



Candidates must complete this page and then give this cover and their final version of the extended essay to their supervisor.

Candidate session number	0	0							
Candidate name									
School number			0	0					
School name									
Examination session (May or November)	May			Year	2009				

Diploma Programme subject in which this extended essay is registered: History
 (For an extended essay in the area of languages, state the language and whether it is group 1 or group 2.)

Title of the extended essay: TO WHAT EXTENT DID THE DE-NUCLEARISATION QUESTION THAT ROSE UP IN UKRAINE, AFTER THE COLLAPSE OF THE USSR, AFFECT THEIR RELATIONS?

Candidate's declaration

If this declaration is not signed by the candidate the extended essay will not be assessed.

The extended essay I am submitting is my own work (apart from guidance allowed by the International Baccalaureate).

I have acknowledged each use of the words, graphics or ideas of another person, whether written, oral or visual.

I am aware that the word limit for all extended essays is 4000 words and that examiners are not required to read beyond this limit.

This is the final version of my extended essay.

Candidate's signature: _____

Date: 15/1 - 09

Supervisor's report

The supervisor must complete the report below and then give the final version of the extended essay, with this cover attached, to the Diploma Programme coordinator. The supervisor must sign this report; otherwise the extended essay will not be assessed and may be returned to the school.

Name of supervisor (CAPITAL letters) _

Comments

Please comment, as appropriate, on the candidate's performance, the context in which the candidate undertook the research for the extended essay, any difficulties encountered and how these were overcome (see page 13 of the extended essay guide). The concluding interview (viva voce) may provide useful information. These comments can help the examiner award a level for criterion K (holistic judgment). Do not comment on any adverse personal circumstances that may have affected the candidate. If the amount of time spent with the candidate was zero, you must explain this, in particular how it was then possible to authenticate the essay as the candidate's own work. You may attach an additional sheet if there is insufficient space here.

I have read the final version of the extended essay that will be submitted to the examiner.

To the best of my knowledge, the extended essay is the authentic work of the candidate.

I spent hours with the candidate discussing the progress of the extended essay.

Supervisor's signature: _____ Date: 2/2 -2009

To what extent did the denuclearisation question that ^{up} rose in Ukraine, after the collapse of the USSR, affect their foreign relations?

May not be
specific enough -
Rather it was
too specific and
difficult for the
candidate to
cope with it

Name:

Candidate number:

School:

Extended Essay

Subject: History

Supervisor:

Session: May 2009

Word count: 3 567

Short

Abstract

This essays aim was to analyse the extent of effect of the nuclear question to Ukraine's foreign relations to the east and the west. Ukraine becoming a newly independent country had to choose between Moscow or Washington and Brussels. Choosing either of the sides something might be lost and something gained. The political stage of east at that time went through a drastic change and nobody knew how things will end.

When Russia made its claims on the Nuclear weapons that they placed into Ukraine while USSR still existed, the whole world got awakened. It was a serious issue and had to be solved, indicated by the fact that both Washington and Brussels wanted to be involved. This time taking Ukraine's side as this newly independent country had set her eyes on the west. Russia who also was in a totally new situation was upset. There was no balance in eastern Europe after the collapse and Russia of course wanting to be a leader country felt some kind of threat when the western world showed that they have nothing against Ukraine being westernised and thereby nuclear free. Negotiations between Ukraine and Russia were started and USA, who can be seen as a mentor for Ukraine at that time, was greatly involved. It took approximately 3 years before the preferred end result was reached.

During the period when Ukraine had to be in negotiation and make sure that they stay independent and war free. Rest of the east Europe seemed to move on and enter the west. Ukraine who is one of the biggest countries in Eastern Europe and had the potential to be a great power, stood still. The nuclear weapon question hindered the development of problem free relations with both the east and west.

