

party in the country, seemed to have a chance to gain popularity again. Zyuganov was expected to change the name of his party into "socialist" or "social-democratic," following the example of the East European left. But he was afraid to lose the biggest part of his electorate, the poor and passionate people able to work for him without any payment.

Rutskoy emerges

The last two weeks after Victory Day, May 9, changed the whole situation. Aleksandr Rutskoy,⁸ who seemed to be silent after being released from prison, gave a long speech at a public rally that attracted much attention. He expressed hope that Russians would meet the next, 50th anniversary of the victory "without this regime." The officials appealed to the public prosecutor but nothing criminal was found in these words.

Rutskoy took his next step on May 21. He restored his party structure, formerly one of the reformist wings of the CPSU, and gave it the name of the Russian Social-Democratic People's Party. It is almost similar to the name of the CPSU's predecessor, associated with "revolutionary romanticism." The only difference is "people" instead of "workers." Actually, Rutskoy uses a kind of a "code" which draws attention to him and his people and gives the left-wing opposition a greater hope for its victory. The third thing Rutskoy did was to issue a huge book about himself with all his speeches and interviews, including a photo where he stands, with a beard (right after Lefortovo), with a czar's portrait in the background. He (or maybe his advisers) really found the sensitive points of the Russian mentality.

These tactics of Rutskoy's proved to be more than effective. Now, most of those who were going to support Valeri Zorkin⁹ or Gennadi Zyuganov sympathize with Rutskoy and think him to be the only capable candidate for the presidency. Now his only real rivals seem to be Yeltsin and Zhirinovskiy. But several businessmen who had been supplying Zhirinovskiy are already going to change their stake for Rutskoy.

Zyuganov probably deeply regrets the fussing about and making up the "Accord in the Name of Russia"¹⁰ movement for Zorkin and himself when rumors of Yeltsin's imminent death were widespread. Its creators called Rutskoy, and he was not eager to join, but then agreed. Now this newly created structure, including the greater part of the communist movement, will be at his disposal. The First National Council of the movement was planned on May 28. Zyuganov proposed that Rutskoy should speak fifth or sixth. "I will speak first," Rutskoy said. And no one objected.

8. The vice president of Russia who opposed Yeltsin's September 1993 takeover and was jailed in Lefortovo with members of the Parliament.

9. Former head of Russia's Constitutional Court.

10. The patriotic manifesto issued by leaders of the opposition to Yeltsin's policies, including Zyuganov, Zorkin, and Rutskoy.

London, IAEA demand Korea confrontation

by Kathy Wolfe

The British and their nuclear police at the U.N.'s International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in Vienna have brought the crisis over North Korea's nuclear program to "irreversible confrontation," Gerald Segal of the London International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) told a journalist on June 4. There will be "some military conflict," he said, since North Korea will "retaliate" if the U.N. imposes sanctions, and "this will set off a dynamic response against them."

Yet the United States must follow the IAEA lead and declare sanctions, or else "we are a joke," said Segal, an American who works in London for the British and who this spring was declared *persona non grata* by Beijing, for predicting civil war and the breakup of China. The integrity of the U.N.'s Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is at stake, and North Korea must be "taught a lesson," so that the "costs of flouting the NPT" will be "taken seriously" by others, he said. Otherwise, "the balance of power in Asia will shift" to the disadvantage of the West. "We need to act," he insisted.

Contrary to IISS and the western media, however, it was not North Korea, but the IAEA which began the crisis. During recent inspections of North Korea's Yongbyon reactor, IAEA officials abruptly walked out of the North Korean capital of Pyongyang on June 2, and IAEA Director Hans Blix issued a harsh condemnation of North Korea to the U.N. Security Council. IAEA inspectors had been told by the North Korean government for weeks before coming that sampling the reactor core would not be allowed; but they came, demanded it anyway, and when refused, threw a tantrum.

"The Clinton administration and all of us are at the mercy of the IAEA's technical people," said one exasperated Washington Korea expert on June 3. "It's been the North's position all along that they want an integrated diplomatic package, of U.S. diplomatic recognition, and help in rebuilding a non-plutonium nuclear industry from the United States [see *EIR*, May 6, p. 51].

"But if they let the U.N. take samples, they have no cards left to play. So North Korea told the U.N. clearly: Until the U.S. recognizes us, we can't let you IAEA folks sample the fuel rods. The IAEA caused the problem. The IAEA knew if they went now, and insisted 'we must take samples or the world will end,' it would provoke confrontation; and that is

what they did.”

Blix, whose claim that crippled Iraq is building a nuclear bomb has caused a four-year world embargo which has killed a million Iraqis, charged that North Korea had destroyed the evidence for an atomic bomb program. “The discharge of spent fuel from a 5-megawatt experimental nuclear power reactor has now made it impossible to select fuel rods for later measurements which would show whether there has been any diversion of fuel,” he said.

U.N. sets up Clinton

The North Korea crisis is a U.N. set-up of the United States and of Asia. It has nothing to do with North Korea’s low-technology plutonium program, and everything to do with London’s desire to destroy President Bill Clinton’s administration. If Whitewatergate, orchestrated by the Hollinger Corp. press empire, won’t do it, then Britain would like to push Clinton into any wild U.N. military fiasco, from Somalia to Haiti to Korea.

London’s “Venetians” also wish to disrupt broader plans in China, Japan, and the Koreas for Euro-Asian economic development (see *EIR*, May 27), and to halt the “Korean Camp David” peace plan between South and North which President Clinton was negotiating.

Most of all, as with the Gulf war, the British and their friends seek to take the focus off the collapsing world financial system. In July 1990, the U.S. banking system was on the verge of collapse, such that the day before the United States attacked Iraq, the evening news in New York City ran a feature on the danger of a banking collapse. The Gulf war, however, changed the subject for months to come, not the least by creating a huge speculative flow into American banks from terrified European and Arab depositors.

President Clinton himself has been at pains to call for calm, telling the press repeatedly, “We don’t want to start a war; this is peace talk, not war talk.”

That has not stopped London and its pawns in the George Bush crowd, however, from loud calls for Korean and American blood. In “A Dangerous Game,” the London *Economist* of June 3 editorially demanded that Clinton “halt” the “illicit development of nuclear weapons” by “the tinpot dictator Kim Il Sung.”

The NPT is more important than 40 million Korean lives, wrote the *Economist*, repeating the British line that North Korea is driving the crisis because it plans to invade the South—so we may as well shoot. “If North Korea can mock the NPT, it will scarcely be worth renewing,” they write, even if “South Korea is the prospective hostage” to the confrontation. “Like Iraq, North Korea is an outlaw state. . . . If others do not accept the risk of countering North Korea’s nuclear program, they may soon find Kim with bombs ready, confronting South Korea with a demand for reunification or else.”

British diplomats complained to Reuters on June 8 that

Clinton’s leniency will destroy the credibility of the IAEA as the world’s nuclear policeman. After Clinton insisted on June 6 that there is “still time for North Korea to change course,” they charged, IAEA chief Hans Blix “rowed back” and began to soften, too. “Should the IAEA fudge for political reasons?” the Brits complained.

“Of course British diplomats complain Clinton is trying to get the IAEA to bend the nuclear rules,” said a source close to the British Defense Ministry who is an editor at *Jane’s Defense Weekly* in London. “Half of the U.N. bureaucracy is furious about it, as are the more experienced Americans [i.e., Bush administration holdovers]. If the IAEA determines a country has violated U.N. standards, the IAEA’s word must be law, and the U.S. must back the IAEA all the way. If Clinton violates this [U.N.] rule, every terrorist nation in the world will build the bomb. Clinton thinks the U.S. looked bad when the Somalis dragged a few GI bodies about. Does he want warlord Aideed, or the Haitian military junta, to have the bomb?”

Bush crowd wants blood

Bush’s Secretary of State James Baker and allied senators are also attacking Clinton; they say that North Korea is now the ultimate test of Bertrand Russell’s theory of Mutual and Assured Destruction (MAD). Hosts of the NBC and CBS television Sunday talk shows addressed by Baker and others on June 6 began by whipping up the American people into a war mood, as they had in the run-up to Desert Storm.

CBS’s Bob Schieffer on “Face the Nation” opened by stating that North Korea is as big a threat as Nazi Germany on D-Day 1944. “This administration has performed in the best tradition of Neville Chamberlain,” Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) replied. McCain called for the second time in a week for “pre-emptive bombing” of North Korea. “Vital national security interests are at stake. . . . Americans should be prepared to act now. . . . If we wait three or four years from now, after they have 8, 9, 10, 15 nuclear weapons, and the missiles to deliver them, we would face a far more serious challenge.”

Clinton has “tried that diplomatic approach for a bit too long,” James Baker told NBC’s “Meet the Press.” “I don’t think you should ever sit down and try and negotiate with a regime like North Korea.” Baker emphasized that “for 40 years, the U.S. maintained peace against a tremendous threat from the Soviet Union through nuclear deterrence. . . . I hope we have called [North Korea’s] attention to the fact we have this deterrent.”

“I don’t think anybody knows what the U.S. position is,” Sen. Robert Dole (R-Kan.) told CBS, denouncing Clinton. “We’ve been making these concession-like statements for the past 15 months.” He said he would support McCain’s call for a pre-emptive strike. “They’ve got to understand that this is the most serious thing happening in the world today. . . . No more of waffling and backing away by the White House.”