unwaveringly ... support them on part with its natural subjects, as well as protect and defend them, their possessions, temples and their natural faith", part of the Crimean nobility fled to Turkey. The last khan abdicated and placed himself at the mercy of the Russian army.

The publication of the manifesto took place after the Crimean nobility swore allegiance to Russia. Potemkin himself swore in mirzas, beys, the clergy and the common people. The festivities included games, horse races, a salute with cannons and, of course, a banquet.

But this state of affairs did not last too long. What the Crimea became after it was subjugated by Russia can be elicited from Alexander Griboyedov's letter. He came to the peninsula 32 years after the manifesto and related his impressions with bitterness and shame to his friend Stepan Begichev on 12 September 1825: "In the place of these ashes, the Genoese Gothic customs once ruled. They were replaced by the pastoral customs of the Mongols with a tinge of Turkish splendour. And then came

we, the universal heirs, and with us the spirit of destruction: not one building survived, not one piece of land in the ancient city was left intact and not dug all over. And so? We ourselves are showing to the future peoples that will come after us, when the Russian tribe disappears, how they

**THE TRAIN OF HISTORY IS LONG GONE, AND THE NOSTALGIA OF VARIOUS "RUSSIAN BLOCs" IS POINTLESS, BECAUSE THE CRIMEA IS NOT A "NATIVE RUSSIAN LAND"**



should handle the perishable remnants of our being."

What Griboyedov saw was a picture of great ruin, and the reader should not assume that the sarcasm of his words is caused merely by the hypochondriac sentiments expressed in his letter where he says he is going to face "madness and a gun".

In general, those who are nostalgic about the territories Russia has lost should look at Alaska instead. Indeed, another case of a "native Russian land"! Unfortunately, on 30 March 1867 Alexander II sold it to the USA. Perhaps he was drunk? No at all. Russia simply found it impossible to swallow up and digest lands on the other side of the Bering Strait. These lands were dominated by creoles (2,000), Aleutians (5,000) and Indians (40,000). The Russians (600-800) were greatly outnumbered. Russia decided it would be a better idea to take possession of Sakhalin and began to fortify its positions in the Amur River region. At the same time, it collected US \$7.2mn from the transaction.

The official transfer ceremony took place on 18 October 1867 which has since been celebrated as Alaska Day in the USA.

Well, Alaska was more fortunate in the 19<sup>th</sup> century than the Crimea in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. ■



# Knockout in the Donbas

**T**he word “knockout” aptly describes the sentiments now prevalent in the Donbas. Total confusion and shock. Alarming rumours about trainloads of heavily armed extremists from Western Ukraine heading for Donetsk. It is as if you are reading Mikhail Bulgakov’s White Guard.

The citizens of Donetsk, fuelled by the hysterical propaganda dished out by local bureaucrats, called for vigilante groups and self-defence units to be formed a week ago, but now they are left to handle their fears all alone. An army of hired goons was disbanded; bureaucrats suddenly changed their tone by calling Viktor Yanukovich a bloody usurper; only the Communist Party set up several tents in downtown Donetsk to channel, on the quiet, the protest potential of Donetsk residents in a desired direction.

A small group of people protecting the Lenin monument against destruction in downtown Donetsk is the only reminder of the confrontation. The so-called Eastern Front, comprised of the supporters of the Communist Party, Natalia Vitrenko, the Russian Bloc and other pro-Russian marginal forces, is likely to go away in the absence of a real threat. The truth is that no-one has actually tried or will try to storm Donetsk. The local opposition still does not have a critical number of people willing to take down the monument.

Of course, this is not 2004. Back then, Donetsk was indeed brewing, and the spectre of separatism roamed among grey Khrushchev-era residential buildings and factories. A decade ago, dozens of thousands of people came to rallies in the city and speakers came onstage with the most radical slogans and calls. Viktor Yushchenko was portrayed as a vampire who was about to ban Russian and burn Russian-language books in squares. The local elites rose as one to defend the falsified election results obtained by Yanukovich and continued to make waves for a long time afterwards.

Today, there are no signs of popular outrage. Just a handful of people show up for rallies in the absence of orders from above. Many of them are just willing to get a drink and shoot the breeze. Overnight, bureaucrats renounced Yanukovich as rubbish. The overthrown president is no longer an icon or superhero. The least offensive words he is called in the streets of Donetsk were “traitor” and “coward”. Some are lambasting Yanukovich for putting insufficient pressure on the Maidan, which the president tolerated for three months. Some are shocked by the luxury of Yanukovich’s mansion and the “golden loaf” which became an instant Internet sensation. Some were concerned about the fact that Party of Regions leaders pronounced Yanukovich usurper and murderer. The idol burst within days like a bubble, and even those who are joining the ranks of the Eastern Front are now spitting at him. The most frequently heard statement at the anti-Maidan in Donetsk is “We have been betrayed”.

In a sense, they have. Everything that has been said by Party of Regions spokespeople is now declared a bunch of lies.

“Yanukovich forced us. We told him that was not the way to do it, but he didn’t listen to us. We knew it would lead to a sad ending but couldn’t do anything about it. We thank you all for your support, people, and now go back to work. You remember that we always work, don’t you? We don’t have time for rallies. Didn’t we tell you this earlier?”

The vigilantes that have joined self-defence groups at the request of MPs from Donetsk and the governor of the region are now calling the city administration non-stop, but the bureaucrats are trying to shake them as obtrusive lunatics. “We have no say on these things. Go to the police,” they tell them.

The so-called “fanatic Banderites”, “extremists” and “the homeless from the Maidan” which had been held up as a bugaboo to the Donbas for so long, eventually came out victorious, and the Donetsk officials who called for the most decisive repulse suddenly swore allegiance to them, leaving their citizens astonished and confused. Where can they go now? Who can they appeal to? The Party of Regions, which only recently appeared to be an invincible force, has fallen apart and capitulated. The Communist Party has joined, as it has traditionally done, the most powerful force in the game and is now

happily voting in favour of legislation sponsored by what was the opposition only yesterday. Treason, cowardice and deception are all around, as the last Russian tsar quipped. This is what usually happens

when an autocratic vertical of power breaks down.

What will the Donbas do next? This remains unclear even to the Donbas itself. Politically, the region is badly demoralized, and what will happen to it depends directly on what the new government does. There are several possible scenarios. If the parties led by Yulia Tymoshenko, Arseniy Yatseniuk and Vitaliy Klitschko fail to finally bring the region under their control and start seriously working there, marginal political forces may sharply increase their power in the Donbas, true separatism will gradually become strong or the Party of Regions will manage to quickly restore its stained image on the wave of revanchist sentiments. In these cases, the Donbas will turn into a source of perennial headache for Ukraine and a kind of shackles preventing the country from making headway towards Europe.

Whether the new team has sufficient political will and stamina to finally come up with a wise solution to the “Donetsk issue” will become clear in the near future. If there are no major reshuffles among the Donbas leadership, if the local kingpins who have established a kind of feudal system in the region are not punished and put in prisons and if the charcoal mafia is not suppressed, Ukraine will definitely see another “Yanukovich from the east” in the future. ■



**Author:**  
Denys  
Kazanskyi,  
Donetsk

**THE LEAST OFFENSIVE WORDS  
HE IS CALLED IN THE STREETS  
OF DONETSK WERE “TRAITOR”  
AND “COWARD”**

# Watch Out – Federalization!

Federalization of Ukraine in the past: who, how, when and with what consequences

**W**hen Ukrainians recently attempted, again, to draw closer to the European civilization, this evoked fierce resistance from Moscow and its ardent supporters within the country. The EuroMaidan has shown to the world that Ukraine can be delayed but not stopped on its way to the West. As it loses chances to keep all of Ukraine in its orbit, the imperial Moscow is trying to cut off at least its eastern part by splitting the country through federalization. The sad history of attempts to turn Ukraine into a federation is something modern-time Ukrainian federalists should keep in mind.

The spectre of federalization as an alternative to European integration was brought about by the opponents of the European choice inside and outside the country. Home-grown federalists claim that this model is commonplace in Europe, extremely democratic and best fits our traditions and realities. The ethnographic map of Ukraine is extremely diverse, they say, and the past of the Donbas is vastly different from the history of Galicia or the Crimea. This is not the first attempt to federalize Ukraine, so a historical overview is in place as the past experience definitely needs to be taken into account. Therefore, who federalized Ukraine in the past, how, when and with what consequences?

## CULTURAL DIVERSITY IS NOT GROUNDS FOR FEDERALIZATION

Since the time of ethnic divisions of humankind in the Palaeolithic

**Authors:**  
**Leonid**  
**Zalizniak**

Period, all peoples have been made up ethnographic groups and their languages always divided into dialects. Therefore, the division of Ukraine into cultural-historical regions or dialect groups (Lemkos, Hutsuls, Polisia natives, Volhynians, Sloboda Ukraine population, etc.) is not unique. This is a normal condition for any large developed ethnos. All great peoples of contemporary Europe, including Ukrainians, have ethnographic groups and their languages clear dialectal divisions. The French have the Provençals, Normans and others; Italians have, for example, the Florentines, Genoese, Si-

cilians. The same goes for Poland.

Moreover, large European nations, such as the French, Germans, Italians and Spaniards, are even more diverse than Ukrainians in some aspects. For example, anthropological data shows that most Ukrainians belong to the Dinaric racial type, while the north of France and Germany is populated largely by blond northern Caucasians and the south by dark-haired southern Caucasians. The Poles and Russians have many more anthropological strands than Ukrainians do.

However, despite the ethnic differences between some regions, European nations created mainly unitary states rather than federations. So why should the ethnographic diversity of Ukraine be grounds for doing the opposite? This logic contradicts the European principles of state building.

## HOW FEDERATIONS WERE FORMED IN EUROPE

A federation is a union of sovereign entities based on the principles of equal rights and self-government. An autonomy is less independent of the central government. However, both fed-

## Divide and rule?

*The Ukrainian Week* has superimposed three maps of Ukraine: administrative, economic and historical-ethnographic. This simple experiment shows that the maps do not match. This leads to the question: What principle are the political adepts of federalization going to use to carve up Ukraine?



Source: open sources

erations and autonomies in Europe usually unite peoples with their ethnic lands in one umbrella state. The only exception here is Germany where a federation emerged in the course of history (discussed in greater detail below).

The statement that federalism is a norm of European state building is absurd. The continent is dominated by unitary states: Poland, Finland, Sweden, the Czech Republic, France, Hungary, etc. Of 40 something European countries, only a handful are not unitary.

Federations arise when distinct people with their ethnic territories voluntarily unite (as in Switzerland) or as a preventive measure to keep multinational empires (Yugoslavia, the USSR, the Russian Federation) or their fragments (Czechoslovakia, Belgium) from falling apart altogether. These post-imperial unions are essentially a weak form of former empires in which a colony gained some autonomy but not equality with the centre (the USSR, Yugoslavia and the contemporary Russian Federation). Being vehicles of an inefficient system which caused the fall of empires (Spanish, Turkish, British, Soviet and Yugoslav), these quasi-federative entities are bound to split into the states ruled by individual peoples.

Thus, in Europe the federal model and autonomous entities are present mainly in countries that have incorporated various peoples with their own ethnic lands. Often, these are modernized fragments of empires which had forcefully kept the territories of several ethnoses under their control. For example, the Russian Federation includes the lands of not only Russians but also Tatars, Karelians, Chuvash, Kalmyks, Buryats and numerous Caucasian peoples. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia included the ethnic territories of the Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Bosnians, Kosovars and others. Czechoslovakia was a fragment of the Austro-Hungarian Empire comprising the Czechs and Slovaks with their lands. In Belgium, there are the Francophone Walloons and the Flemish living in their lands.

The Swiss federal system with its German, French and Italian population is also sometimes held up as an example to be followed by Ukraine.

These models are unacceptable to Ukraine, because its lands are the ethnic territory of one Ukrainian people. The Crimea, the native land of the Crimean Tatars, is an exception here. In Europe, individual peoples have autonomy only in their ethnic lands, so giving it to the Russian-speaking population of the Crimea contradicts the European norms. In fact, it is a form of violence of the former empire against both the Crimean Tatars and a young Ukrainian state. Except the Tatars in the Crimea, ethnic groups in Ukraine (even the largest one, Russians) are not native to the Ukrainian land and have their historical homelands elsewhere. In other words, they cannot claim either a federative status or an autonomy in Ukraine. According to the European canons, their status should be the same as that of Arabs or Poles in France, Ukrainians in England or Russia, the British in Spain and Jews and Turks in Germany. They enjoy all civil liberties but not the right to form territorial autonomies in someone else's ethnic lands.