= a précis

not an I.B. Abstract ✓

Scope not stated (o)

Word count: 299

ie the
wish to be
nuclear-free
or denuclearized

v. broad

A different
question

Contents page

Introduction.....	1
Ukraine and Russia – The break-up.....	2
The nuclear weapon question – The Plot.....	3
Ukraine and The west.....	5
Conclusion.....	6
Bibliography.....	10



Introduction

The aim with this essay is to examine Ukraine and its foreign policy goals after the collapse of the Soviet empire. The main question would be – **To what extent did Ukraine's wish to be denuclearized affect the foreign relations with the western countries such as USA, Poland and Hungary and Russia as the so called east?** Ukraine having a very suitable geographical position had two options, to open itself up and try to enter the west or take the easier and less problematic decision and choose the east side.

3rd attempt
at a question -
much too
wordy

✓
v.
broad
RQ ①

When?

✓ What makes this so interesting is that we can observe a newly independent country, which has the possibility to choose between to highways. We know in hindsight that Ukraine chose the west. This political goal they had set up would cause a lot of political discussions, not only in near west and east but also in larger western countries such as the USA who decided to interfere and help Ukraine with its problems, especially with the denuclearization.

Other things have to be taken into consideration as well. For example the fact that during these years, the late 1980s, the political stage of Russia was full with challenges. Not only did they have to test the idea and structure of a new Russia, to be respected by the west but also they had to face a power struggle within, between two highly respected men – Yeltsin and Gorbachev.

Today Ukraine is still trying to make her way to be a respected and a democratic country in Europe. They have not still fully reached their goal but they have not given up either. Their situation seems to be more complicated than we can imagine. Wanting to be a part of the western world and at the same time trying to keep the independence and democracy in a country where the political field has not yet been fully developed is a challenge.

This essay will not deal with the ethnicity struggle in Ukraine during this period. There were still many living in Ukraine, who would have liked to be a part of a Union. Furthermore, the essay will not count upon Ukrainian economical situation, which was in recessionary period. Also, bearing in mind that most of the sources studies were written by Ukrainian experts or Russian experts. Thus the essay can lack the western view point.

explain
more

Intro ✓
①

Ukraine and Russia – The break-up

For a long time Ukraine, as many other eastern European countries, had been a member of USSR. It had its centre in Moscow and was controlled by the communist party. But in 1989 there were signs for change. In February, the same year, Gorbachev paid an official visit to Ukraine and said the following words: *A strong centre and strong republics*. He was talking about a big step towards equality by which he meant that the idea of self-management and self-financing had to be elaborated on¹. By that time the idea of independency in Ukraine was highly popular. The idea which was set into motion, to create a Union of equality and lose the supremacy of Russia² was coming too late. Ukraine being the largest and the most important member republic wanted autonomy.

On the 16th of July 1990, after the Congress of Russians People's Deputies had voted for the state sovereignty of Russia on the 12th on the same year, Ukraine did the same³. Now when the republics had gotten more liberated, the struggle within continued. Opposition to the communist government grew day by day. Many of the parties made clear statements that their aim was to fight for a totally independent Ukraine. The people held strikes on the streets opposing to the Union Treaty that was to be signed.

During this period when the renewed Union treaty was to be signed, Ukrainian government started to hesitate more and more, if this is really what is best for their country's future. There were uncountable reasons why the government of Ukraine decided to act as they did, one of them being the intellectual and psychological effect that the Chernobyl Nuclear power plant accident created. We might not be able to count all the events that lead to this decision, but what we know is, that Ukraine's government decided in June 1991 that they would not sign the renewed Union Treaty⁴. The decision was taken after the ballot arranged by the Soviet council to find out what Ukrainian people thought about the renewal of the Union. But Ukrainian Government added a question, if the people approved signing of the treaty at all⁵. This decision, not to sign the treaty, affected concept of renewal, as Yeltsin put it: *We cannot imagine the Union without Ukraine. We are convinced that the multinational people of Ukraine also cannot conceive of the future without Union-type relations with all of the peoples of our country, with whom they are linked by a history of many*

what was the 'Union treaty'?

This needs explaining.

