

ish, it is a heathen or paganist freemasonic rite, a cult—called B'nai B'rith.

Look at the role of Volpi de Misurata, then called Volpi, and of Volpi's friend Parvus, otherwise known as Alexander Helphand, in the period of the B'nai B'rith coup called the Young Turk rebellion in Turkey—i.e., the government which used the Kurds to slaughter the Armenians beginning in 1908. And look at the relationship of this branch of B'nai B'rith called the Young Turk government, whose publicist was Vladimir Jabotinsky, the friend of Mussolini, earlier the editor of *Young Turk* magazine, and Volpi's role in putting Mussolini into power, with Volpi de Misurata as finance minister of Italy, the actual builder of Italian Fascism. If one looks at this, and at the freemasonic connections, and is not blinded by what Mussolini did to certain freemasonic leaders in Sicily and so forth, then one has a comprehension of the kind of processes with which we are dealing.

The essence of the matter is that the Venetian party faction, or the imperial faction of Britain, as exemplified by Lord Palmerston and the rule of the British Grand Lodge over such European lodges as Grand Orient and B'nai B'rith—this faction is determined to prevent, at any cost, the unification of the sovereign nation states and sovereign national political economies of Europe and Asia in a Eurasian bloc of economic development cooperation. To the purpose of preventing such a development, as proposed by Russia's Count Sergei Witte at the turn of the century, the British, with the aid of their Grand Orient and B'nai B'rith allies, used the Young Turk operation to unleash the Balkan Wars preceding World War I. The Balkan Wars had the purpose of destabilizing all Europe and unleashing what became World War I.

Beginning in 1989, the British and British agents in the United States, including friends of Henry Kissinger such as British agent Lawrence Eagleburger and Brent Scowcroft inside the Bush administration, together with Gorbachov in Russia, unleashed the Serbian fascists who were British agents, primarily around Slobodan Milosevic, to slaughter their neighbors for the purpose of destabilizing the underbelly of central Europe, in a campaign which from 1989 onward was openly advertised as a campaign against the danger that Germany united might become an economic power "Fourth Reich," in the words of Mrs. Thatcher's cronies.

That is the context in which certain Anglo-American forces and their B'nai B'rith allies, through freemasonic channels, are working to destroy Italy today. If one understands the global context for these local events within Italy, and notes the similar phenomena which are erupting in eastern Europe, where production is down to 30%, approximately, of 1989 levels, as a result of these same plots—the destabilization of Germany, the coming destabilization of France, the destabilization of Spain, and so forth—one sees what these forces are doing to all civilization. It is time to awaken. It is time to defend Italy, of course; but, we cannot defend Italy effectively unless we understand the global adversary against whom we are fighting.

Ukraine is becoming a rudderless nation

by Konstantin George

A series of decisions taken on May 20 by the Ukrainian Parliament, which is dominated by old communists, stripping the executive of real power, has put Ukraine on a path leading to further economic collapse and social upheaval. The crisis in Ukraine, occurring simultaneously with the collapse of the Polish government of Prime Minister Hanna Suchocka, which fell on May 28, and a communist-engineered political crisis in Belarus, has created a matrix of crises threatening the stability of the three largest eastern European countries lying between Germany and Russia. The destabilization of Ukraine was immediately exploited by Moscow when, on May 24, it re-launched the dispute with Ukraine over control of the Black Sea Fleet.

Control of the Black Sea Fleet, however, is not the most serious conflict concerning military matters between Russia and Ukraine. The fundamental question, and this threatens to take some very ugly turns, is over the 176 former Soviet ICBMs based on the territory of Ukraine, which under Start I had been slated for dismantling.

The issue of the ICBMs, what is referred to as Ukraine's "nuclear arsenal," is a trap which has been set for the young republic which is being exploited by Moscow—with western assistance—which is bent on a reconquest of Ukraine in stages. To date, Ukraine has agreed in principle to destroy these missiles; however, being bankrupt, it has insisted that the cost of their destruction be borne by the United States and Russia, as the successor state to the U.S.S.R. Pending that, Ukraine has stalled on ratifying the Start I treaty and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The same old communist-dominated Parliament which has plunged Ukraine into instability is playing into Moscow's hands, and has indefinitely postponed debate on ratification of Start I.

Russia has repeatedly charged, though it has never supplied any evidence, that the Ukrainian stall on ratification conceals a project to place these missiles under Ukrainian control, and that Ukraine is covertly working on re-targeting these missiles against Russia. During May, articles in the Russian military press began to float the idea of a potential need to "preempt" a Ukrainian nuclear capability. Such talk, coupled with the re-launching of the Black Sea Fleet issue, has prompted Ukraine into fearing a potential Russian invasion some time in this decade.

The Russian posture has caused a policy re-thinking in

Ukraine, where one can frequently read citations of Ukrainian officers in the nation's press, discussing the need for Ukraine to hold onto these nuclear weapons as the only possible "deterrent" against future Russian aggression. A very dangerous dynamic has thus been set into motion.