The times of empires are passing, and each nation in Europe today is a master in its own home and a guest in its neighbour's land. Regardless of how numerous the Turks are in Germany, Arabs in France, Ukrainians in England and Russians in Ukraine, they cannot claim official status for their language, or autonomy, or federal status in the territory of these countries.

Unlike Switzerland, the Russian Federation and former Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, most European countries (France, Italy, Sweden, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, etc.) are nation states and their borders usually coincide with the borders of the ethnic lands of a certain people. According to an established European tradition, nation states are unitary. Ukraine, which occupies the lands of one ethnos, also belongs to nation states. Thus, it should be a unitary state rather than a federation.

Germany, a monoethnic federal state, is an exception to the

prevalent European practice. The explanation lies not so much in historical tradition as in the fears that the neighbouring countries had of Germany's great-power ambitions. This is precisely how historians in Berlin explained the origins of German federalism to me in 1996. Throughout the Middle Ages, German lands were fragmented and divided among feudal lords. The number of independent duchies reached 365. When they united into one state in 1871, the Germans became so much more powerful that the repartition of the world was on the agenda. After two world wars started by Germany, the international community federalized the country in order to reduce the threat it posed to its neighbours.

In contrast, Ukraine is a young state that is not a threat to anyone. Why weaken it through federalization? If you think



## **FEDERALISM SERVES AS A COVER-UP OF PLAIN SEPARATISM**

about who benefits from a weak Ukraine, you will find the true sources of Ukrainian federalism.

### **WHO FEDERALIZED UKRAINE AND WHEN**

The idea of federalizing Ukraine did not arise because of the country's ethnographic diversity, European standards or increasing democratic sentiments in society. It was dictated by a desire to weaken a young state in line with the ancient divide-and-rule principle. History shows that all attempts to federalize Ukraine were made by hostile external forces or their agents inside the country.

One exception here is the first federalization of Russia-Ukraine in the 12<sup>th</sup> century. It was a case of feudal fragmentation which was not imposed from the outside but was a logical stage in the development of medieval society. It weakened the first Ukrainian state so much that the Tatar invasion wiped it off the historical arena.

The 1667 Truce of Andrusovo divided Ukraine between Muscovy and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth along the »



Dnieper River and was also a kind of federalization. It triggered a bloody civil war tellingly called “the Ruin” and eventually led to the demise of the Cossack state. It was then that the division into easterners and westerners – so tragic for Ukraine – emerged.

Under Bolshevik rule, Russia federalized Ukraine by setting up such puppet autonomies as the Donetsk-Kryvyi Rih Republic and the Crimean autonomy. It also recognized and supported Nestor Makhno’s “free republic” as long as it was useful in fighting against the Ukrainian National Republic, General Denikin’s troops, the Germans and the French. Relying on these “independent republics”, Moscow suppressed an attempt to restore a Ukrainian state in the early 20th century and then scrapped these entities altogether.

In the interwar period, Poland “federalized” conquered Western Ukrainian lands and was trying to persuade the Lemko people that they were not Ukrainian. In Lemko schools, they even tried to replace the Ukrainian language with the Lemko dialect. Adolf Hitler was a convinced “Ukrainian federalist”. He divided the country into four parts: Galicia was made part of the General Government, while Bukovyna and the Odesa region were together named Transnistria and given to Romania, a Nazi ally. Central Ukraine was part of Reichskommissariat Ukraine headed by Erich Koch, another federalist, while eastern Ukraine was under the Nazi military administration.

The Kremlin made another attempt to “democratically” federalize Ukraine under Mikhail Gorbachev when there was a risk that Ukraine might break away from the Soviet empire. Moscow consistently and openly fuelled separatist movements in the Transcarpathian region, southern oblasts, the Donbas and the Crimea in the early 1990s. After the victory of national-democratic forces in 2005, the Kremlin’s idea to federalize Ukraine was revived – Viktor Yanukovich and Yevhen Kushnariov contrived a plan for the ill-famous South-Eastern Ukrainian Republic.

In our days, scared by the European choice of Ukrainians,

Modern-time supporters of federalization should remember that what they are trying to do to Ukraine is a delirious dream of not only their favourite Joseph Stalin but also Hitler and Koch

In Europe, the federal model and autonomous entities are present mainly in countries that have incorporated various peoples with their own ethnic lands. These are often modernized fragments of former empires. These models are unacceptable to Ukraine, because its lands are the ethnic territory of one Ukrainian people. One exception is the Crimea, which is the native land of the Crimean Tatars

Moscow and the pro-Russian Ukrainian ruling elite are grasping at the divide-and-rule principle as a drowning man grasps at a straw. This explains the current attempt to weaken the country through federalization after which its eastern part will go to Russia. However, modern-time Ukrainian supporters of federalization should remember that what they are trying to do to Ukraine is a delirious dream of not only their favourite Joseph Stalin but also Hitler and Koch.

History shows that each federalization attempt in Ukraine was accompanied by prolonged bloodshed and led to subjugation. Haven’t our leaders, who, instigated by the Kremlin, are willing to make the same historical mistake, learned the sobering lessons of the past? They are threatening federalization in order to preserve their criminal power. If history is any guide here, this will plunge the country into bloody confrontation.

## FEDERALISM OR SEPARATISM

Eastern Ukraine is one of the regions that have been the subject of federalization talk. However, it is home to an ethnographic group of Ukrainians (Slobozhany), so its separation would be not federalization but separatism, according to the European norms. Separatism is considered to be one of the gravest state crimes because it pushes the nation into a civil conflict. Nations and their leaders who fail to understand this are bound to step down from the historical arena, all the more so if they cannot learn lessons from their country’s past. Unlawful appeals made by ranking officials should not be justified by references to freedom of expression in Ukraine. Even in the biggest democracies of the world, an appeal to split the country is subject to prosecution rather than a topic for public discussion.

Imagine the reaction of Moscow and entire Russian society if Ryazan Oblast or Arkhangelsk Oblast decided to break off. What would the French do if Brittany, Gascony or Provence said they wanted to become independent entities within a federation? Why is the Ukrainian

justice system silent, while our post-Soviet statesmen view separatist talk as a manifestation of democracy? Are Ukrainians already more democratic than the French? Have Ukrainians forgotten the sad history of Ukraine federalization attempts? Or is there anyone wishing to join the ranks of such federalists as Stalin and Hitler?

Competition among nations for a place under the sun in today’s crammed world is only increasing despite all the talk of democracy and mutual tolerance. Therefore, if a nation and its state are incapable of adequately and rapidly reacting to such challenges as separatism, they are doomed to be subjected and assimilated by their more aggressive neighbours. Isn’t it time for our post-colonial criminalized “elite” to yield to a new, more dynamic generation of leaders who have no memory of being enslaved by Russia? Without this, Ukraine will keep repeating the mistakes of federalization, “brotherly” unions and so on.

Therefore, neither ethnographic diversity nor Ukrainian or world history furnishes any grounds for a federal Ukraine. On the contrary, the majority of large European nations with which Ukraine has close historical, cultural and spiritual ties have formed unitary states despite having ethnographically heterogeneous populations. These include Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, France, Italy and others. Numerous attempts to federalize Ukraine have been imposed from the outside by those who want to divide and rule. These historical lessons should be kept in mind by both the Ukrainian supporters of federalization who look up to Moscow and all Ukrainian citizens. They should be a safeguard against another criminal proposal of federalization, which inevitably leads to a civil conflict.

Ukrainians should not let themselves be fooled into destroying Ukraine through federalization that serves as a cover-up for plain separatism. In all civilized countries of the world, separatism is recognized as a grave crime, because it leads to splits, civil bloodshed and the death of the state and its citizens. ■

# Ukrainian Revolution: Western Perspective, Western Influence and Western Contribution

It was bitter on the one hand. The West didn't support us... Kept waiting... Negotiating... On the other hand, what did we expect? Did we hope that Europe would immediately side with the Maidan, believe in Ukrainian civil society and oust the tyrant out of power? Firstly, that is not how things are done in international politics. Secondly, European officials had every reason to be skeptical.

Ever since the official Kyiv prepared documents for association with the EU while using this as a bargaining chip to get more money from the opposite side, European politicians, let alone public opinion, have been puzzled and feeling that "there is nobody to trust there." What about the ideals of democracy, aspirations of the nation and common values, then? In realpolitik, the actual balance of powers continentally and globally, as well as the need to coordinate positions within such complex and somewhat poorly-managed entities as the EU, NATO, UN Security Council and the like, have pushed these ideals and values to the sidelines.

However, it was still fair enough for those who fought for Ukrainian democracy to expect more support from the West, even if moral rather than material - especially in the light of the stark contrast in the morals and even aesthetics of the forces confronting the EuroMaidan. Moreover, the Yanukovich regime kept doing anything possible, from shameless daily lies to blatant muscle-flexing in yet another crackdown on the Maidan on December 10 when the EU High Representative Catherine Ashton and US Assistant Secretary Victoria Nuland were in town, to test the West's patience. It didn't work.

To assess the indecisive and ineffective policy of Europe and the US regarding Ukraine, we will look

at the past three weeks when this policy became visible.

**On February 6** the European Parliament adopted a tough resolution on the situation in Ukraine demanding to "cease the shameful deployment of Berkut riot police and other security forces of provocations, kidnapping, harassment, torturing, beating and humiliating supporters of EuroMaidans". On the same day, a video with Russian subtitles where Victoria Nuland said "Fuck the EU" in a telephone conversation on the EU's passivity in dealing with the Ukrainian crisis with the US Ambassador to Ukraine Geoffrey Pyatt went viral. German Chancellor thought that such assessment was unacceptable.

**On February 7**, Viktor Yanukovich went to Sochi to see the opening ceremony for the Olympics. While there, he asked European officials to help him draft the Constitution he would "later put up for national discussion", while accusing Europeans of interference with Ukraine's domestic affairs.

**On February 10**, the EU Human Rights Commissioner Nils Muižnieks told Acting Interior Minister Vitaliy Zakharchenko that beating protesters with police batons was unacceptable. Zakharchenko agreed with that. The EU Council of Ministers shared its opinion on the situation in Ukraine from Brussels. Only a new government, a constitutional reform and fair presidential election can improve the situation in Ukraine, they said while refusing to impose sanctions. Ukraine's Interior Ministry thanked them and once again agreed with what they said.

**On February 11**, the US Congress passed a resolution to support the Maidan; EU Enlargement Commissioner Štefan Füle met with opposition leaders in Kyiv and held three-hour negotiations with Yanukovich the next day. The talks fo-

**Author:**  
**Yuriy**  
**Makarov**

cused on the revision of the Constitution, the establishment of a new government and a stabilization programme from international financial institutions. Meanwhile, Catherine Ashton talked about financial assistance to Ukraine with the IMF Executive Director in Washington. She said officially that the EU was looking at two approaches to Ukraine: pressure and support. We are deeply concerned with the developments and contemplating our actions, she said. I think Ukrainian authorities have gotten our signals very well, she noted.

**On February 13**, the EU hoped that an independent committee to investigate cases of violence during protests in Kyiv would start to work as soon as possible,

**IT WAS FAIR ENOUGH  
FOR THOSE WHO FOUGHT  
FOR UKRAINIAN DEMOCRACY  
TO EXPECT MORE SUPPORT  
FROM THE WEST**

Štefan Füle said during a visit to the Maidan.

**On February 15**, the US State Department welcomed the release of detained protesters and the opposition's decision to vacate administration buildings.

**On February 16**, Didier Burkhalter, Foreign Minister of Switzerland, said the OSCE believed that de-occupation of the Kyiv city hall by protesters would lead Ukraine out of the stalemate.

**On February 17**, German Chancellor Angela Merkel said she did not think it was necessary to impose targeted sanctions against Ukrainian officials to solve the crisis after her meeting with Vitaliy Klitschko and Arseniy Yatseniuk who came to Berlin upon her invitation. This was the first official contact with the opposition. She also approved the official Kyiv's de-

cision to amnesty EuroMaidan activists. Martin Schulz, President of the European Parliament, said the EU would be ready to sign the Association Agreement and FTA with Ukraine right after the crisis is solved and Ukraine fulfills the necessary conditions agreed before the Vilnius Summit without any additional terms.