¹ Solchanyk Roman, "Ukraine and Russia: The post-soviet transition,, , 2001, Rowman & Littlefield p.29

² Carrere D'encansse Helene, "The end of the Soviet Empire: The triumph of the nation", 1993, Basic Books p.256

³ Solchanyk p.30

⁴ Szporluk Roman, "Russia, Ukraine and the breakup of the Soviet Union", 2000, Hoover Press p.316

⁵ Szporluk p.300

centuries⁶. There was no point of a new treaty when Ukraine is not included as one of the signatories. Russia needed Ukraine's support to hold the Union in one piece.

Right after declaring their independence on the 24th of August 1991⁷ and announcing the decision to not sign the union treaty, the government of Ukraine directly introduced a plan on securing their country by starting to build up an independent military⁸. This very decision had an effect on Russo – Ukraine relations as Russia sensed a bit of rivalry⁹. It was assumed by people that these two great Slavic nations will stay on good terms but history tells us otherwise. Even after Ukraine got rid of the nuclear weapons the rivalry and foreign relation problems between these two countries continued.

too general and sweeping.

The Nuclear weapon question – the Plot

It took approximately a week from Ukraine's declaration of independence when a spokesman of Russian president made an open statement of the possible territorial gains from Ukraine¹⁰, nothing that the politicians in Kiev would accept. Another issue that directly arose from Russian side was the question of nuclear weapons. During the period of the Soviet Union, Russia placed its nuclear weapons into different former Republics. When the Union collapsed, Russia immediately claimed that the weapons belong to them and should be transported and held inside Russians borders and made it clear that if needed they can help with the transporting. Here Ukraine saw an opportunity to pursue their aim to become an equal. In late December 1991 they insisted upon being involved in whatever decision making that considered the Soviet nuclear arsenal¹¹. They were not in control of the weapons as the button sat in Moscow. Ukraine now an independent country would be accountable for the missiles launched from their territory even though it would be done so by a foreign power¹².

interesting point - and it is clearly explained

The amount of nuclear weapons Ukraine had inherited from the Soviet Union was not a small one; it made her the 3rd largest country in the world¹³, it included 1512 warheads, 212 strategic

⁶ Solchanyk p.47

⁷ Dyczok Marta, "Ukraine: Movement without change, change without movement", 2000, the Harwood Academic Publishers p.110

⁸ Szporiuk p.320

⁹ Szporiuk p.320

¹⁰ Szporiuk p.321

¹¹ Dyczok p.115

¹² Dyczok p.115

¹³ Solchanyk p.90

carriers of which 176 were ICBMs (Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles)¹⁴ and 36 heavy bombers¹⁵. Ukraine, whose real wish was to be denuclearized due to the wish of returning to Europe¹⁶, started having doubts if this wish of Russia, would lead to a positive end. Their caution was built upon a fact that there was an article in "Moskvoie Novosti" on October the 20th 1991 that claimed that Yeltsin had planned a nuclear attack on Ukraine but withdrew from the plan for purely technical problems¹⁷. In 1992, Russia started to show interest in Ukraine's territory, especially in the Crimea. It was after when Russian Vice – President Aleksandr Rutskoi travelled to Crimea and urged the peninsula to secede from Ukraine¹⁸.

Ukraine kept the status as a nuclear state but without any nuclear capability¹⁹. This decision was highly disliked by both Russia and the USA. The United States of America saw this as an aggressive move and they did not like the idea of two nations in Eastern Europe with nuclear capability²⁰. Both Russia and the USA made an offer to help and remove the missiles but the answer from the Ukraine was negative. Historians have come up with several different ideas why Ukraine chose to do so.

Too vague

more specifics

put into a paragraph

- Firstly, this can be a question of national pride and political strategy. In the Soviet Union it gave a country status to own nuclear weapons²¹ and because Ukraine still had the manners of an eastern republic it is natural that both the politicians and inhabits believe that it gives them prestige.
- Secondly, USA promised to provide security to Ukraine as long as they have not solved the nuclear weapon problem with Russia. Ukraine might have feared that once the nuclear weapon issue is out of sight they lose a great powers support²². To this claim another one can be added. As one of the political aims of Ukraine was to become internationally recognized, nuclear weapons was a great way to draw attention²³ acc to Blackville + Karagov?
- The third reason might have been that they hoped that until they have a large amount of Russia's nuclear weapons the chance of a military attack is low. acc to Dyczok.