Executive stripped of power

On May 20, the special powers held by Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma since last autumn to rule by decree in dealing with the ever deepening economic crisis, expired. Kuchma asked Parliament to extend his special powers for another six months. Then the roof fell in.

The Parliament first voted to deny Kuchma an extension of the power to rule by decree on economic matters, to which he responded by resigning. The Parliament then rejected his resignation, thus keeping the Kuchma cabinet in as a lame duck government, powerless to deal with the crisis. The Parliament also rejected a bid by Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk to take over the cabinet and rule by decree. The bid by Kravchuk, however, who works closely with the communist majority in the Parliament, was pro forma, as he knew in advance it would be opposed. Kravchuk supported the Parliament's action stripping Kuchma of his powers, and calmly accepted the crippling of the executive.

The disaster Ukraine faces was concisely put in statements on May 21 by Vyacheslav Chornovil, a Ukrainian patriot and leader of the Rukh anti-communist opposition, and by Ivan Zayats, head of the opposition democratic group in parliament. Chornovil said of the Parliament decisions: "That means . . . there will be no executive mechanism to implement reforms, there will be no reforms whatsoever and the economic collapse is inevitable." Zayats predicted that "economic collapse accompanied by social unrest is likely to come about by autumn."

Russia reopens fleet dispute

Russia re-opened its fight with Ukraine for control of the Black Sea Fleet on May 24 in the immediate aftermath of the Kiev Parliament debacle. The fleet conflict had apparently been settled under a Russian-Ukrainian agreement—called, ominously, the Yalta Agreement, because it was signed in that same Crimean town where the 1945 "Big Three" agreements dividing up postwar Europe were signed by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin—signed by Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Kravchuk, keeping the fleet under joint control pending a final decision on apportioning its ships, equipment, and facilities in 1995.

The conflict resumed when, under orders from the Russian Naval Command in Moscow, the Russian flag was hoisted on 30 supply and support ships of the fleet at its main base and headquarters at Sevastopol in the Crimea. The action spread geographically when, on May 25, some 14 support ships based at Kerch, at the tip of the Crimean Peninsula separated from Russia by a narrow strait, joined the "revolt."

No warships were involved but, by June 1, a total of 202 ships had hoisted the Russian flag.

Moscow is confident that Ukraine, with its near-total energy dependence on Russia, will be forced to accept the Russian formula for dividing up the fleet, and accede to Russia's demand that it retain control over the Sevastopol base and other key military facilities in the Crimea. The first signs already exist that the Russian calculations are well-based. As protested by Rukh leader Chornovil, President Kravchuk has been notably acquiescent toward the Russian moves. His "softness" was given an initial reward, so to speak, when in the midst of the Black Sea Fleet brawl, Russia agreed on a price for its natural gas exports to Ukraine, denominated in rubles.

While the revolt in the Black Sea Fleet was ordered from Moscow, the basis for its success is the devastating economic crisis in Ukraine. The Russian newspaper *Izvestia* on June 1, being but one of about 20 recent examples, has been crowing over the fact that 70% of the sailors who have opted for joining the Russian Navy are Ukrainian. Why? Under the "joint control" agreement, Russian sailors are paid by Moscow in rubles, and Ukrainian sailors are paid by Kiev in the Ukrainian ersatz currency, the karbovanets. This worked fine last autumn, when the karbovanets was introduced and set at a rate of 1:1 to the ruble. By February, however, it was at 3:1, and by May, at 5:1. Despite compensatory moves by Kiev that increased the wages in karbovanets, by May the real wage of the Ukrainian sailor was only half that of his Russian counterpart. One must remember that Russian and Ukrainian sailors both shop at the same base commissary. Thus, out of desperation, Ukrainian sailors have opted to join the Russians, something unthinkable six months ago.

On the naval base question, the Russian position toward Ukraine is identical to the one it has taken toward the Baltic Republic of Latvia. In both the Baltic Sea and the Black Sea, Russia is not concerned about maintaining ground forces based outside of Russia, but is insisting upon its "right" to keep at least one crucial naval base outside its territory in both the Baltic and Black Seas as non-negotiable. In the case of Latvia, the facility is the large naval base at Liepaja, and vis-à-vis Ukraine, Russia wants the key base at Sevastopol, at least.

Both in Ukraine and in the Baltic republics it is rightly feared that these base demands are only the beginning of broader Russian demands. Russia is in no hurry to settle this crisis with Ukraine. An appeal by Kravchuk on May 31 for an immediate summit with Yeltsin on the Black Sea Fleet question fell on deaf ears. According to Interfax, which cited "informed circles" in Moscow, Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev is to go to Kiev on June 7 to prepare a summit. The earliest mooted date is June 12, though the Russian daily *Nezavisimaya Gazeta* speculated on June 1 that there would be no summit until June 20.