**On February 18**, news came of new victims. Frank Wal-

**On February 20**, EU leaders officially announced visa and financial sanctions against officials of the Yanukovych Administration and pro-government MPs, as well as business owners who backed the regime thus making the use of unbelievable violence possible, at a meeting in Brussels. US President Barack Obama spoke on Ukraine for the first time at an international summit in Mexico, criticizing Vlad-

ski tried to talk the Maidan into accepting the compromise while US Ambassador Geoffrey Pyatt said in an interview for 1+1 TV channel that Ukraine needs Viktor Yanukovych to implement political changes and that Viktor Yanukovych should lead the country into the future.

**On February 22**, Yanukovych who fled Kyiv earlier accused foreign guarantors to the



ter-Steinmeier, German Foreign Minister, said Europe would have to revise its moderate approach to the case of targeted sanctions against Ukrainian officials responsible for the bloodshed in Ukraine.

**On February 19**, Radoslaw Sikorski, Poland's Foreign Minister, claimed that the EU could impose sanctions similar to the limited sanctions against Belarus or even those imposed against Cuba, Zimbabwe or Iran that proved effective.

imir Putin for disrespect of basic freedoms and support of repressions in Ukraine and Syria. He called on Kyiv to set up a transition government.

**On February 21**, Yanukovych and opposition leaders signed the Agreement to Solve the Crisis in Ukraine with foreign ministers from Germany and Poland and a diplomat from France. The agreement entailed the return to the 2004 Constitution and presidential reelection in December 2014. After that, Radoslaw Sikor-

ski tried to talk the Maidan into accepting the compromise while US Ambassador Geoffrey Pyatt said in an interview for 1+1 TV channel that Ukraine needs Viktor Yanukovych to implement political changes and that Viktor Yanukovych should lead the country into the future.

**On February 24**, Elmar Brok, Chairman of the European Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs, said that the EU was ready to provide EUR 20bn as financial assistance to Ukraine after it has a new government.

**On February 25**, Radoslaw Sikorski said in an interview for Polskie Radio that three states including the US, the UK and Russia, had signed the Budapest Declaration in 1994 after Ukraine gave up



its nuclear weapons. The Declaration specified their obligation to guarantee independence, territorial integrity and no pressure on Ukraine, meaning Russia's efforts to destabilize and disintegrate Ukraine. Meanwhile, "aides said he (Barack Obama – Ed.) wanted to wait until the critical moment, and it came when Americans saw indications that Mr. Yanukovich might turn loose the military on the pro-



PHOTO AP

testers..." the New York Times wrote. Washington is trying to distance itself and stay out of loud conflicts on the planet to prevent a situation where the victory of democracy in other countries would be seen as the spread of the US' influence, the publication wrote. Still, Moscow kept blaming the West and Washington in particular, officially and through presumably independent (yet totally loyal to the Kremlin) media, of orchestrating Ukrainian protests and direct financial and organizational backing

thereof, up to the training of the "fighters" on the territory of the US Embassy. In this sense, Russia's policy was completely predictable based on a number of factors: a) general paranoia that makes the key players believe in the nonsense they invented themselves; b) geopolitical claims whereby Ukraine is considered an originally Russian territory and part of the Russian World orbit; c) personal grudge of the Kremlin masters about losing the nice piece of land they spent so much time, energy and money to take over. On its part, Moscow does and will not spare money to undermine the disobedient vassal, if not to return what it had lost. This is done and will be done through support of undermining forces, separatists and possibly criminal elements since all these groups are closely intertwined historically. Russian propaganda will play its role too: it feels comfortable in Ukraine and has endless opportunities to reach out with its ruinous messages to the population as it dominates the media space.

Why did the West prove so shortsighted? Ukrainians have to realize that Ukraine is of little importance to Europe, let alone the US, despite its geostrategic location, resources and human potential. Geopolitically, Ukraine is rather part of relations with a complex, dangerous and unpredictable superpower that modern Russia is. Therefore, Ukraine is viewed through the Russian prism. Since Ukraine has given up its own nuclear weapons and its gas transit system is losing its crucial role because of the alternative Nord Stream, plus diversification of supply sources in the West, Ukraine is seen abroad as a potential problem area that should not get in the way of other countries. Changing this and transforming Ukraine into the territory of positive opportunities and pleasant surprises is something Ukrainians, not foreigners should do. Ukraine's desire to sometimes participate in international security operations is too little and unambitious of a contribution into the cause. However, some politicians and Russian groups of influence make an additional factor that is interested in Ukraine. European public opinion hardly reacted to the unprecedented scandal with a one-time leader of the most powerful Euro-

Despite its geostrategic location, resources and human potential, geopolitically, Ukraine is rather part of relations with a complex, dangerous and unpredictable superpower that the modern Russia is

pean state who became a top manager of the Russian gas company after he retired.

After all, money does not solve everything. Russia's influence on Europe goes very deep; many intellectuals and public figures like Moscow without any mercantile interests. Ukraine has no such influence or soft power.

Yet, some neighbours proved friends and allies indeed at times of need, not seeking any profits. Many diplomats, government officials and public figures of Poland, Lithuania and other countries of Eastern and Northern Europe consistently promoted Ukrainian interests, reminding their public as well as the entire European community what exactly the Euro-Maidan was struggling for. They may not all have believed in the victory of the Ukrainian revolution, but that made their help and compassion ever more valuable.

After all – it is actually crucial – Ukrainians should not have su-

## RUSSIA'S INFLUENCE ON EUROPE GOES VERY DEEP; UKRAINE HAS NO SUCH INFLUENCE OR SOFT POWER

per-high expectations of politicians and diplomats. To actually understand Ukraine's specific system of the past two or four years, they would have to collect and process a lot of data; monitor the key players, their interests and schemes of interaction; business links and more. Apparently, Western experts thought that these efforts would not be worth the outcome. This resulted in a situation where diplomats and intelligence services of most European states and the US ended up unarmed in the face of sudden and unpredictable developments in Ukraine.

The West did not imagine that Yanukovich's regime was a house of cards because it did not understand how it operated. Nor did it have any idea of what ground an alternative Ukrainian society should be based on.

The modern world offers two ways to make oneself known and respected: one is to be a threat. Another one is to be an object of fascination and jealousy. Today, we have one more chance to make the right choice. ■

Many diplomats, government officials and public figures of Poland, Lithuania and other countries of Eastern and Northern Europe consistently promoted Ukrainian interests, reminding their public as well as the entire European community what exactly the EuroMaidan was struggling for

# How to Be Good Neighbours

Ukraine is the biggest test of the EU's policy towards countries on its borderlands



**W**hen the European Union expanded to take in eight former Communist countries, leaders faced a conundrum: they did not want to keep extending the club eastward, neither did they want to tell Ukraine and others that they would be shut out forever. So they devised a middle way: the EU would offer to extend large parts of its single market to countries in eastern Europe, the Caucasus and the Mediterranean rim, without making any promises of membership.

This European Neighbourhood Policy was meant to create “a ring of friends”. Ten years on, Europe's borderlands look more like a ring of fire. Libya has been in violent chaos since the overthrow of Muammar Qaddafi. In Egypt one military ruler was replaced by another after a brief interlude with an elected president. Syria is suffering an ap-

palling civil war. Georgia has lost territory after a war with Russia. Belarus languishes under the dictatorial Alexander Lukashenko. Two small countries, Tunisia and Moldova, are the closest thing to success.

For a time it looked as if Ukraine would join the list of failures. Last November, ahead of a summit in Vilnius of the EU and ex-Soviet countries, President Viktor Yanukovich caved in to Russia and refused to sign an association agreement with the EU that included a “deep and comprehensive” free-trade deal. This was a pyrrhic victory for Russia. Pro-European protesters took to the streets of Kyiv and, after weeks of confrontation that culminated with the shooting of protesters, Yanukovich ran away.

Opinions around Europe are divided about the meaning of events in Kyiv. A recent paper by Stefan Lehne, a former Austrian

diplomat, argues that the neighbourhood policy has failed. Modelled on the enlargement process, it “does not work for countries that do not want close association with the EU, and the absence of the carrot of future membership frustrates those who do”, writes Lehne in his paper for Carnegie Europe, a think-tank. The slow process of enacting European standards, on everything from the environment to food safety, was designed for a stable world, not tumultuous revolutionary change. Others, though, are convinced that the victory of Ukraine's Maidan protesters is proof that Europe's soft power can still trump Russian bullying.

Ukraine presents the EU with an opportunity to redeem itself. The foreign ministers of Poland, Germany and France were in Kyiv at the height of the shooting, and may have facilitated a controlled collapse of Yanukovich's rule. The EU's foreign-policy chief, Cathy Ashton, was in Kyiv to urge victorious anti-Yanukovich parties to create an “inclusive” government and avoid witch-hunts. The visitors come away with a strong sense that they must not let down those who risked their lives. But as Lehne argues, their tools may be too limited.

The EU decided far too late to impose sanctions on Yanukovich's regime. The deal it offered Ukraine involved long-term modernisation and a pledge to support an IMF-sponsored adjustment programme. It said it would not be drawn into a bidding war with Russia, which instead offered a large instant loan and cheaper gas. Now Europeans are scrambling to come up with a short-term financial package to halt an imminent default. They are still hoping that Russia might contribute. They are also planning to send technical experts to help Ukraine manage reforms and ensure the

© 2014 The Economist Newspaper Limited. All rights reserved



money is not stolen. Andrew Wilson of the European Council on Foreign Relations, a think-tank, has proposed a longer to-do list. It includes help to recover stolen assets stashed away in Europe, limited interim trade-agreements to help kick-start the economy, inclusion of "civil society" in political reforms and facilitating EU visas for Ukrainians.

Soon the Europeans will have to decide whether to go ahead with the accord that Yanukovych rejected. Most think they should wait until Ukraine holds presidential elections, changes the constitution and then holds a ballot for the new parliament. The current crop of opposition leaders taking over power in Kyiv, not least Yulia Tymoshenko, the former prime minister, are viewed with suspicion by many Maidan protesters. EU officials also worry about provoking Russia in its already resentful mood.

In fact, the timing will be decided by Ukrainians themselves. Having been prepared to deal

with a man who now has much blood on his hands, and having promised Ukrainians that the accord remains on the table, the EU can hardly refuse if the interim government asks to sign it.

### BACK TO THE FUTURE

The signature ceremony would be a good time to answer the question Europeans have tried

operation". They should be more explicit and say that a future democratic Ukraine would be eligible to apply, even though the prospect is far off.

The Europeans should also rethink the neighbourhood policy, which lumps together disparate countries merely because they happen to be nearby. In the south it may have to devise a wider concept of its interests stretching out to the Sahel, the Horn of Africa and the Middle East. Here Europe has no real friends, lots of acquaintances and not a few enemies. To the east it needs better ways of helping those who want to move closer to the EU.

Above all, the EU needs a coherent policy to deal with Russia. Its members are divided between Russo-sceptics, particularly in the Baltic states and Sweden, and Russophiles including Cyprus, Italy and Hungary. Russia's behaviour in Ukraine should be a warning to all Europeans of the danger of embracing Vladimir Putin closely. ■

## RUSSIA'S BEHAVIOUR IN UKRAINE SHOULD BE A WARNING TO ALL EUROPEANS OF THE DANGER OF EMBRACING VLADIMIR PUTIN CLOSELY

to avoid for a decade: should they offer a "membership perspective" to Ukraine? Earlier this month EU foreign ministers dropped a cryptic hint in a statement, saying that the association agreement "does not constitute the final goal in EU-Ukraine co-



**ШИНОК**  
ЩИРА УКРАЇНЬСЬКА КУХНЯ

# UKRAINIAN FOLK PERFORMANCE

**Shynok – restaurant-museum  
of Ukrainian life**

Dishes from all the regions of Ukraine; 14 kinds of vareniks;  
7 kinds of Ukrainian salo; 18 kinds of homemade liquors;  
7 sorts of special homebrewed beer;  
Folk songs by national Ukrainian musicians; Souvenir shop.

28v, Lesi Ukrainki blvd., Kiev, Ukraine  
(044)285 57 77

Мировая Карта  
corporation



# Andrew Wilson:

## "The West did not react adequately to the usurpation of power by Yanukovych"



**Interviewer:**  
**Dmytro**  
**Potekhin**

**A**ndrew Wilson is a Senior Policy Fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations and a permanent Reader in Ukrainian Studies at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies (SSEES), University College London. He shared his views with *The Ukrainian Week* on the prospects for rapid reform in Ukraine, on the inadequate reaction of the West to the usurpation of power by Viktor Yanukovych and the absence of the rule of law, both under the Orange government and under that of Yanukovych.

**UW:** In 2009, you published a piece titled *Ukraine – From Orange Revolution to Failed State? Why such a pessimistic title?*

One reason for writing that piece back in 2009 is that Russians were using that phrase a lot. People like Gleb Pavlovsky (Russian political scientist and adviser to the Russian Presidential Administration until early 2011 – **Ed.**) were calling Ukraine a failed state. There are hardly any real failed states in the world, even Somalia isn't that bad. So it was more a question of a failing, weak central state – immobile state, I think was the phrase I settled on in that case. This is the Orange period when you had state institutions constantly fighting with each other and weakening each other in the process. You had a degradation of the judiciary, in particular.

**UW:** Do you think that it was worth having the Orange Revolution?

The story and its disappointment is a complex one. Of course it was worth trying. That's why we are where we now are, ten years later. It's not an action replay; it's not an Orange Revolution 2.0. Clearly, one event follows another and it has been a learning process of what went wrong and how it might be done better this time.

**UW:** Do you think it can be better this time? Do you think the chances for reform after violent action on both sides can be more efficient than in 2004?

It is now looking very difficult. One thing that Yanukovych was able to do when he came to power in 2010 was to take advantage of Orange fatigue, Ukraine fatigue.

**UW:** And he did take advantage – to further his own interests!

Well yes! He took too much advantage. A lot of his early power-grab was front-loaded, because he knew that the West would probably forgive too much in the short-term. And we certainly did in the period between February and October 2010. The reversal of the old constitutional change is the key moment when the regime developed into something different. But there were early steps that were also pretty much unconstitutional,

breaking the agreement in support of the imperative mandate, removing the Tymoshenko government. There were reforms that were deeply reprehensible, particularly the judicial reform of summer 2010. In October, the regime obviously changed track completely. Yanukovych was a legitimately elected president, but not as a president with that degree of power to be used for such self-interested purpose.

**UW:** So did he transform into a usurper? Is this possible in a democratic country, for a person who was elected with one set of powers to usurp power and continue to be called a president?

Quite clearly you have a situation where the change is made via the Constitutional Court. And in the Ukrainian system, as in many political systems, ironically, the Constitutional Court is the guardian of the Constitution. It clearly failed in its function with its decision, was reprehensible, shocking and confirmed its non-judicial reputation. In fact, it contradicted its earlier decisions, and of course the basic principle in the Constitution itself whereby changing the Constitution requires a special procedure. Some kind of consultation with a popular referendum was clearly mandatory.

**UW:** How about the West? It would have been strange if the

## Russian regime had condemned the violation of the rule of law in Ukraine, but do you think the West reacted as it should have?

No. The West woke up and began to react when the opposition was targeted with bizarre, brazen, selective prosecution. Justice is never selective. In 2011, there was the Yulia Tymoshenko case, which was the consequence of the centralisation of power, changes to the Constitution and the judicial reform of the summer of 2010. The West failed to make sufficient protest when those building blocks were put in place. It protested the consequences, rather than the cause.

The EU was turning a blind eye or did not protest strongly enough in 2010, then waking up and focusing on a particular issue in 2011 – the Tymoshenko prosecution

**UW:** Many are blaming the West for almost everything that is going on in Ukraine. But shouldn't Ukrainians themselves (politicians, political scientists, analysts, human rights activists, journalists and other public authorities and leaders of public opinion), who continued to recognise Yanukovich as the president, in spite of the unconstitutional situation in the country, have stopped legitimising him? Shouldn't they have been the first to act and provide society with accurate information?

You do have a paradoxical situation whereby Yanukovich won a free and fair election, endorsed by most of the key bodies, including the OSCE ODIHR. And then you have an unconstitutional abrogation of power. He was legitimately elected, but acted illegitimately. In such a case of the conflict of one principle or another, you need a constitutional arbiter. The Constitutional Court abrogated that function. The logical route for Ukrainian citizens might have been able to take the question to the European Court of Human Rights as a substitute constitutional arbiter, but they didn't.

**UW:** Instead, Ukraine, the West, and of course, Russia, kept dealing with this situation as if there were legitimate institutions in Ukraine and Yanukovich was a legitimate president?

– We can't go that far to talk about a total absence of legitimate institutions in Ukraine. As often in the post-Soviet world, in the 2012 parliamentary election, you had elements of façade democracy, ma-

It's not an Orange Revolution 2.0. Clearly, one event follows another and the past decade has been a learning process of what went wrong and how it might be done better this time

nipulation, the use of administrative resources, political technology, – all of that corrupts the process and reduces the quality of democracy and other elements of façade democracy, but it doesn't completely deny it. In some sense, those 2012 elections were surprisingly competitive, but the authorities had changed the rules, to reintroduce the okruhy (first-past-the-post constituencies where 50% of MPs were elected while the rest of the Parliament was elected through party lists – **Ed.**) and the Party of Regions actually lost under those old rules. We wouldn't be where we are today if Ukrainian democracy had been completely destroyed.

**UW:** Are you sure that this is democracy?

It's pluralism. You clearly have different parties, different regions. Now you have a situation where there is a disconnection between the various groups on the Maidan, the ordinary folks on the Maidan and the parliamentary opposition – now that's another question.

**UW:** Yes, that's pluralism, but can we have a democracy without the rule of law?

No. Ukraine does not have problems with the rule of law, Ukraine does not have an imperfect rule of law, Ukraine has nothing remotely resembling the rule of law. Serious problems were already accumulating during the period of the Orange government, but after the reform of 2010, the rule of law died. Then there is a problem when you have a pluralistic system, but no arbiter to support the rules of the game, and that was a huge problem, if we're going to get anywhere near real competition in future elections.

**UW:** Could the use of violence have been avoided? How could the conflicts have been resolved if the institutions were not working? What could have been done differently?

Well, with the West, the problem was that the EU was turning a blind eye or did not protest strongly enough in 2010, then waking up and focusing on a particular issue in 2011 – the Tymoshenko prosecution. This was important as a symbol of everything else that was going wrong, but not the sum total of everything that was going wrong.

America's voice was rather soft in this region during the Obama reset period. It seems to have woken up recently and has played a much more constructive role, but very recently.

As to domestic reaction, the Yanukovich regime is not a traditional full-on authoritarian regime. He's always gaming potential reaction. The government has kept a blurred picture, partly because it is skilled in the art of blurring, but also because the current parliament is not completely legitimate. The rules were changed, there was political technology, there were all sorts of administrative resources applied, which distorted what was otherwise a competitive vote. The key start for the violence on Tuesday (February 18 when the most violent clashes started as protesters tried to march towards the Verkhovna Rada. MPs were expected to vote for the change of the Constitution curbing the President's powers but failed – **Ed.**) was the government's refusal to begin the discussion of key questions and compromise.

**UW:** I feel that today, Ukraine is a failed state...

Ukraine can clearly become a stronger state. Yanukovich has been preparing his defences in many ways, stronger security forces in particular, since 2010, for the 2015 election. It clearly suits him if the opposition is radical, in a broader sense. It suits his narrative if the opposition is allegedly, which it isn't, dominated by radical nationalists. We've seen all attempts to slap a false narrative on the opposition in the last three months – nationalists, puppets of the West and anti-Semitism.

**UW:** Why did the EU not act? Or did it act, but this was such a sophisticated strategy that we have not yet understood it?

The protests began in support of the EU and European values. But Brussels proved itself incapable of acting decisively. The European Union's phobia against imposing sanctions manifested itself. Individual members of the organisation should have immediately imposed sanctions against corrupt elites. In truth, this is potentially a disaster for European soft power and reputation. ■

# Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea

**A**s William Hague, the Foreign Secretary, held crisis talks with Ukraine's new leaders in Kyiv at the weekend, London announced that it was pulling out of preparatory talks on the Sochi G8 summit, and warned President Putin that Russia's actions could lead to war.

In common with other NATO allies, Britain sees the Russian military occupation of Crimea as a blatant infringement of Ukraine's sovereignty and a threat to world peace. All weekend there were frantic telephone consultations between Britain and its European partners and the United States. British commentators and the press have described the events as the biggest East-West crisis since the Cold War.

While urging Ukraine not to respond to Russian "provocations," there is strong support across the political spectrum for Ukraine's sovereignty. "It is clear that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine has been violated," said Hague. "This cannot be the way to conduct international affairs".

The British Government has demanded that Putin withdraw those Russian troops who appear to be in control of the airport in Crimea and to halt preparations for a military invasion. But there is also caution about what to do next. In a year when many people have been remembering the anniversary of the start of the First World War, politicians have warned Moscow – and also Kyiv – not to do anything hasty to precipitate a chain of events that might end in open hostilities. Britain is trying to persuade the Russian and Ukrainian governments to talk directly to each other – either at the United Nations or in European security forums.

For many Britons, Crimea has an emotional resonance because of the long and bloody war fought against the Russians in the penin-

**Author:**  
**Michael**  
**Binyon**

British Foreign Minister William Hague visited Ukraine on March 3 to meet with Acting President Oleksandr Turchynov and Premier Arseniy Yatseniuk. "UK will give

**£10m**

of urgent technical help for economic + political reform in Ukraine. British team arriving in Kyiv today to work on this," he wrote on Twitter. Hague also visited Maidan and described it as a "scene of great sacrifices for Ukraine's future"



sula some 160 years ago. But today there are mixed feelings about Crimea. On the one hand, television news has shown the Russian-speaking population demonstrating against the fall of Yanukovich and has underlined the split in Ukraine between the westward-looking West of the country and the south and east that have closer links with Russia. On the other hand, the British press has been forthright in condemning what it sees as aggression by Russia and Putin's attempt to crush the new government in Kyiv.

What everyone realises, however, is that the West would find

it difficult to halt any Russian military incursion into Crimea. There is little public appetite for a full-scale military confrontation with Moscow, and few NATO countries are willing to commit troops to the defence of the Ukrainian government. NATO called an urgent meeting of its members, but is unlikely to issue a military ultimatum that could complicate the search for a diplomatic solution. Comparisons are being made with the war between Russia and Georgia. The most that now seems likely is that all normal relations with Russia will be suspended while diplomats



frantically try to work out a face-saving compromise between Kyiv and Crimea.

Those urging a tougher line against Moscow are aghast. Sir Roderic Lyne, a former British Ambassador to Russia, said at the weekend that the initiative would have to be taken by the Polish,



German and French governments as it was clear that President Obama had little wish to get involved and that Britain no longer seemed to have an effective foreign policy.

Despite the strong support for the new government in Kyiv, commentators have largely blamed Ukraine for bringing this tragedy upon itself. Newspapers and television have poured scorn on the country's record of mismanagement and bad government since independence. There were high hopes in the West that democracy would triumph after the Orange Revolution in 2004.

But the subsequent record of bickering, corruption and incompetence by the Yushchenko government has led many to conclude that no Ukrainian politician seems able or even willing to control corruption or run a democratic government free from factional bias or ethnic division. The Economist this week called the Rada a "nest of crooks and placemen".

The news that Ukraine now needs an urgent injection of USD 35bn to avert bankruptcy has produced incredulity: few Western countries will lend any money at all to a Ukrainian government without guarantees of political reform, transparency, national consensus and the recovery of the huge sums embezzled by Yanukovich and other corrupt politicians and oligarchs. Sir Roderic said Ukraine now needed "tough love" from the West. He added: "Alasting solution is not within sight. Ukraine is not a 'prize' to be won or lost by Russia or the EU. Ukraine, in its current state, is a liability".

There is also some dismay at the influence of extremists and anti-Semites who were present on Maidan. Their views have been given publicity in Britain and have not attracted support for the anti-Yanukovich cause.

Nevertheless, despite the very high numbers of Russians living, investing and working in Britain (more than 100,000 live in the London area), there is virtually no political support for President Putin and his nationalist policies. His uncompromising anti-Western and anti-American positions, authoritarian style and repression of dissidents and political opponents at home have given him

## IN COMMON WITH OTHER NATO ALLIES, BRITAIN SEES THE RUSSIAN MILITARY OCCUPATION OF CRIMEA AS A BLATANT INFRINGEMENT OF UKRAINE'S SOVEREIGNTY AND A THREAT TO WORLD PEACE

an image of an old-fashioned Soviet dictator, who is not to be trusted and who is invariably hostile to Western interests.

Indeed, some on the Right in Britain see the Ukrainian crisis as an ideal opportunity to confront and humiliate Putin. Wiser politicians say this would be extremely dangerous and counter-productive. As a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, Britain has to work closely with Russia on global issues. The danger of confronting Putin over Ukraine is that co-operation over Syria, for example, would become impossible. Britain also has huge investments in Russia, which could be confiscated or frozen. And the large number of Russian tourists coming to Britain could be halted, hurting Britain's tourist economy. On money-laundering, global terrorism, disease control and climate change Britain and other Western countries still need to keep open a dialogue with Moscow.

So far, there has been almost no lobbying from the Russian community in Britain – many of whom are in any case strongly opposed to Putin. Some of the richer ones, with property and investments in Britain and children at British private schools, have no wish to get involved in a political confrontation with their home country. The Ukrainian community, comprising about 11,000 people, has also been restrained in its comments, though Ukraine's ambassador to London has offered strong support to the new government and appealed for British solidarity.

The main worry for Britain and other Western governments is that Ukraine will collapse as a unified country, with old divisions between east and west becoming ever more acute. Politicians have been trying to convince Moscow that anything that sharpens the divisions within Ukraine would be disastrous as much for Russia as for the West. There are calls for NATO to invite Russia to become more closely involved in its discussions on security across Europe, and to give Russia a stronger presence at NATO headquarters. In the present tense atmosphere it seems very unlikely that Putin would contemplate any such offer. The Government, Parliament and the press in Britain all see a rapidly worsening crisis over Ukraine, with no obvious way out. ■

# Ukraine as the Latest Fashion

Poles supported the Maidan gladly and passionately – more so, I think, than Russia supported the anti-Maidans

**D**uring the decisive week of protests, which ended with the flight of Yanukovych, who was abandoned by his security forces, the Maidan was constantly on TV screens, smartphones and computers.

Euphoria reigns in Poland, where events in Ukraine were followed closely, now that the “guarantor” has beaten a hasty retreat. Poles remember how sincerely they were greeted on the Maidan, and say that they are Ukrainians’ blood brothers.

Mutual compliments sometimes reach grotesque proportions. For example, ultra-right MEP Jacek Kurski from *Solidarna Polska* (Solidarity Poland), came to Ukraine once everything was over. He was photographed on the barricade, with *Samo-Oborona* (Self-Defense) fighters in front of the Cabinet of Ministers’ building and with Klitschko, then posted these photographs on Facebook.

This photo session was soon ridiculed in the internet and labelled “Maidan tourism”, although it does show that to a certain extent, Ukraine is in fashion in Poland. It would be good for this period to last as long as possible, although fashion comes and goes – that’s its role.

The stereotype of a Ukrainian in Poland is the same as that of a Pole in the West: a shabby-looking street trader, who has uncertain relations with vodka and self-organisation. However, during popular uprisings (preferably without grudges against Poland), this stereotype changes to that of a campaigner for justice – a romantic warrior with an *oseledets* (the traditional Cossack haircut).

Poles are regarded in a similar manner in the West, but the romantic *oseledets* is replaced by a

romantic moustache. This was the case during two uprisings in the 19th century, again in the battle against the Bolsheviks in 1939, and during the Solidary movement.

Once the smoke clears above the field of battle, everything will go back to normal – including the stereotypes. The Poles’ romantic moustache is no longer the symbol of a hero, but a drunken villager. Unfortunately, the Ukrainian *oseledets* can expect the same – the distinction of a proud Cossack will become something uncultured and primitive, while the people wearing it will once more turn into the shabby street traders in worn-out unfashionable jackets. There is no need to fool yourself. Although I would prefer to be wrong, and predict friendship for Poles and Ukrainians, similar to that of Poland and Hungary, even if it is purely declarative.

After all, Poland and Ukraine have a mutual geopolitical enemy – Russia, and nothing joins countries together like a common adversary. However, I think that this pertains more to Western Ukraine. Eastern Ukraine takes no note of Poland at all, and if it does, then just like Russia, considers it to be a disobedient puppy that throws itself into the game of true geopolitical players.

For the central regions – the core part of Ukraine – Poland was only attractive as an outpost of the West, and the part of it that is most reminiscent of Ukraine, and the closest to it.

The last “Polish accent” of the previous revolutionary weeks was the irritated commentary of the Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Radosław Sikorski that a compromise with Yanukovych must be found, otherwise a state of emer-

**Author:**  
**Ziemowit**  
**Szczerek,**  
**Poland**

gency will be implemented, tanks will be brought in and everyone will be slaughtered.

It emerged that this speech was a huge oversight, because even if Yanukovych wanted to impose a state of emergency (and documents from *Mezhyhirya* confirm this), he was unable to do so: he was betrayed by his circle, and the security forces did not want to risk their lives and get blood on their hands while protecting his estate.

Sikorski was strongly criticised, particularly by the right: MEP Kurski (the “Maidan tourist”) hurled thunder from the Kyiv barricade saying that people cannot allow themselves such things.



Stanislaw Penta, a representative of the Law and Justice Party (no-one is more right-wing) referred to the Head of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as "Moscow's puppet" and said that he should not have called on Ukrainians to compromise, only to uncompromising battle and ultimate victory. Of course. Paraphrasing the well-known saying, "a Pole is only wise after the damage has been done", you can say that he is wise after everything has ended relatively well. Meanwhile, the bodies of the dead dampened the euphoria a little.

If there had really been damage as opposed to a successful finale, and Sikorski had called on Ukrainians to engage in uncompromising battle, he would have been called a bloodthirsty idiot. Such a scenario could not have been ruled out. Few remember that even former Polish President Kwasniewski, who best knew the situation in Ukraine (he and Pat Cox spent half of the autumn in Ukraine for negotiations), predicted that Yanukovych would fight until the bitter end. And he probably would if he had any chance.

Sikorski was furious when he came to Ukraine. He could hardly

hide that fury whenever he shook hands with Yanukovych, while his undiplomatic words about the state of emergency were not directed to the camera, but to one of the opposition politicians.

The Minister's fury drew more attention to him than he deserved, since he didn't bring anything new to the table when drawing apocalyptic visions for the opposition. His words were merely the persistent encouragement of compromise, which was seen as Sikorski's position from the very start: his solution to the crisis would have left both parties unsatisfied. Should he have chosen a different resolution? It's hard to say.

You get the impression that he wanted to play the role of Churchill, who similarly tried to cool the Polish hotheads, wanting to reinstate their pre-war borders after Hitler's defeat. The pragmatic Churchill knew well that Stalin would not agree to this, so persuaded the Poles to sit at the negotiation table and be ready for concessions. Then, Poland was still able to claw something back from the so-called outskirts on its eastern border: the issue at hand was Lviv or the Boryslav Basin. Till the very end, Poland did not believe in the compromise, and the border was established along the Curzon Line. Today, this seems to have been a good decision (although we shouldn't forget that Polish nostalgia for Lviv remains quite strong), but this is a different matter altogether.

If Churchill had persuaded the Poles to resist Stalin, they would not have gained anything, and the latter would possibly have reconsidered annexing former German territories to Poland.

Thus the British Prime Minister acted pragmatically, preferred to play it safe and not stake everything. This is what Sikorski did. He could rouse the indignation of the Maidan, but making such declarations, he should have counted on the realistic support of the Ukrainian opposition. This is not verbal or economic assistance, but real instruments of pressure. Otherwise, such a call could have drowned in a sea of blood. It is known that the option of force was considered. Even so, everyone was surprised that Yanukovych was not completely decisive, and spec-

ulated that given the opportunity, he would have taken every possible measure.

On Thursday, February 20, snipers shot at people on the Maidan, as if shooting at ducks. And everyone was surprised when on the night of Friday to Saturday, the police, Berkut riot police and titushkas withdrew from the government quarter, while Samo-Oborona (Self-Defense) entered government buildings.

In a word, it's easy to criticise Sikorski post factum. It's far more difficult to put oneself in his place. It finally emerged that as a whole, the Polish right had problems with the Maidan. It was quite funny to observe how they fluctuated between support for the anti-Rus-

## POLES UNDERSTAND THAT THOSE WAVING THE RED AND BLACK FLAGS ON THE MAIDAN ARE NOT THE ONES WHO INTEND TO PICK UP ARMS AGAINST THEM AGAIN

sian unrest (because the Polish right loathes Russia, although with its primitive views and demands, radicalism and its craving to subjugate the interests of the individual to national interests, lists of banned publications, lack of tolerance towards sexual minorities, it is more reminiscent of Russia, than anyone else) and the Ukrainian European vector (they still don't grasp the notion of the liberal, tolerant, anti-nationalist and worldly EU).

However, the funniest thing about the Polish right lies in something else: they are offended by Ukrainian nationalism; that it cannot duly admit the demons of its own past and recognise its mistakes. Meanwhile, they fail to do this with their own home-grown demons. Poland is afraid of Ukrainian nationalism. To a certain extent, this is logical, because it, just like all the others, is bad. But to be honest, Poles generally understand that those waving the red and black flags on the Maidan are not the ones who intend to pick up arms against them again.

Glory to Ukraine! Dear Ukrainians, you have achieved an unbelievable feat! ■

Radoslaw Sikorski was strongly criticised in Poland for encouraging Ukrainian protesters to accept a compromise with Yanukovych

PHOTO: AP



# The Curse of the Worn-Out Vocabulary



Author:  
**Leonidas  
Donskis,**  
*Lithuania*

Over the past days and weeks, on a quick look at Russian TV channels (I have one even in my hotel at Strasbourg not to relax from the disturbing complexities of our life in the EU and in the vicinity – especially after comparison of Russian TV with BBC News or French TV) it was difficult to get rid of a déjà vu feeling. Every piece of information about Ukraine there is strikingly and frighteningly similar to what I had long been listening immediately after 13 January 1991 when the Soviet troops killed fourteen peaceful civilians in Vilnius.

When Lithuania declared its independence on 11 March 1990, it was just the beginning of a long and winding road of the first breakaway republic of the former Soviet Union. The country had a turbulent period full of unsafety, uncertainties and insecurities, which was a logical outcome of the threat that Lithuania posed for the mortally wounded and slowly dying empire. Yet the highest price was still to come. And it came on 13 January when fourteen people lost their lives depriving the Soviet Union the remains of its political and moral legitimacy.

Although peaceful and innocent people were killed, there was not a single case of blasting Russia or Russians as a nation. Everybody understood that the USSR was the name of evil. The reaction of the Kremlin had nothing to do with the feelings of the Russian intelligentsia, not to mention fearless and noble-minded Russian dissidents. Immediately after bloodshed and casualties in Vilnius a group of Russian writers and academic came to Lithuania to express their sympathy to Lithuanians coupled with their dismay at the Kremlin's actions. Among them, Sergei Averintsev, an eminent Russian cultural historian and poet, read out his poem on Vilnius as the city of freedom on whose stones the blood of innocent people was shed.

Yet there was another side of the coin – the official reaction by court journalists and various groups of sycophants which had gone so far as to suggest that Lithuanian snipers were killing their own fellow citizens to compromise and discredit the peaceful and progressive Kremlin – that same Kremlin whose master was at that time in Oslo for the Nobel Peace Prize which he received for his “humane policies.”

However, the point is that Lithuania spoiled the show – just like Maidan spoiled the Sochi Olympics for the new master of the Kremlin and the real mastermind of the Olympics as a high point in Russia's history and as a seeming comeback of the country to the club of the most powerful and significant global players. Gary Kasparov has made a good point suggesting that for the sake of gold medals Vladimir Putin gladly sacrifices his imperial chauvinism buying foreign talents and offering them Russian citizenship. According to Kasparov, had Adolf Hitler been less fanatical in his mad racist mythology, he would have bought in 1936

Jesse Owens to win four gold medals for Germany. I wish many gay and lesbian athletes won the gold medals in Sochi proudly emphasizing their identity and sexual orientation – for a gay or lesbian athlete for Putin would be what Owens was for Hitler.

Watching Russian TV channels and reading comments of state officials and culture people, one cannot help feeling of being back in time. Astonishingly enough, nothing has changed in terms of rhetoric and perception of reality. If the megaphones of the Kremlin sounded aggressive and bitter in the late 1980s about how the Baltic States will unavoidably fail both economically and culturally (“Who needs you there in the West?”), now they reached the depths of madness and folly – suffices it to mention the fascist political clown Vladimir Zhirinovskiy launching the campaign of military volunteers to save their Russian brethren

in Ukraine, a grotesque form of exploring how far the Kremlin can go boosting the fighting morale of court patriots. The worn-out vocabulary of some writers and public figures appears no better than pathological tirades of Zhirinovskiy.

Labeling Ukrainians en bloc as Banderovites (banderovtsy in Russian), terrorists, fascists, or else, is not only morally repugnant. It shows how miserable, cynical, misguided, and misplaced the whole public political discourse is in Russia.

**LABELING UKRAINE AS  
FASCIST CAMOUFLAGES  
THE RISE OF FASCISM IN  
RUSSIA ITSELF. RUSSIAN  
SOCIETY INCREASINGLY  
GETS CLOSE TO FASCISM  
DUE TO THE ATMOSPHERE  
OF HATRED AND  
XENOPHOBIA**



The irresponsible and embarrassingly inadequate use of the term “fascism” can only be explained by the spell of the political-historical narrative which legitimized the description of anyone crushed by the Red Army during and after World War II as a fascist, and any form of anti-Communism as fascism. It would be sobering for those in Russia who crave for exposing the supposed Ukrainian nationalism and antisemitism to remember the darkest traditions of antisemitism in Russia.

All in all, the logic of this picture bears family resemblance to the logic of Jean Baudrillard's simulacrum: just like Disneyland camouflages the fact that it is not Disneyland that should strike us as a freakish thing but, instead, the whole USA which is a single Disneyland. Labeling Ukraine as fascist camouflages the rise of fascism in Russia itself. Russian society increasingly gets close to fascism due to the atmosphere of hatred and xenophobia. Coupled with homophobic legislation and crackdown on NGOs and civil society at large, it leaves a feeling of the failed democratization of Russia. The projection of one's own deceases and traumas onto others does not help much.

This is why it is pivotal to resist these regrettable insinuations against Ukraine whose people continue to be on the frontline in the battle for decent and civilized politics, and against kleptocracy, mafia state, and crony capitalism defending everything that modern Europe stands for – including the fight against real, and not imagined, fascism. ■

BOOKS IN UKRAINIAN  
AND OTHER LANGUAGES  
GIFT EDITIONS AND ALBUMS  
MAPS, ATLASES, GUIDEBOOKS  
CHILDREN'S SECTION  
OPEN 09:00AM-09:00PM DAILY  
PLACES FOR READING  
CD/DVD SECTION  
MUSIC, FILMS, AUDIO BOOKS  
FREE WI-FI™  
LITERARY EVENTS

ONLINE BOOKSTORE: [WWW.BOOK-YE.COM.UA/SHOP](http://WWW.BOOK-YE.COM.UA/SHOP), WEBSITE: [WWW.BOOK-YE.COM.UA](http://WWW.BOOK-YE.COM.UA)



B O O K S T O R E S

**KYIV**

3, vul. Lysenka tel: (044) 235-88-54; 5, vul. Spaska tel: (044) 351-13-38,  
33/2, Povitroflotskiy Prospekt tel: (044) 275-67-42

**LVIV**

7, Prospekt Svobody tel: (032) 235-73-68

**VINNYTSIA**

89, Soborna tel: (0432) 52-9341

**TERNOPIL**

7-9, vul. Valova tel: (0352) 25-4459

**KHARKIV**

3, vul. Sumska tel: (057) 731-5949

**IVANO-FRANKIVSK**

31, vul. Nezalezhnosti tel: (0342) 72-2502

**VOLODYMYR-VOLYNSKIY**

6, vul. Kovelska tel: (03342) 2-1957

[www.book-ye.com.ua](http://www.book-ye.com.ua)

O N L I N E B O O K S H O P

[WWW.BOOK-YE.COM.UA/SHOP](http://WWW.BOOK-YE.COM.UA/SHOP)



# Volodymyr Vasylenko:

## "Government bodies were first and foremost responsible for a civilized regulation and solution of the conflict"

**T**he *Ukrainian Week* speaks to Volodymyr Vasylenko, expert in international law and former Ambassador of Ukraine, about Viktor Yanukovich's responsibility for crimes against Ukrainian people, grounds for prosecution by the International Criminal Court in Hague and actual assistance the West can provide to Ukraine today.

**UW:** Apart from statements of concern, how else could the international community actually help Ukraine preserve the remaining peace in Ukraine and facilitate democracy?

The international community could help by abandoning their declarations and declarative statements that put protesters and the government on an equal scale. The West should have taken into account the fact that the Party of Regions led by Viktor Yanukovich was not a political party but an organized criminal group that did not speak the language of law or justice but exercised the right to force and arbitrariness. That government focused on force and fraud. Appealing to both sides of the conflict to stay away from the use

**Interviewer:**  
**Hanna Trehub**

of force and to hold fair elections manifested complete lack of understanding of the situation in Ukraine.

If they were actually willing to help Ukraine, Western states should have imposed targeted sanctions against members of Yanukovich's team who are responsible and were engaged in crimes against humanity. If the West wants to help ensure fair

elections normally come two days before the voting takes place. They do not go far into details and do not know the overall situation well enough. Then, they report of fair elections in Ukraine while having no idea of the massive rigging during the counting. If Western states actually want to help Ukraine have fair and transparent elections, they must send numerous groups of qualified observers to stay here throughout election campaigns. That would allow them to actually contribute to preventing falsifications.

Law enforcers and Berkut riot police must realize that crimes against humanity have no statute of limitations. Sooner or later, they will have to answer for what they have done. Ukraine has laws that entail punishment for tortures and intentional infliction of serious injuries, murder and the like. The government needs political will to launch the mechanism of justice and to hold the guilty liable. However, we have seen an opposite situation. Berkut troops that took part in the violent dispersal of the peaceful rally on November 30 was awarded, not punished. Not a single Berkut officer

**LAW ENFORCERS AND THE RIOT POLICE SHOULD REALIZE THAT THEY HAVE COMMITTED CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY WHICH HAVE NO STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS. THEY WILL BE HELD LIABLE SOONER OR LATER**

A regime that usurped power in Ukraine and consistently violated the Constitution and laws has no moral right to demand that its citizens abide by law

elections in Ukraine, the Venice Commission must demand Ukrainian legislature to upgrade the Law on Presidential Elections to European standards. In its current version, the law has loopholes to rig election results.

Whenever elections take place in Ukraine, Western ob-



or interior troop was held liable; they did not face criminal charges. However, it will all come. They have not faced charges under the Ukrainian Criminal Code, nor the norms entailed by the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. This Statute entails imprisonment for up to 30 years for crimes against humanity and lifelong terms for grave crimes against humanity.

**UW: Who stood behind the massive bloodshed and the blocked capital of Ukraine on February 18-19?**

The regime led by Viktor Yanukovich is directly responsible for the unprecedented violation of human rights. He was manipulated by the chekist Kremlin administration. The illegitimacy of the force operation of the authorities against the Maidan was a tool of intimidation for the entire Ukrainian society.

If we speak about closing down of three metro lines in Kyiv and huge traffic jams resulting from the actions of the Kyiv City Administration Head or the administration of the Kyiv metro, the effective Criminal Code has provisions on abuse of office. This was done arbitrarily, in excess of powers and intentionally to not just cause discomfort for passengers, but to prevent people from going to the Maidan, to prevent freedom at a critical moment. Therefore, the administration of the Kyiv City Administration and Kyiv metro should qualify as people involved in the crimes against Maidan activists and Ukrainian society.

**UW: The US made a clear point that the entire responsibility for what happened during the most violent clashes is personally on Viktor Yanukovich. A statement was made that he should be held accountable at the international court. What would take him there?**

Ukraine has not ratified the Rome Statute, so its jurisdiction does not cover crimes against humanity committed on Ukrainian territory. In practice, people who committed international crimes on the territory of Ukraine, such as Yanukovich, can only be removed from power. ■

## The Statement of the Public Commission to Investigate Human Rights Violations in Ukraine to February 18 bloodshed

The events of bloody Tuesday, February 18, 2014, confirmed that the Viktor Yanukovich-controlled, anti-constitutional and authoritarian regime resorted to large-scale war against the Ukrainian people (the statement was issued on February 18. After that, Viktor Yanukovich was impeached so his title as president mentioned below is no longer valid – Ed.). This war is accompanied by a new wave of gross violations of fundamental human rights and basic individual freedoms. Using specially trained provocateurs, who have been infiltrated well in advance into the surroundings of the nonviolent protest movement, the government has now used unlawful brutal force against the participants of a peaceful march to Parliament and initiated a barbarous "cleansing" of the Maidan.

By cruel and disproportionate use of force to suppress legitimate protest, the anti-Ukrainian authorities are trying to intimidate Ukrainian society in its entirety. Citizens of Ukraine have become hostages and victims of the criminal acts of government that has proved to be incapable of finding a civilized solution to a political crisis provoked by its own actions. The Government's responses to the just demands of society have come in the form of cynical provocations and crimes against humanity that have been committed by President Yanukovich's security forces and the criminal elements under their control.

The primary responsibility for any further escalation of human rights violations, including murder, grievous bodily harm, torture, persecution on political grounds and other crimes against humanity, falls directly on the President of Ukraine, his political entourage and the heads of his security agencies. However, direct liability also falls on any member of the law enforcement agencies involved in committing such crimes. The Commission considers that the accomplices of these crimes against humanity, not only include the personnel of Berkut and the internal security forces, but also the heads of the Armed Forces and the Ministry of Emergencies of Ukraine, as they deliberately provided to the government perpetrators at their assembly points, military vehicles and equipment to be used against peaceful protestors. The Commission also is of the opinion that the accomplices of the criminal assault of Independence Square [Maidan] are the leaders of the KMDA (Kyiv City State Administration – Ed.) and the City Metro system, which arbitrarily stopped the movement of metro trains and thus deprived the residents of Kyiv of the opportunity to help the defenders of freedom at a critical moment. However, the blocking of roads by

the traffic police on the outskirts of Kyiv and near the Maidan, limiting the broadcast of TV Channel 5, the creating an information blockade on officially controlled news and media feeds, all these measures are practically equivalent to introducing illegally a state of emergency in the capital.

The Commission draws the attention of the President of Ukraine, Viktor Yanukovich, heads of security agencies and all of their employees, that under the Constitution of Ukraine, citizens have the right to peaceful protest, and one of the main tasks of the police is to ensure public order and protect the life and health people. Employees of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Security Service should be carrying out only protective law functions - not punitive functions.

The Commission calls upon all members of law enforcement agencies that under no circumstances should they participate in the cruel and excessive use of force or take special actions against peaceful protestors, and reminds them that under Article 60 of the Constitution of Ukraine, no one is obliged to accept and execute manifestly criminal orders and instructions. Issuance or execution of clearly criminal orders entails criminal liability.

The Commission also notes that crimes against humanity have no statute of limitations, and those who committed them, regardless of their status, shall be liable in accordance with national and international law and procedures of the International Criminal Court.

The Commission calls on President Viktor Yanukovich to immediately stop the unlawful use of force against peaceful participants in protests in Kiev and throughout Ukraine.

The Commission calls on the international community and, in particular, on the heads of the European institutions, the governments of Western democracies, to adopt individual sanctions against V. Yanukovich and his team members for their gross violations of human rights in Ukraine caused by their criminal behavior.

Also, the Commission calls on Ukrainian citizens to unite Ukraine and undertake organized peaceful resistance to the regime's attempts to destroy democracy in Ukraine and turn it into a satrapy. Only the joint efforts of Ukrainian society can remove from power the criminals and to restore constitutional order in Ukraine, respect for human dignity and creating appropriate conditions for everyone to live in security and prosperity.

**Kyiv February 18, 2014  
Volodymyr Vasylenko, Commission  
Chairman**

# The Political Side of Ukraine's Oligarchy



Author:  
Ihor Losev

In numerous publications and discussions, authors confuse having wealth and being an oligarch. Indeed, there are no poor oligarchs, but not every superrich person falls into this category. What makes a person an oligarch is not huge capital as such but something else.

The Greek word *oligarch* describes the rule of a handful of rich people. In Ancient Greece, people forced oligarchs to serve the interests of a polis and its community by burdening them with so-called liturgies, or duties, such as building military ships, financing municipal services and paying for theatre tickets so that ordinary Athenians could watch, regardless of their income, a new tragedy by Sophocles or Euripides. Ancient Greek society controlled oligarchs, while in Ukraine oligarchs control society. Quite a reversal after 2,500 years.

Oligarchy with its modern, largely negative connotations means shadow power enjoyed by superrich people within a country. It is mainly achieved through corruption, bribery or financial enslavement of the top officials when the Cabinet of Ministers becomes a committee for managing oligarch's affairs, essentially turning the state itself into a mechanism serving the business interests of several families. Without such covert power, riches in themselves do not lead to oligarchy. Superrich people live in many civilized and democratic countries, but they do not have covert leverage with the state authorities there.

Modern Western democracy demands that any influence be transparent and public. For example, representatives of the Rockefellers, Kennedies and other families were able to have access to power only through democratic channels and governed the country, a state or a city not anonymously behind the scenes but openly via the mandate granted to them by voters, while being constantly under fire from the ubiquitous free press. Add to this the powerful code of laws tested by the two centuries of American statehood, the system of checks and balances, the legal and political balance which is constantly being honed and so on.

Naturally, this does not eliminate powerful lobbying groups in the USA, but they operate within boundaries set by legislation on lobbying and act transparently and publicly. In contrast, oligarchic clans in Ukraine put pressure on ex-President Leonid Kuchma behind the scenes. (Kuchma belonged to one of these clans and was quite comfortable arbitrating interclan disputes.) Ukrainian society learned about — and often experienced first-hand — the results of oligarchs'

infighting in the form of new laws, strategic economic decisions and personnel reshuffles.

Party of Regions propagandists need not point to the West suggesting that oligarchs and lobbyists exist there as well. They do, but the West also has an uncorrupted independent judiciary, the truly free press, powerful human rights NGOs and other reliable mechanisms protecting citizens and democracy, while all these things are missing in Ukraine. Even more ludicrous are the attempts of Party of Regions lawyers, such as Vadym Kolesnichenko and Volodymyr Olynyk, to compare the punitive and repressive measures adopted on 16 January 2014 with their Western "counterparts".

Owning over 60 per cent of the national wealth, with some estimates as high as 90 per cent, oligarchs in Ukraine rule not only the economy but also politics. Having huge financial resources and strong connections to administrators at all levels, they can manipulate parliamentary and local elections and the activities of political parties. In Ukraine, it is extremely hard to be a politician and resist becoming dependent on oligarchic capital, because there are few things in this country it does not control.

It is no secret that political forces, including some in the opposition, are financed by oligarchs, so it is vain to hope that "a Washington with a new and righteous law", as Taras Shevchenko put it, will emerge from this environment. As Ukraine becomes increasingly democratized, it will probably have to revert to state financing of parliamentary parties. Oligarchs also control the Verkhovna

## AS UKRAINE BECOMES INCREASINGLY DEMOCRATIZED, IT WILL HAVE TO REVERT TO STATE FINANCING OF PARLIAMENTARY PARTIES

Rada. Many political scientists routinely allege in their writings that Rinat Akhmentov has 50 loyal MPs in Ukrainian parliament. A question then arises: Do other oligarchs, such as Dmytro Firtash, Ihor Kolomoiskyi, Viktor Pinchuk, Yuriy Ivaniushchenko and Oleksandr Yanukovych, have their own faithful MPs, and if so, how many?

There are reasons to believe that what we are dealing with here is not even lobbying but the ancient Roman clientele system when a client, who was dependent on his patron, joined him in people's assemblies but voted strictly as ordered by the patron. Could this be





the reason why many political scientists publicly said they hoped those 50 MPs would receive orders from their patron and vote to help solve the social and political crisis in parliament?

The clan-oligarchic system forces the entire country to develop and transform in the interests of a handful of “rulers of life” rather than the absolute majority of people. These selected few control the state budget, the government, the most important government decisions and even the presidents, from Leonid Kravchuk to Viktor Yanukovich.

However, experience shows that oligarchs are no supporters of social and economic progress. They have vested interests in preserving archaic forms of economic activity and political life, particularly through their support of Soviet traditions and parliamentary votes in favour of ideological laws inspired by communism and the Soviet empire, such as the one on “the protection of historical memory” in its Soviet redaction. They also form alliances with the communists, stall modern economic and social reforms and prevent healthy competition in every way by establishing monopolistic rules of the game, which they are able to do thanks to their exclusive access to the top government officials. The type of capitalism Ukraine experiences thanks to the oligarchs has been dubbed “capitalism with a Bolshevik scowl” by some wisecrackers.

Businesses owned by the oligarchs are not prime examples of technological progress, either. Most of them are low-level metallurgic and chemical processing plants, mines, agricultural exporters, etc.

Ukrainian oligarchs are typical comprador bourgeoisie, to use a Marxist term. With its purely export orientation, it undermines the development of Ukraine’s domestic market, which is critical not only for economic reasons but also for the unity of the nation and the state. Using their pull within the government, the oligarchs are pursuing the policy of blocking and isolating medium and small businesses viewed as competitors that break their oligarchic monopoly.

There are very good reasons to suspect that the Ukrainian oligarchs are not efficient owners. They can only be efficient in the absence of fair competition, while exploiting their exclusive access to the

budget and total corruption in the government. This is one of the reasons why the Ukrainian oligarchs are wary of deep pro-European reforms and the country’s European integration. The wild Russian-style monopolistic capitalism is something that understand better than the European and North American norms of business life. The Russian capital scares them not ontologically but at the situational level as a much too powerful a competitor in a game without rules. If it were not for this factor, they would happily plunge themselves into the familiar environment of lawlessness, bribes, kickbacks and hostile takeovers in the interests of the select few and favourable monopolism for the chosen ones.

The oligarchs have small chances of becoming “friends for whom nothing is too much to give” and high chances of finding themselves among the enemies against which “the law” will be applied. This is what urges them to show an overall friendly reaction to European integration projects. However, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century a large European state cannot be held hostage to the narrow interests, psychological complexes and phobias of a few oligarchic families. As long as the clan-oligarchic system is in place, it will impossible for Ukraine to make any progress. ■





# Tycoon Wars: Elusive Hope

Economic changes should be deep. Otherwise there will be no change

**Author:**  
**Yuriy**  
**Radchenko**

**M**any felt outraged when MPs from oligarchs' groups did not show up at the first session of the new Parliament. The next day, however, most deputies servicing the oligarch system were voting unanimously according to recommendations of their bosses on the phone.

Apparently, they are feeling optimistic. That runs counter to what could make the Maidan feel that way. Undoubtedly, this optimism is based on solid ground.

Firstly, the experts around the Maidan have barely raised the issue of deep reform of Ukraine's feeble economy – and if they did, it was purely prognostic. Currently, two interesting concepts prevail there. One is that oligarchs are the force that will help lift the economy ruined by the Family out of the abyss. The other one is that nothing too bad will happen if Ukraine announces a default.

Secondly, the swift and virtually monopolistic takeover of the current government (and the future one too given Yulia Tymoshenko's speech from the Maidan stage) by Batkivshchyna is very similar to 2009 when the Bloc of Yulia Tymoshenko (BYuT) and the Party of Regions (PR) tried to set up a broad coalition to turn Ukraine into a two-party country. Back then, the idea of ensuring long-term economic and political stability was another crucial argument in favour of the new coalition.

As to oligarchs, they always switched to a new government only after they were sure that the old one was facing a defeat. They did so when Viktor Yushchenko replaced Leonid Kuchma, and when Yushchenko lost the election to Viktor Yanukovich. This time,

the first signal came from the Dnipropetrovsk-based oligarch Ihor Kolomoyskyi who publicly warned Kharkiv Mayor Hennadiy Kernes to stop fueling separatism.

Another key message in this sense is the interview by Hennadiy Korban, a one-time, posted on the *Economichna Pravda* (Economic Truth) web-



site on February 6. The interview promotes the idea of “old capitals” and mentions specific names, including those of oligarchs Rinat Akhmetov, Ihor Kolomoiskyi, Hennadiy Boholiubov and Viktor Pinchuk, are good and perfectly legitimate, and the revolutions should “engage them and ask them for help in running the country.” The capitals of “young oligarchs” accumulated over the years of the Family’s reign are bad because they came from unfair tenders and embezzlement of public funds. Ihor Kolomoiskyi was the one to provide his plane to Korban to flee to Israel from political persecution.

On February 24, Rinat Akhmetov finally spoke his word against separatism. Apparently, the Family was ultimately betrayed. This impression grew stronger when, on March 2, Ihor Kolomoiskyi was appointed the Governor of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast, while another oligarch, Serhiy Taruta, headed the Donetsk Oblast Administration, without any discussions with the Maidan and in violation of all principles of separating business from power declared earlier. Taruta told the press immediately that he would “rely on Akhmetov’s shoulder”. Apparently, the Great-Absolutely-Legitimate-Capital promoted by



A question to Kostiantyn Matvienko, member of the Public Expert Council and expert at the Gardarika strategic consultancy: “Have you raised the issue of dismantling the oligarch system among the Maidan experts?”

“As far as I know, this issue has not been raised. So far, we are talking about liberalization of SMEs and a framework of antimonopoly laws.

As to the disintegration of oligarch businesses, this is not being discussed. However, this does not mean that it should not be done. We should wait till the time is right,” is the answer. “Now, it is important to improve the state’s institutional capacity and do so with the help of oligarchs. Once we are in a normal legal process, this business will surely be fragmented into smaller pieces to prevent the economy from being monopolized by oligarchs in the future. We will surely do an inventory of all national economy. But I can’t give you deadlines. I think the interim government will start this. But this is something that takes more than one year.”

the one-time raider, Hennadiy Korban, can now take over the crisis.

However, two purely economic problems are in their way in addition to the political one (the birth of the new Ukrainian social community). One is tactical. The previous government left a financial hole so deep that plugging it could prove too burdensome even for all Ukrainian oligarchs united if they were willing to do that.

Another one is strategic. If Ukraine’s economy goes under total control of the same old people, more political liberalization through economic liberalization will be its only difference from the old system.

Let us look at these problems in detail.

## CONFUSING CHAOS

The courage of people is not the only thing that ensures victory of the current social revolution. Another crucial factor is the fact that the system of power, cumbersome and expensive, is far less effective than the machine of the revolution in economic terms, even if it operates almost perfectly from tactical and strategic standpoints. When it makes serious mistakes, its efficiency plummets to zero. We have seen this in gradual escalations of tension around Maidan.

The regime would need at least USD 15-20bn every year to secure weak protection for itself by compensating for the money transferred offshore by oligarchs and pacifying the part of the population employed in the public-funded sector, as well as maintaining law enforcers and the prosecutor apparatus. With the protest energy, USD 10-20bn is enough since youth extremism and actual protest sentiments constitute a free resource available, for instance, in the post-revolution Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, Yugoslavia and Middle East. So, the West has learned to work extremely effectively with the pyramid-like ideology as a leading post-industrial instrument.

Once the government is replaced, the long anticipated technical government comes into play. What does it face? Where will it get the funds to cover the gap between proceeds and expen-



ditures if the current economic system remains unchanged? Recent hysterical talks of the upcoming default and unpopular yet vital measures are a perfect illustration to the scale of systemic crisis in Ukraine.

The cap budget deficit of 2014 was set at UAH 71.5bn. According to Viktor Pynzenyk, ex-Minsiter of Finance and ex-Vice Premier in several Cabinets, the real number is UAH 200bn, while financial analyst and investment manager Eric Naiman spoke of UAH 100bn.

The new Ministry of Finance estimated the amount of macro-financial assistance in 2014-2015 at USD 35bn, i.e. UAH 280bn by the old "stable" exchange rate of UAH 8/USD 1. Those who anticipate a default speak of up to USD 60bn which Ukraine needs in 2014 and 2015. This includes the balance of payments deficit, repayments of public debt plus payments under loans taken earlier, uncollected taxes, transport and utility charges, pension fund deficit, expenditures on the start of the farming season, outstanding payments on wages, repayments of direct government-backed debt and corporate debt, and more.

This chaos that leaves even the top economists confused is further aggravated by horrendous unemployment. The official statistics only covers people registered at the public unemployment service, showing a meager 1.5%. This does not include shell Individual Entrepreneurs, employees reporting minimum wages while getting the rest in envelopes (this is a widespread tax-minimization practice), temporary employment or holders of three to four jobs, each paying peanuts. Maidans all over Ukraine show that official unemployment statistics is nonsense.

## WHAT'S NEXT

It is obviously pre-term to speak of any further methods now. Moreover, the threat of a war ruins any projections. Still, there are a few points to note.

1. It may well happen that the endless gaps in Ukraine's budget will have to be plugged not by Europe and US or Russia alone, but by all of them jointly, after the current turmoil abates.

Europe still needs Russian gas. The idea that the offer of a choice between western or eastern partnership that excluded cooperation with the opposite party was too much for Ukraine was already discussed by Berlin and Moscow at the Russia-EU Summit in Brussels on January 28. Now, many publications write that Ukraine is an independent player only politically, and all big European players, unlike the US

Ukraine plummets into default and applies austerity measures. A structural reform to revive production is hardly possible without partial economic autarky whereby the product manufactured domestically enjoys preferences over imported goods to provide employment as high as possible. Meanwhile, anything not produced domestically should have open access to the country's market under quotas and customs rules entailed by international trade agreements. Opponents to this method insist on expanding the service industry. However, the 2000 crisis (when the dotcom bubble exploded) proves that services can be expanded to a limit. This will of course run counter to the WTO arrangements but the state has diplomacy to secure its economic interests.

Since the pre-Maidan MPs failed to solve the WTO trouble when it came to tariffs on the critical 371 trade items, it is doubtful that external forces will let Ukraine revive its independent economy. And even if they do, Ukrainians will end up on another Maidan. That one will be a revolution of work. It will teach people to revive and preserve their own production (including that in the public sector), not just embezzle something built by others. It is hard to predict how the nation will go through that without courage, adrenalin or free breakfasts, just long and painstaking work.

3. Oligarchs and their "creative class" know better than anyone else that money lose value with time when not circulating and bringing profits that exceed inflation. However, that money should not vanish. They can return to the country as foreign investment or reinvestment. They can convert into jewelry, luxury goods and real estate. They can also convert into securities, fixed and non-fixed assets. But they stay in Ukraine, especially when it comes to basic infrastructure industries and systems.

In this sense, the magic words "re-privatization, nationalization and restitution" come very helpful regardless of what new posts Ukrainian businessmen have taken. ■



## THE RECENT HYSTERICAL BUZZ OF A LOOMING DEFAULT AND UNPOPULAR YET VITAL AUSTERITY MEASURES ARE A PERFECT ILLUSTRATION OF HOW BAD THE CRISIS IN UKRAINE IS

or new EU member-states were fairly restrained during the Maidan conflict. After all, one thing to remember is that Russia's proposals from December 2013 were more about programmes of technical and trade cooperation for a much bigger sum than the USD 15bn loan without any specific obligations on Russia's part that would secure strategic contracts for Ukrainian enterprises. Ukraine always survived by balancing between much bigger political players. Its economy in the current state would hardly let it quit these political privileges now, unless some global geostrategic shifts take place in the near future.

2. It is now clear that Ukrainian economy should undergo structural reforms if it aims at survival rather than dissolution into a more powerful neighbour. The problem is that its fundamental production level is either ruined or privatized. For many years, the budget has been filled with one-time proceeds from a sold enterprise and loans when the government ran out of those proceeds. As long as this fundamental level of local production agglomerations and core city, county or region enterprises is revived to meet modern standards, not those of the 1990s, no foreign loans will help Ukraine as they will be eaten out even if



I remember Yulia Tymoshenko having a list of 300 Ukrainian enterprises as top priorities for re-privatization. Eventually, only one underwent the procedure. It was Kryvorizhstal. So, where is that list now?



**2 March, 7 p.m.**

**Rodin. A ballet by Boris Eifman**  
**National Opera House**  
**(50, vul. Volodymyrska, Kyiv)**

Boris Eifman's new ballet is dedicated to the tragic story of the life and art of the great sculptor Auguste Rodin and his student, lover and muse, Camille Claudel. For more than 15 years, the artists complemented each other in everyday and creative life. For this reason, their breakup was a heavy blow to Camille's mental health and spiritual balance. Obsessed by the idea that there was a conspiracy against her and convinced that the person behind it was Rodin, she went out of her mind. Eifman's ballet does not simply depict the tragedy of the story, but also the fine points of spiritual experiences.

**7 March, 8 p.m.**

**Andru Donalds**  
**CARIBBEAN club**  
**(4, vul. Petlyury, Kyiv)**

The unique voice of Enigma, the renowned Jamaican-born musician will once more visit the capital of Ukraine to gladden the hearts of his fans with an



unbelievable concert. A vocalist with the creative Enigma ensemble, the singer also has a solo career, since Enigma is a studio project. He can fully express himself on stage in his own shows. The musician showed that he was a talented solo artist back in 1995, when he released his single *Mishale* in the USA. Today, Andru Donalds has dozens of songs, for which the public loves him.

**9 March, 7 p.m.**

**Jose Luis Merlin**  
**Kirov Palace of Culture**  
**(1A, pr. Metalurhiv, Zaporizhzhya)**

His grandparents emigrated to Argentina back in 1912, and he is the first of the family to visit his historic motherland, Ukraine, a century later. The world-renowned composer and legendary guitar virtuoso, Jose Luis Merlin will perform a concert of classical and traditional chamber Latin-American music in Zaporizhzhya. The maestro performs his best compositions, which are part of the mandatory programme at most conservatoires of Europe, America and Asia. Over the course of his music career, Jose Luis Merlin has participated in more than 30 tours throughout the world.

**11– 15 March, 5 p.m.**

**The Antique Art Collection of the Khanenko Museum. Selected Pieces**  
**The Bohdan and Varvara Khanenko Museum of Art**  
**(15-17 vul. Tereshchenkivska, Kyiv)**

*The Antique Art Collection of the Khanenko Museum. Selected Pieces* is an exhibition of almost 60 works of art from Ancient Greece, Etruria and Rome from its museum collection. They include terracotta figurines, as well as painted vases and goblets that are 1,700 to 3,000 years old. Most of the exhibits are from the collection of Bohdan and Varvara Khanenko, Ukrainian philanthropists and art collectors of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The rest were given to the museum from archaeological digs and by various entities. The exhibition is dedicated to Fanny Stitelman, archaeologist, art critic and principal researcher of the collection of antique art at the Khanenko Museum.

**12 March, 7 p.m.**

**DakhaBrakha**  
**Sentrum**  
**(16a, vul. Shota Rustaveli, Kyiv)**

Elements of soul, drum and bass style, the combination of Ukrainian singing with Eastern rhythms and the Hutsul interpretation of hip-hop – are some of the many more musical elements that characterise the unusual performance style of DakhaBrakha, a Ukrainian ethno-quartet. The band has recorded five albums over the course



of ten years. The musicians worked on their last album, *Khmeleva Project*, with PortMone, a well-known Belarusian band. The group's fans will hear compositions from the last and other albums at the Kyiv concert.

**15 March, 6 p.m.**

**Unity**  
**Kyiv National Academic Theatre of Operetta**  
**(53/3, vul. Velyka Vasylykivska, Kyiv)**

Kyiv will soon see the start of the 12<sup>th</sup> annual Unity (Yednist) International Jazz Festival, which was first held in 2002. During this time, musicians from Ukraine, Russia, the USA, Norway, Germany, Israel and other countries of the world have performed on the festival's stage. The well-known Polish band, Paweł Kaczmarczyk Audiofeeling Trio, will be special guests at this year's event. The jazz band is the personal project of pianist and composer Paweł Kaczmarczyk, who together with his colleagues will present compositions from their multi award-winning album, *Complexity in Simplicity*.





The February Revolution of 1917 in Kyiv: city residents in Khreshchatyk, in the square near the city дума (now Independence Square) at the time when the abdication of Nicholas II was announced



# The Streets and Squares of Revolutions in 1917

*A number of revolutions and uprisings took place in Kyiv in the course of its long history – from the expulsion of princes who had gone against the will of Kyiv residents to the Maidan in our days. At all times, chroniclers and journalists have tried to gather as much information about urban life as possible at such pivotal times. However, perhaps the biggest historical gift was made by nameless photographers in Kyiv who in spring 1917, nearly 100 years ago, chronicled the revolutionary events that ushered the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-21.*

Author: Yaroslav Tynchenko

**K**yiv residents learned about the February Revolution the next day after the tsarist government was overthrown. The first person to send a telegram about Nicholas II's abdication was Alexander Bublikov, a member of the State Duma.

At the time, several members of the Romanov family, includ-

ing the emperor's mother, empress Maria Feodorovna, resided in Kyiv. The empress took care of a military hospital located in the Mariinsky Palace. After her son's abdication, she went to Mohyliv to see her son for the last time, then to the Crimea and from there to Denmark, her native land. The last governor general and, somewhat later, the commander of the Kyiv Military Dis-

The first Ukrainian manifestation in Sofia Square in Kyiv, March 1917



Parade of revolutionary troops in Khreshchatyk, spring 1917





One of the first revolutionary rallies, Bibikov Boulevard (now Taras Shevchenko Boulevard), March 1917



Rally in Volodymyrska Street near the Golden Gate, March 1917



trict surrendered their powers peacefully. New leaders, with a revolutionary past, were appointed in their place from Petrograd.

“Revolutionary masses” resorted to violence only against policemen. A militia was formed to replace the police and was headed by a revolutionary officer. Amidst the upheavals, a monument to Pyotr Stolypin, former prime minister of Russia shot dead by a revolutionary in the Kyiv Opera House in 1911, was damaged.

Official information started coming from Petrograd about the formation of the Council of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies and the Provisional Government. Kyiv organized its own council

representing various parties and organizations, including illegal ones. Initially, this body functioned in the building of the city дума in Khreshchatyk and later moved to the Mariinsky Palace.

The replacement of the old government with a new, revolutionary one in March was absolutely peaceful in Ukraine. In addition to a council of workers’ and soldiers’ deputies modelled on the one in Petrograd, the Central Rada emerged in Kyiv as an all-Ukrainian representative body. For a long time, it acted cautiously and theoretically, mainly calling organizing congresses and rallies. In the spring and summer of 1917, Kyiv hosted several all-Ukrainian congresses which greatly boosted the stand-

ing of the Central Rada and led to the proclamation of its First and Second Universals.

Unfortunately, there were casualties, initially only among Ukrainians. First, several military men who spoke in favour of having a national military unit were killed. Then, as the Bohdan Khmelnytsky First Ukrainian Cossack Regiment was leaving for the frontline, 16 of its men were killed by Russian soldiers.

However, the revolution never abated. As of November 1917, when the Bolshevik party staged a coup and seized power in the capital of Russia, the Central Rada had power not only in Kyiv but across Ukraine. The Ukrainian revolution was just beginning. ■



A soldier and a student – the first militia in Kyiv that replaced the police with the Kyiv Opera Theatre in the background, March 1917





HOT MUSICAL EVENT



PREMIER PALACE HOTEL  
KYIV · UKRAINE

# JAZZ PREMIER THURSDAY

- JOIN US AT OUR SERIES OF HOT JAZZ EVENINGS IN THE LOBBY BAR OF THE PREMIER PALACE HOTEL. TWICE A MONTH, ON THURSDAYS, FROM 20:00 TO 22:00
- OUR SPECIAL PRESENTER WILL BE OLEKSIY KOHAN, THE GURU OF UKRAINIAN JAZZ

THE PRICE PER PERSON PER EVENING IS FROM UAH 300 WHICH INCLUDES TREATS  
AND DRINKS FROM THE LOBBY BAR MENU

STARTING FEBRUARY 6 THROUGH APRIL 17

[PREMIER-PALACE.COM](http://PREMIER-PALACE.COM)

+380 (44) 244 12 35