¹⁴ <http://www.fas.org/nuke/intro/missile/icbm.htm>

¹⁵ Dyczok p.113

¹⁶ Solchanyk p. 90

¹⁷ D'encansse p.259

¹⁸ Dyczok p.114

¹⁹ Blackville D. Robert/ Karagov A. Sergei, "Damage, Limitation or Crisis? Russia and the outside world,, , 1994, Brasseys, London p.128

²⁰ Dyczok

²¹ Blackville/ Karagov p.129

²² Blackville/ Karagov p.130

²³ Dyczok p.113

amel
plus

- Fourth, after the collapse of the union Ukraine landed in an economic trough which is understandable because it can take time before a newly independent country reaches economical stability. The catch here is that Ukraine's government heard another rumour. Russia planned not to use the missiles removed from Ukraine but to sell them. This upset Ukraine who in an economical breakdown felt that they should get some benefit out of it²⁴. They hoped that if this rumour is true Russia would offer them a suitable deal that will benefit both countries.

As mentioned earlier, the USA showed interest in the nuclear weapon problem that arose between Ukraine and Russia and clearly was seen as a problem in far west as well. But it was not until 1993 when Clinton's administration started to take some real action²⁵. The same year in May, when the ambassador of the USA, Strobe Talbott, visited Kyiv a three way negotiation was set into motion. The result of this was a Trilateral Statement on the 14th of January 1994 where all presidents of the three countries met and promised to treat each other's countries with respect and as equals²⁶. Yet the road to denuclearisation was not smooth. Already in 1993 Yeltsin and his office seemed to offer a suitable arrangement. Both Ukraine and the west were relieved. The arrangement included security guarantees from their side right after Ukraine will sign both START (strategic arms reduction treaty) 1 and NPT (Nuclear non- Proliferation treaty)²⁷. After a closer look of the papers by Ukrainian diplomats they understood that this problem is not solved as Russians could not accept any of Ukrainian demands. The greatest problem being that Russia would only accept Ukraine when it becomes a member of CIS (commonwealth of independent countries). Ukraine felt suffocated and Russia claimed to not be in a position to make a better offer²⁸. What must be taken into account is also the fact that Ukraines diplomats and political leaders lack the experience of foreign policy. Thus misunderstandings and misinterpretations were easy to arise.

where is
this?

a little
analysis

From 1993 to 1996 Ukraine still worked for denuclearisation. During a CSCE conference held in Budapest in 1994 Ukraine got assurances and separate documents written so that they could feel themselves closer to the final decision. Ukraine received security assurances from different NPT countries and the right to seek help from United Nations Security Council in case of possible dishonouring of contract²⁹. Still no security guarantees were given to Ukraine by any of countries.

²⁴ Blackville/ Karagov p.125

²⁵ Solchanyk p.90

²⁶ http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1584/is_nSUPP-1_v5/ai_15184081

²⁷ <http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/start1/news/npt-95.htm>

²⁸ Solchanyk p. 91

²⁹ Solchanyk p. 91

good detail, but
mainly narrative

The very end result was that in June 1996 Ukraine became a nuclear weapon free state³⁰. This was to open a new era for Ukraine. The dream of breaking free from the direct attachments from the east was the end of one chapter.

✓

Ukraine and the west – “*The problem is not if Ukraine is ready for Europe but if Europe is ready for the eastern republics,*”³¹

If we talk about Ukraine and the west it needs to be clarified that they did not only seek friendly relationships with far west such as the United States of America but also with the near west neighbours like Poland and Hungary. Being on good terms with both is equally important. The far west can take the role of a mentor. The near west can be seen as friend.

