

IMF, Gore spread Cold War lies vs. Primakov

by Michele Steinberg

The most serious civil war now facing Western civilization is not in Yugoslavia, or Asia, or Africa—it is in Washington, and the stakes are nothing less than a global showdown with a thermonuclear payload. The issue in this war is whether President Clinton will break with London, and turn his administration's strategic priorities back to the Germany-Russia-China orientation that characterized its best impulses prior to the British-engineered impeachment that eclipsed all urgent business of state for 1998 through early 1999, and allowed Vice President Al Gore to become almost the "acting President."

For years, President Clinton, with a small but significant grouping inside his administration, has oriented toward global peace, and advocated the strengthening of a relationship between the United States and Russia, for trade, disarmament, and technological progress. Clinton has spoken repeatedly of a strategic partnership, with Russia, and with China.

But, a maniacal anti-Russia mob, led by Gore, his national security adviser Leon Fuerth, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Henry H. Shelton, and Zbigniew Brzezinski (mentor of the laughable, but dangerous Secretary of State Madeleine Albright), has opposed this policy. Gore's grouping is closely allied with the worst right-wing zealots in Congress—the very forces that, after the impeachment fiasco, are trying to transform U.S. foreign policy into an adjunct of the British Empire.

One group of Gore's anti-Clinton allies in Congress, centered in Rep. Benjamin Gilman's (R-N.Y.) House International Relations Committee, is hell-bent on crushing Russia, and breaking relations with China in a new Cold War. This committee, in only one week before the Easter recess, held hearings accusing Russia of arming "rogue states," launched a red scare over a potential missile attack on the United States by North Korea (see accompanying article), and began a push for Mexico to be "decertified" as a U.S. partner in fighting drugs.

Leaning on a closely knit network of think-tanks financed by the British-American-Commonwealth faction, such as the Center for Security Policy, which receives funding from Richard Mellon Scaife, the billionaire financier of the Kenneth Starr "Get Clinton" effort, the Gilman committee has become a sounding board for British and Israeli disinformation.

And, on close observation, their military/national security

rhetoric is a cover for the Gore-Gilman-Wall Street crowd's anger over the fact that the Primakov government is against the London-centered financier oligarchy, and puts people first.

Gore and the Yahoos

This Wall Street crowd has been on a rampage to restore Gore's corrupt collaborator, Viktor Chernomyrdin, as Prime Minister in Russia. This question was central to Gore's efforts to cancel the Primakov visit (see accompanying article by Jeffrey Steinberg).

The testimony before the Gilman committee on March 25, one day into the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia started, provides ample evidence that the Gore anti-Primakov drive is coordinated with the right-wing GOP warmongers in Congress.

Gilman's first witness was former CIA director James Woolsey, now a Washington attorney with the firm of Shea and Gardner, who had served in the CIA during 1993-95. Woolsey sounded the clarion call for making Primakov an "enemy image." But, Woolsey is not a spokesman for the Clinton administration, as he is portrayed by the British-linked media. Woolsey is a Gore operative, who got the CIA job at Gore's urging. Since he was dumped from the CIA in 1995, Woolsey has worked closely with the Heritage Foundation, an Anglo-Zionist-linked think-tank also financed by the Scaife nexus.

Providing no documentation, Woolsey blasted Primakov as the man who replaced the International Monetary Fund (IMF) "reformers," and who was responsible for the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to "rogue states." Woolsey said that he had just returned from Moscow—where, with Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.) and former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, he specialized in insulting Russian officials.

"First of all," said Woolsey, "an important part of the problem of Russian proliferation to rogue regimes, such as its deplorable assistance to Iran, stems, in my judgment, from . . . decisions by my former counterpart, Mr. Primakov, now moved on to higher office. . . . I believe it's quite clear that Mr. Primakov sees the strategic relationship between Russia and the U.S. as a zero-sum game and is interested in strengthening Russia's ties with such regimes as those in Iran and Iraq as a way of building a bloc of nations committed to weakening us and our influence in the world."

He claimed that "much of Russia's military industrial complex" is "for sale to the highest bidder," including to the Aum sect in Japan, and that massive sales to "rogue states and groups" are being tolerated and "sometimes facilitated by the Russian government." Again, Woolsey singled out "particularly decision-makers such as Mr. Primakov."

