

Brzezinski-ites Fear Prospect Of Actual U.S.-Russia Alliance

by William Jones

President Putin arrived in the United States on Nov. 12 for talks with U.S. President George Bush with a broad-ranging perspective of U.S.-Russian-European collaboration, which could fundamentally transform the entire fabric of U.S.-Russian relations. While no one expected any particular strategic agreement to come out of the three-day visit because of the very significant differences over the issue of the ABM Treaty and U.S.-planned missile defenses, Putin has indicated that he hopes that the discussions will be the beginning of an entirely new U.S.-Russian relationship, and that he intends to utilize the warm relations that he has established with the U.S. President to bring that about.

Before an audience of American businessmen and journalists at the Russian Embassy on Nov. 13, Putin invoked the historical friendly relations between the United States and Russia which extend all the way back to the American Revolution. "At dramatic turning points of history, in the moments of truth, when the very existence of our nations were at stake, Russia and the United States have always stood together," Putin said. "They were together at the dawn of the American independence. Let's remember when the Russian Empress Catherine II politely, but resolutely, denied the request of King George III to send Russian soldiers to participate in the suppression of the insurgents in the American colonies.

"Our nations were together during the time of liberation reforms in Russia . . . where in the mid-19th Century it coincided with the Civil War in the United States," Putin said. "It is symbolic that the two great statesmen, Emperor Alexander II and President Abraham Lincoln, abolished slavery in their countries at approximately the same time. And both fell victims at the hands of terrorists."

It was of crucial significance that President Bush again emphasized, at their Crawford press conference, the great importance of his telephone consultation with President Putin

in the crucial hours of Sept. 11, defusing a threatened spiral of nuclear-alert reactions. And Putin's reference to "moments of truth" was not merely a historical remark. Lyndon LaRouche stated it thus in a recent interview: "Someone, at high levels, within the U.S. command structure, unleashed an attempted coup d'état against the Bush Administration on Sept. 11. Had that crisis led to a nuclear-alert escalation between the U.S.A. and Russia, the coup plotters would have succeeded, almost without doubt. President Putin's Sept. 11 telephone conversations with President Bush, changed that situation in a radical, beneficial way."

The military actions launched in the "war on terrorism" might unleash exactly the Brzezinskian "clash of civilizations" the plotters intended in the first place. As LaRouche concluded, "The coup attempt has been defeated, at least temporarily, but the nightmare rolls on." Nevertheless, the importance of the developing U.S.-Russia Presidential relationship, is underlined by the hostility of Brzezinsky himself to the summit. In a Nov. 13 *Washington Post* op-ed entitled "A New Age of Solidarity? Don't Count On It," Brzezinski denigrated Russian cooperation, calling instead on continued "American preponderance." This fits the neo-Conservative call for a "new imperialist" strategy for the United States as the "only remaining superpower."

A New 'Atlantic Alliance'

One of the key issues underlined by the Russian President was his country's intent to become an integral part of Europe. A major obstacle to such integration has been the continued existence of NATO, properly a defensive alliance against the former Soviet Union. Russia's new relationship with Europe, and hopefully, with the United States, makes NATO in its present form obsolete, Putin argues. This was also recognized by many political leaders in the early 1990s when the Berlin



Going into his meetings with Bush, Putin has made clear the Cold War is ended—emphasizing that that includes the long-standing American and Soviet practices of using terrorist formations as irregular-warfare troops against one another.

Wall came down; but instead of abolishing NATO as the Warsaw Pact was abolished, they set up instead a Joint Permanent Council between NATO and Russia as a temporary mechanism for consultation.

Putin insists that such an interim mechanism is now woefully insufficient. Speaking to a group of American journalists in Moscow on Nov. 12 prior to his departure for the United States, Putin said, “I think that the body which was established—the Permanent Council, the so-called SPS—has on the whole been useful at a certain stage. Today this body is totally insufficient to change the quality of relations between Russia and NATO. . . . I think that all understand the thesis according to which we will act effectively, vigorously, and persistently to attain the objectives and to accomplish the tasks which will be drafted with our participation. And if we do not participate in the drafting of these tasks, then, correspondingly, one may expect a certain kind of behavior of the Russian Federation.”

Speaking at the Russian Embassy on Nov. 13, Putin reiterated his position, “We intend to move toward the development of equal partnership with [NATO], to go as far—and I would like to stress this—as far as the Atlantic Alliance itself is ready to go, and to the extent that it is capable to take into account the legitimate interests of Russia.” At their joint press conference earlier in the day, it appeared that Putin had gotten some support from President Bush on that issue. “Russia should be a part of this Europe,” Bush told reporters. “We will work together with NATO and NATO members to build new avenues of cooperation and consultation between Russia and NATO. NATO members and Russia are increasingly allied against terrorism, regional instability, and other threats of our age, and NATO must reflect this alliance.”

In his Russian Embassy speech, Putin underlined cooper-

ation in the area of fundamental science. Reflecting many of the points that have been stressed by Lyndon LaRouche in his discussions with Russian scientific organizations, especially his emphasis on the significance of the fundamental work of Russian scientist Vladimir Vernadsky, Putin said, “Particularly great here, are the capabilities and potentialities of the scientific communities. After all, there are only two countries in the world that, from the very outset, chose to develop science across the board in all its spheres, and those countries are the United States and Russia.

“Ambition to produce knowledge, including fundamental knowledge, is an inherent feature of both the American and Russian cultures,” Putin said. “But the Russian fount of fundamental and technological knowledge has not yet been realized in full. Therefore, joint Russian-American R&D, we think, has great prospects, all the more so, since we already have an example of such a successful cooperation, and the example is NASA activities.”

Originally, Putin had intended to visit NASA but, for political or other reasons, that itinerary was changed. Putin came back many times to the important U.S.-Russian space cooperation. In his comments at Rice University, he noted that “Russian has been heard spoken for a long time now on the premises of the Johnson Space Center, and we even have a common holiday—that is, the 12th of April, the day when our Russian compatriot Yuri Gagarin made history to become the first man to travel in space. . . . We know that the legislative assembly of Texas declared that day to be a holiday. For us, it is a special symbol, and let me assure you that to us, this is something that makes us view Texas in a special way.”

It was an irony of administration economic policies that precisely as Putin spoke, a new NASA Administrator, Sean O’Keefe, was appointed to replace Administrator Dan



Putin spoke to American businessmen at the Russian Embassy on Nov. 13, telling them that cooperative U.S.-Russian relations go back to American independence.

Goldin, who had overseen all the U.S.-Russian cooperation during the post-Cold War period. The International Space Station, now the center of U.S.-Russian space cooperation, has suffered from numerous cost overruns, and it is feared that the new director, with his background in “business management” rather than in space science, will mandate even more cuts in the NASA budget which would threaten that very cooperation that Putin was referring to (see article in *Economics*).

ABM Or NMD?

On one of the more controversial issues, the two Presidents are still worlds apart: the issue of the ABM Treaty and the U.S. commitment to build a missile defense system. Administration officials downplayed any expectations of reaching an agreement now. In his interview with American journalists in Moscow, President Putin indicated that the United States had not provided Russia with any clear indication of how exactly they intend to proceed with their missile defense program, making it extremely difficult for the Russians to respond. “What do they specifically propose to change [in the ABM treaty]?” Putin asked. “What specifically hinders the implementation of the program which was conceived by the U.S. administration?”

Perhaps in an effort to move the Russian side a bit on that issue, President Bush agreed to unilaterally reduce U.S. nuclear warheads to a level of between somewhat 1,700 and 2,200 over the period of the next ten years, somewhat lower than the level the U.S. side had previously indicated it was willing to go. President Putin has agreed to come back soon with a Russian reduction level, after the experts have had a chance to study the Bush cuts, and it is felt that an agreement on reductions is only a matter of time. Nevertheless, many of President Putin’s military advisers are hesitant to agree to anything without some regime of verifiability as to the levels. “Trust, but verify,” was also President Reagan’s watchword

on the negotiations with Soviet President Gorbachov.

On the missile-defense issue, President Putin still intends to adhere to the ABM Treaty. According to the treaty, the U.S. could unilaterally withdraw with six months notice, notice which they have not yet given. It is generally believed that, barring any changes in the Russian position on the treaty itself, Russia may allow the U.S. broader parameters for missile-defense testing, than those allowed by a strict adherence to the treaty, giving more time to discussions regarding the ultimate fate of the treaty.

Uppermost in their discussions was the urgency of finding a political solution to the situation in Afghanistan. President Putin, who has direct contact with leaders of the Northern Alliance, has called for a multi-ethnic solution to the crisis.

More important, the issue of going after the “real flanks” against terrorism, which Lyndon LaRouche has continually stressed, has become an important focus of the Bush-Putin discussions. First, the two sides agreed to cooperate to bring Israel and the Palestinians to the negotiating table. In a joint statement, the two Presidents said that they were “stepping up their efforts aimed at facilitating an early resolution of the crisis in the region and resuming negotiations on all tracks — Palestinian, Syrian, and Lebanese.” This action was reflected in a unanimous UN Security Council demand on Nov. 11, that Israel immediately pull out of the Palestinian Authority’s Area A.

Drug trafficking is a second critical flank. Speaking to high-school students in Crawford, Bush said, about U.S.-Russian cooperation over a post-Taliban government in Afghanistan: “I think — and it started yesterday in my house in Crawford, where the President and I had a very long discussion about how to make sure that the post-Taliban Afghanistan accomplished some — certain objectives: one, that it be a peaceful neighbor to everybody in the region; secondly, that it never harbor and train — serve as a training ground for terrorism again; and third, that it be a country that doesn’t export drugs.” “I don’t know if you know this or not,” Bush continued, “but the Taliban government and al-Qaeda, the evil ones, used heroin trafficking in order to fund their murder. And one of our objectives is to make sure that Afghanistan is never used for that purpose again.”

Here again, during the Soviet war in Afghanistan, low-intensity operations by the CIA also involved using drugs to demoralize Soviet troops. Much of the drug problem in Russia today stems from their own “Afghan debacle.”

The United States has also committed to supporting the Caspian Pipeline Consortium — effectively scrapping the Brzezinski geopolitical gimmick of a Baku-Ceyhan pipeline going through Turkey — and to help develop new oil and gas resources in the Far Eastern Sakhalin area.

That this cooperation become a genuine “partnership,” requires President Bush taking up the cudgels against the “clash of civilizations” crew, both within and outside of his administration.