In 1993 Ukrainian president Kravchuk paid an official visit to Budapest and made an open statement and put forward an idea that he together with the Polish president had come up with – The newly independent countries need to establish a zone of stability and security³². The collapse of the USSR has created an off balance situation and seeing the way Russia is handling the situation by only showing the power it has, it is natural that the former member countries who find themselves in the same situation, try to solve it by co-operating . It is not only Ukraine who has to tackle with foreign and interior problems; they all had to stand against Russia and show that they could survive without its Supremacy. The nuclear weapon problem with Ukraine was not unique situation as Russia had placed them into different member countries of the USSR. The aim of entering the west was another common goal. It is always easier to find the same pace with a country that knows what you are going through. Thus it is more than normal that Eastern European countries wanted to co-operate in every possible way.

Ukrainian relations to USA and it European allies (Western-European countries) depends mostly on how fast can Ukraine adjust to the new environment which the collapse has created. Not to be forgotten that Russia still is not happy about the Ukrainian western orientation. Thus it is not only a question of how eagerly Ukraine wants to become a member of western institutions like NATO or European Union. The so called west has to maintain a relationship to Russia. Washington and Brussels, in this case, want to be in the role of a mentor. They want to help Ukraine to solve the interior questions and to stabilize Russo-Ukrainian relations. They even

Meaning of this needs to be made clearer.

³⁰ Solchanyk p. 91

³¹ Solchanyk p.98

³² Solchanyk p.100

financial

offered them ~~financial~~ support which made Ukraine heavily dependent on the States. By 1997 it was known that they became the 3rd largest country to receive foreign aid from USA³³.

- amans?

In hindsight we know that Ukraine has more trouble entering Europe and rest of the western world than other eastern European countries such as the Baltic States, Poland and Hungary³⁴.

Ukraine still is not a member of the European Union but they have close relations and their government is still working on becoming a member of EU³⁵. But why is this process taking such a long time? The nuclear weapon issue can be blamed here as it isolated Ukraine for three years³⁶, from 1993 to the final step of the denuclearisation in 1996. Some historians also have mentioned that maybe Europe is just not ready for Ukraine to enter the Union. But it feels more like Ukraine with its internal problems is not ready for Europe.

- Yes internal problems social, economic & most importantly political needed some mention

Conclusion

The chance to enter the west created dreams of becoming one of the great powers for Ukraine, as it was one of the largest countries with one of the largest militaries in Europe. They wanted to be a great power and if not one of the greatest, then at least they wanted their voice to be heard. Ukraine thought herself to be able to become as important as Russia.

Russia did not support Ukraine decision. Most of the former member republics took a western orientation and Russia might have felt threatened especially when the biggest and most powerful of them preferred to reject them. Russia has always competed with the states so the fact that USA assured to protect Ukraine in case of Russia's aggression did not make things easier for Ukraine. Still, the potential provision of security showed that the USA was pragmatic to some extent. They made the offer to protect them only because they wanted Ukraine to lose her nuclear capability. Two large countries situated in the Eastern Europe with powerful weapons was not a preferable outcome.

The wish to be denuclearised was a welcomed decision by both the east and the west. The United States of America and Russia who might compete about the influence in the world, have to bear in mind that when needed they have show the ability to co-operate to retain the balance. It seems like this was an issue that might have gone pass more quietly if Ukraine had accepted the

³³ Dyczok p.105

³⁴ D'encansse p.261

³⁵ <http://www.delukr.ec.europa.eu/page36480.html>

³⁶ Dyczok p.115

not a bibliography

transport aid right away. But being afraid of an attack and to lose their gained political freedom, they hesitated. Doing so, they aggravated Russia to the last straw. Yet, both Ukraine's and Russia's reaction is understandable.

