

Sib-Aral. The State Planning Committee, State Agro-Industrial Committee, and Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources were told to halt any work on these projects for their economic planning until 1990. Regional solutions would have to found to the Central Asian water shortages, Moscow announced.

The Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences led the opposition to the plan. This, combined with sharp cost-cutting, and “nationalist” views of some Russian writers opposed to sending such resources to the South, prevailed. Even after the August order, the controversy was so great, Micklin wrote, that criticism of the project continued, some of it exaggerated, misrepresentative, and using personal attacks.

A December 1991 *Pravda* interview of KGB Major General E.N. Yakovlev, on the 70th anniversary of the Soviet secret services, gives one insight into what was behind this decision. In 1985, Yakovlev said, the KGB had “obtained data” that Western intelligence services and experts viewed clean fresh water as “an important strategic material,” soon to be “in short supply in many parts of the world.” The Westerners urged saving water with better irrigation systems, but also “pointed out that gigantic projects to irrigate arid areas—and particularly to divert rivers—are not cost-effective.” Water losses, they claimed, are enormous and “negative ecological effects” too great. The KGB submitted these views to the Council of Ministers, which gave the KGB “several unpleasant moments.” There were many counter-reactions to these Western views.

Yakovlev said the KGB could not “claim the main role in the government’s decision, soon after, to reject river diversion,” but was gratified that it had “spoken out from objective, impartial positions.” (I owe this reference to my late colleague Denise Henderson.)

Indeed, Nikolay Grishchenko, leader of the project under the Soviet Union, said in April 2002, that he regretted the project had not been started then, in the 1980s. It would have increased agriculture production in the Aral Sea basin, and given the region good drinking water. “The West was against it, because it was selling a lot of grain and other produce to the Soviet Union and needed to keep its market intact,” he told Uzbek journalist Karina Insarova.

In Central Asia, the reaction to this Soviet decision was strong, especially in Uzbekistan and Kazakstan, where governments, population, and “scientists, writers, and journalists,” as Micklin wrote, continued to demand that action be taken to bring water to the region and the Aral Sea. In 1988, Micklin wrote that the “preservation of the Aral may require implementation of the controversial project to divert water from western Siberia into the Aral Sea basin.” Now, his views have apparently changed: UPI quoted him on April 2, 2004 warning that Central Asia “can (and probably must) get along without Siberian water”—because the World Bank and such institutions would not fund such a project.

More momentous decisions were being made in Moscow in August 1986. At the beginning of the month, then-U.S. President Reagan made a speech in Washington, describing

What Transforms The Biosphere?

And you look, as Vernadsky did, at the planet. And the planet is a Biosphere. What does that mean? That life is more powerful than abiotic principles. That life penetrates, and acts upon the domain of abiotic principles. Life does not come from inorganic processes. Life is a principle, in the universe, which *acts* upon what we call inorganic processes, to produce the combined effect, such as we call the Biosphere: a planet which has fossil layers and so forth—including the atmosphere which is a fossil, a product of living activities which produced the atmosphere, which produced the oceans, the water; which produced the fossil layers on this planet; which concentrated certain minerals and certain deposits within the fossil layer, which you will not find concentrated as efficiently for your purpose anywhere else, except by knowing which fossil made that deposit. Who made all that chalk, on the cliffs of

Dover? Trillions of animals, who died, and left their little bodies behind, as chalk, as a result of what they had consumed.

So, the planet is becoming, more and more, a living creature. Because, what we call the “inorganic” or abiotic processes of the planet, are constantly being gobbled up, and *taken over*, by a superior force, called “life!”

And then, we find a third one: The planet is being transformed, the biosphere is being transformed, by a *more powerful force!* The more powerful force is the ability of the human mind, to discover a universal physical principle. And the changes in the planet as a whole, as a result of man’s discovery and application of physical principles, is changing the planet into what Vernadsky called a Noö-sphere. That is, the ratio—of the total pure weight, of the mass of the planet—is being increased, so the product of man’s intervention, through man’s discovery of principles, is becoming more and more. And if this continues, the whole Solar System is going to become a product of the human mind, which has gobbled up, assimilated, and mastered all processes of non-living and living processes on the planet.—*Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.*