According to the biography *Gore: A Political Life* by Robert Zelnick (soon to be released by Regnery Press), Woolsey is a Gore man who had been brought in by Fuerth, a suspected

listening post for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, as one of the Gore's "mind melder," more than 20 years ago. In the chapter "Gore and Nuclear Arms Control," Zelnick says: "Fuerth set up a kind of structured learning program. . . . [Gore] devoted at least six to eight hours each week for a full study [of] arms control," through lectures by Fuerth. Among the occasional "guest lecturers" was Woolsey.

"Woolsey recalls visiting Gore in his dingy Longworth Building office . . . surrounded by more charts and graphs than Woolsey could have imagined. Fourteen years earlier—in the mid-1960s—Woolsey had worked . . . on a highly classified project called 'Code 50,' which sought to 'game' various nuclear exchanges between the United States and the U.S.S.R." Zelnick depicts Gore revelling in computer nuclear war games; he writes: "*Woolsey noticed that Gore had been punching away at some of the old 'Code 50' scenarios on his IBM computer*" (emphasis added).

The IMF protection racket

Woolsey urged the committee to use the IMF to hammer Russia into line. The United States should focus "the withholding from Russia . . . those things they want . . . these IMF loans and the like," he said. This is better than sanctions.

But on March 30, the news arrived that IMF Managing Director Michel Camdessus had agreed to release IMF loan funds to Russia. Woolsey and Gore's Wall Street friends hit the roof. On March 31, the *Wall Street Journal* seethed. In an editorial entitled "The Russian Racket," it said: "Russia, after filching billions in aid, defaulting on tens of billions in loans, accusing the U.S. of bottomless villainy in Serbia, and kicking top NATO advisers out of Moscow—is going to get new billions of dollars in credits from the IMF." Blaming it on President Clinton's hopes that Russia will do "nice things," and on Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin's pushing the IMF to help Russia, the *Journal* threatened the IMF and Camdessus with the cut-off of "American taxpayer" funding.

But the Gore-Wall Street rant is not without opposition. Rep. Howard Berman (D-Calif.) challenged Woolsey on why his account was so different from a briefing he had attended by Jack Matlock, President Reagan's Ambassador to the Soviet Union, who said that "Primakov is the best thing that's happened to Russia," and that the United States is humiliating the economically distressed Russia, without regard for the future.

Sanity has also been forthcoming from a new organization called the Russian American Goodwill Association, a coalition of Russia scholars, business people, and citizens. The association took out an ad in the March 24 *Washington Post*, the day that Primakov should have met with President Clinton, urging "support for Primakov's reforms," and calling on Congress to reject the canard that "a weaker Russia is better for us" and for the American people to show friendship for our "World War II ally that sacrificed tens of millions of lives to help secure our freedom."

Plan to privatize Medicare is defeated

by Linda Everett

A Federally appointed commission, charged with improving the Medicare program and saving it from bankruptcy, ended its last meeting on March 16 without the required votes to promote a contentious "market-oriented" proposal to radically reform the Medicare program by privatizing it. Medicare, the nation's largest health insurance program, provides medical coverage for nearly 40 million of the nation's elderly and disabled people. The Bipartisan Commission to Save Medicare—made up of Democratic and Republican appointees from both Congress and the private sector—was established by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 to analyze the financial condition of the program, and to propose to Congress how to restructure Medicare to keep the program from going bankrupt.

Low wages and fewer people in the workforce have meant that there is a shrinking tax base and collapse of the tax revenues needed to support the program—at the same time that the number of Medicare beneficiaries is expected to double to 80 million as the "Baby-Boomers" turn 65, and the number of beneficiaries who are disabled or over age 85, is also doubling.

Post-industrial disaster

Any proposal to strengthen Medicare needs first to address the root cause of that collapse, which lies in the post-industrial economic policies in place since shortly after Medicare was established in 1965, and which are driving the collapse of the nation's critical productive sectors (machine tools, manufacturing, agriculture, mining, infrastructure). Both Republicans and Democrats who are now rushing into a misguided shouting match over whether the bogus national budget surplus should be used to "save" Medicare (and if so, how much of it), are missing the real purpose of economic policy, as defined by the political economist Lyndon LaRouche, which is to create the means necessary to foster an improvement in mankind's condition from one generation to the next.

The Medicare program was one such improvement. It is credited with saving tens of millions of lives, and increasing the country's life-expectancy rate. However, as this report will show, the commission proposal to privatize Medicare would actually turn back the clock some 40 years, and rescind the nation's promise of medical care to our most vulnerable populations.