Ukraine wanted to be denuclearised as being nuclear weapon free was one of the demands by the western countries. As Ukraine possessed such a large amount of the weapons all of them greeted the decision. Especially at first when USA saw Ukraine as an aggressor not a country in need of guidance and protection. Though, it can be stated that the nuclear weapon question made a statement for Ukraine, that they cannot be ignored. But at the same time it can be seen as the major cause of the delay of entering the west. As other member countries were working on becoming acceptable Ukraine had still work on its denuclearisation and the uncertainty they were surrounded with. As long as they had not solved the nuclear weapon question the west did not worry about Ukraine's suitability as a member in the EU and therefore they did not receive any financial help during these three critical years to speed up the economy. Thus the issue of nuclear weapons made it difficult for Ukraine to develop strong problem free relations with the west. Even though, Ukraine was not attacked by a nuclear missile, physically the complex situation they created for her can be seen as an emotional hit to a country who tries to mature and become an equal in the western world.

Wanting to be independent is one thing but surviving is another one. A fact is that Ukraine was economically dependent on Russia. Ukraine was cut off from the supplies they got from Russia, and that hit their economy hard. They had no near trading network after upsetting Russia. Due to the isolation that the nuclear weapons created, Ukraine got no economical aid that would have speeded up their economy. They wanted to go west but that needed investment. They could not invest because their economical situation had only gone downhill after the break-up. If they had chosen the east, they probably had not had such an economical trough. Russia had the power to influence their economical situation. Moscow probably wanted to show Kyiv that they chose the wrong highway.

On the other hand, after Ukrainians had attained freedom from the union and Moscow, they had never been more proud of themselves. They felt that by fighting for independence they achieved national unity that was stronger than ever before. They wanted equality which was not possible in the USSR as Moscow was the strong centre. The problem seemed to be that Ukraine wanted too much too fast. Both Washington and Brussels wanted Ukraine to be a part of Western Politics, but one must understand that this decision was only beneficial to Ukraine and European countries had almost nothing to benefit from them. They did not want to make hasty decisions

This is not backed up adequately in the essay

this should have been included in the actual essay not in the conclusion

by accepting them. Both EU and NATO need to consider Russia's opinion. European Union is just a political union and Russia being so close to them and having such economical and political influence cannot be ignored.

The research question is too general and the approach taken is not focussed. A limited range of sources consulted. As a result the argument is not strong - not strongly supported or clearly expressed.

Yes the essay is too general & needs more specific examples to ~~pro~~ prove assertions made. This is probably because the research question was too specific, and the candidate found it difficult to establish a convincing argument on denuclearisation, and also found it difficult to find and analyse specific points about the nuclear situation & problem.

Bibliography

Literature

✓ Blackville D. Robert/ Karagov A. Sergei, "*Damage, Limitation or Crisis? Russia and the outside world*," , 1994, Brassey's, London

✓ Carrere D'encansse Helene, "*The end of the Soviet Empire: The triumph of the nation's*," , 1993, Basic Books

✓ Dyczok Marta, "*Ukraine: Movement without change, change without movement*," , 2000, the Harwood Academic Publishers

✓ Solchanyk Roman, "*Ukraine and Russia: The post-soviet transition*," , 2001, Rowman & Littlefield

✓ Szporluk Roman, "*Russia, Ukraine and the breakup of the Soviet Union*," , 2000, Hoover Press

Internet

Find the articles – Bnet

http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1584/is_nSUPP-1_v5/ai_15184081

Federation of American Scientist

<http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/start1/news/npt-95.htm>

Limited bibliography

Assessment form (for examiner use only)

Candidate session number	0	0							
--------------------------	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Assessment criteria		Achievement level		
		First examiner	maximum	Second examiner
A	research question	1	2	1
B	introduction	1	2	1
C	investigation	2	4	2
D	knowledge and understanding	2	4	2
E	reasoned argument	2	4	2
F	analysis and evaluation	2	4	2
G	use of subject language	2	4	2
H	conclusion	1	2	1
I	formal presentation	3	4	3
J	abstract	0	2	0
K	holistic judgment	1	4	2
Total out of 36		17		18

Name of first examiner: (in CAPITAL letters)

Examiner number:

Name of second examiner: (in CAPITAL letters)

Examiner number: